United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1999 No. 73

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 19, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

We know, O God, how we strive to gain influence and extend our ideas and we know too that Your word calls us to see the needs of others. We admit that excessive pride demands victory in all things but Your word calls us to do justice and speak the truth. We acknowledge that we can see more clearly the evil in another person but can miss the selfishness in our own hearts. O gracious God, our creator and our guide, we pray Your spirit will lead us in the way of justice and reconciliation and with a greater understanding may we walk faithfully along the road of peace. In Your holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4. An act to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 39. An act to provide a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 95–521, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Patricia Mack Bryan, of Virginia, as Senate Legal Counsel, effective as of June 1, 1999, for a term of service to expire at the end of the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public law 105–341, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individuals to the Women's Progress Commemoration Commission:

Joan Doran Hedrick, of Connecticut;

Lisa Perry, of New York; and

Virginia Driving Hawk Sneve, of South Dakota.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 one-minutes per side.

UNITED WE STAND, DIVIDED WE FALL

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Lincoln once said, ''United we stand, divided we fall.'' Well, that old adage is quite appropriate to the Kosovo crisis, and I am sure Mr. Milosevic understands it very well.

Just take a look at NATO. The British are calling for ground troops and a summer invasion of Yugoslavia; while the Germans, the Finns, and the Italians are openly opposed to ground troops and are engaged in a hectic peacekeeping effort calling for a pause in the NATO bombing.

Meanwhile, the European Union leaders met with Russian delegates with very little progress, and no signs of any agreement on how to proceed.

Now, on the other hand, the Clinton administration may or may not be opposed to ground troops. It certainly does not support a bombing pause. Now, is anyone else confused?

Mr. Speaker, one week ago 11 Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, tried to provide the administration with a simple framework for peace in Kosovo, in complete cooperation with the Russian Duma. The administration, however, came out whining about freelance diplomacy, but sadly they have completely missed the point.

Our bipartisan effort is simply an attempt to get the Clinton administration and the rest of NATO singing off the same sheet of music, and to bring solidarity, consensus, and a peaceful conclusion to this confusing crisis.

Printed on recycled paper.

EVERY DIPLOMATIC OPPORTUNITY SHOULD BE PURSUED TO END WAR IN YUGOSLAVIA

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, there is a drumbeat in Washington this morning, as there has been a drumbeat in London, where troops are being advocated to be sent to Kosovo and into the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for purposes of winding up this war.

I think it is an important moment to reflect, as British officials are visiting this country today, as to whether or not it is in the best interest of our country to not just be talking about ground troops but to even have the thought of an expanded war in which the lives of our young people, of our sons and daughters, would be put at risk.

I say that instead of talking about the possibility of an expanded war, we should begin aggressively to pursue peace. We should look for every diplomatic opportunity to bring an end to this war, to stop the conflict, to stop the bombing, to begin the withdrawal of the Serbian troops, to stop the military activities of the KLA, to begin the repatriation of the refugees, to give them a chance to go home.

This has to be done diplomatically with international armed peacekeeping troops. We cannot win this war militarily. We have to bring an end to it diplomatically.

THE CLINTON-GORE ADMINISTRATION IS REFUSING TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE HEALTH CARE FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, why is the Clinton administration shortchanging Medicare? Under the Clinton-Gore leadership, the executive branch's Health Care Financing Administration is refusing to spend money which is desperately needed by our Nation's elderly population and which has been authorized under the Balanced Budget Act. This amounts to an astonishing $20 billion this administration is withholding from the most deserving members of our society: retired Americans who are suffering from illness.

There is a lot of discussion in this town about abiding by the caps of the Balanced Budget Act, and I support the idea of requiring our appropriation bills to follow the budget. But when the Congress and the President enact a statute that says funds are needed to ensure the health of our country's greatest generation, HCFA has an obligation to abide by the law.

It is a scandal that the Clinton-Gore administration is refusing to provide adequate health care for our senior citizens.

AMERICA GIVES, GIVES, GIVES TO RUSSIA AND RUSSIA TAKES, TAKES, TAKES

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, a classified report says, and I quote, Russia is spying on NATO and America. The report goes on and says Russia has recruited spies and is sabotaging our activities in the Balkans. Now, if that is not enough to scorch your Apache, Russia is passing on our secrets to Milosevic. Unbelievable. Think about it. America gives, gives, gives to Russia. Russia takes, takes, takes; then stabs us right in the back.

Beam me up. I say Russia is a bunch of ingrates that should not get one more penny from Uncle Sam. Finally I say, after the bombing is over, let Russia go in with their rubles and rebuild Yugoslavia, not Uncle Sam.

THE QUESTION ARISES, WHAT WAS THIS PRESIDENT OPPOSED TO IN VIETNAM?

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a quote made recently by retired three star General Tom Griffin, attempting to understand our involvement in Yugoslavia. I quote: ''Now let's see here if I understand all this correctly. President Clinton has ordered our forces to engage an entrenched, politically motivated enemy backed by the Russians, on their home ground, in a foreign civil war, in difficult terrain, with limited military objectives, bombing restrictions, boundary and operational restrictions, queasy allies, far across the ocean, with uncertain goals, without prior consultation with Congress, the potential for escalation, while limiting the forces at his disposal, and the majority of Americans opposed to or at least uncertain about the value of the action being worth American lives,'' end quote.

When we review history, the question arises, what was this President opposed to in Vietnam? Are we going to learn from the history of the 1960s?

IF WE HAVE THE POWER TO BOMB, THEN WE HAVE THE POWER TO SETTLE THIS WAR IN YUGOSLAVIA

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of finger pointing with the tragedy of Littleton, Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I announce a proposal for ''give a child a chance'' omnibus mental health services bill for our children, for there are many things that we can do, but I believe that it is important that we listen to young people and provide them with school counseling services and guidance services which will be available to intervene for children at risk and others.

Mr. Speaker, as we talk about violence, let me move quickly to a subject and join my colleague in asking for a cessation in the bombing. I have asked the President for three days, 72 hours, in order to begin talks on a negotiated settlement over the Kosova conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can win. I supported the air strike. I certainly did not support the bill yesterday that was throwing good money after bad, $15 billion, although I supported it before for the refugees and military pay increase. If one has the power, they need to use it right. We need to go to the negotiated settlement table right now and deal with the request or the needs of the NATO allies and begin to send refugees back home.

When I went to the refugee camps in Macedonia, they said one thing to me: Promise to help us go back home. And that was my promise. If we have the power to bomb, then we have the power to settle this.

We need to be at the table of settlement, the negotiated settlement with Mr. Milosevic. It has nothing to do with whether he is a war criminal. That is another matter. Let us get a negotiated settlement and stop this conflict now. It is time now to stop the bombing and begin to discuss the way to really get our refugees back home and bring our military personnel back home.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION SHORTCHANGING SENIORS

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, why is the Clinton administration shortchanging our seniors? Here is a story we will not be hearing much in the mainstream media. The administration is spending $20 billion a year less on Medicare than Congress authorized and provided under the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. My colleagues heard that right, and let me repeat it. The administration is hoarding $20 billion a year from the funds the Republican Congress provided under the current law.

Skeptical? I encourage my colleagues to give a call over to their friendly HCFA offices and verify these numbers for themselves. One can hardly grasp the irony of the startling facts. The same administration that has run millions and millions of dollars in deceptive Medicare TV ads aimed at scaring seniors is now found to be shortchanging the same seniors they claim to care so much about.

We cannot blame seniors for becoming cynical about this administration's constant willingness to play politics

with Medicare. Do our seniors not deserve better?

ADMINISTRATION CUTS MEDICARE BY REFUSING TO SPEND THE MONEY

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) points out yet another way in which the Clinton-Gore team says one thing and does another. Indeed, to use the rhetoric of Mediscare from 1996, in essence Mr. Clinton, Mr. Gore and their liberal allies have cut Medicare by $20 billion by refusing to spend the money.

I suppose it will come as no great surprise to the pundits and those in town here engaged in spin, because we have a credibility canyon of people saying one thing and doing another.

□ 1015

That is why, Mr. Speaker, not only in terms of defending our seniors, but for all Americans in terms of national security, this House should release the Cox Committee Report so that we can get to the bottom of Chinese espionage and transfers of technology, not to engage in spin and double-talk, as some do at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, but because the American people deserve the facts, and free people in a constitutional society have the right to a common defense and a sound national security.

Let us end this breach of credibility. Let us heal that breach and give the American people straight answers.

BUCKLE UP AND DRIVE SAFELY

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Transportation Week to discuss the safety of our Nation's children. As a father of a four-year-old, this issue hits home for me.

I am a strong advocate of child passenger safety laws, but sadly, not all of America's drivers are. Listen to the statistics. Each year, 1,800 children ages 14 and under are killed. More than 280,000 are injured. An average of 24 children 10 years and under die every week. Why is this happening? We are not protecting our children. Six out of 10, or 60 percent, of the children who die in automobile crashes are unrestrained. No seat belt, no car seat.

Mr. Speaker, the law is clear. All children must be buckled up at all times. As parents and drivers, let us demonstrate a commitment to protecting our youth. I urge my colleagues to buckle up and travel safely.

DEMOCRATS MAKE MEDICARE POLITICAL ISSUE

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let us face it. The Clinton administration sure does talk a good game about Medicare, but now there is even more evidence that the administration and their liberal defenders in Congress are only paying lip service to the seniors they claim to champion.

First, they shot down, for political reasons, their own bipartisan Commission on Medicare Reform. They said, you can kiss Medicare reform goodbye in this Congress because the Democrats need to make it a political issue in the 2000 election. After all, what would an election be without Democrats scaring seniors with demagoguery about Medicare? Mr. Speaker, do not take my word for it. Just ask the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana in the other body about the Medicare Commission and why the White House will not even look at it.

Now we learn that the administration is shortchanging seniors to the tune of $20 billion in this year alone from the Medicare program. Hard to believe? Well, ask the hospitals and the seniors if it is true or not.

This administration is spending $20 billion less than authorized by law. Our seniors deserve better.

REPUBLICAN MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN SAVES MORE FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican plan saves $100 billion more for Social Security and Medicare compared to the Clinton plan. Now, this one is going to be awfully difficult for the Democrats to spin, to deny, or to demagogue.

Do not get me wrong, this will not stop them from trying. But the numbers are there for all to see. They are on the Internet. They are on the record at the Congressional Budget Office, or the CBO. In fact, even a generation of children growing up on rain forest math, whole math, and arithmetic through self-esteem could probably figure out the truth about the Republican budget.

The Republican budget saves $100 billion more for Social Security and Medicare over the next 10 years than the Clinton budget does. Mr. Speaker, $1.8 trillion is locked away from Social Security and Medicare by the GOP plan.

Under the Clinton plan, $1.3 billion is promised, but not locked away, for Social Security and Medicare, and the kicker is that the Clinton plan contains $350 billion in new Medicare IOUs, a bad deal for seniors.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT HONESTY AND INTEGRITY FROM PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the book that I am holding up came from the Library of Congress, and it is entitled Honest Graft. It is written by Brooks Jackson, and it documents the influence-peddling and the soft money abuses of a former Member of Congress and the former head of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. Largely as a result of the events that were documented in this book, that former Member was compelled to resign his seat in the Congress.

The significance of this today is that that discredited former Member, who literally invented the soft money scams and then worked to hide the truth from the American people, has been tapped for a new job and that new job is heading up the Vice President's campaign.

To all of my colleagues who have argued on this floor that we need to reform campaign laws, particularly those on the Democratic side, I say, you need to join me in speaking out that the Vice President is making a huge mistake. This decision reflects poorly on his commitment to honesty and integrity, and the American people are crying out for honesty and integrity in the candidates for the next President of the United States.

NO AMERICAN BLOOD SPENT ON THE FIELDS OF KOSOVO

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is on the verge of sending in ground troops into Kosovo. Just look at the headlines in today's Washington newspapers. Estimates, however, take between 150,000 and 300,000 ground troops in Kosovo, with casualties of between 7 and 12 percent, and 65 percent of those ground troops would be Americans. Casualties of up to 20,000 Americans in Kosovo, and who is pushing it? NATO, many of whose members still continue to ship oil to Serbia. Who is pushing it? The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom who uses the word ''we.'' His Nation sends 20 airplanes to Serbia, while the United States sends over 600.

It is time to negotiate a settlement now. It is time to stand up and say, the American people do not want any blood of American soldiers spent on the fields of Kosovo.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1654, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 174

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 174 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1654, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1999.

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000, 2001 and 2002 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for other purposes.

The rule provides for one hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. The rule waives points of orders against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII, requiring a three-day layover of the committee report.

Additionally, the rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. The rule provides that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be open for amendment at any point. The rule further waives points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI, prohibiting nongermane amendments.

The Chair is authorized by the rule to grant priority and recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the Congressional RECORD prior to their consideration.

The rule allows for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 174 is a fair and open rule for consideration of H.R. 1654, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act. It is my understanding that some Members may wish to offer germane amendments to this bill, and under this open rule, they will have every opportunity to do so.

Mr. Speaker, this seems an appropriate week for us to consider this rule and its underlying bill, H.R. 1654. Across our Nation, Americans from every age group and every walk of life have shown our Nation's continuing fascination with the mysteries of space. Last night as the clock struck 12 o'clock, thousands upon thousands of people took part in an unprecedented phenomena across these United States, lining up to see the sequel to the 22-year-old movie, Star Wars. But our country's fascination with space and space exploration is rooted as much in science as it is in science fiction.

Long before anyone heard of George Lucas or Darth Vader, Americans were fixated on the small screen in their living rooms to bear witness to Alan Sheppard's first manned Mercury space flight and Neil Armstrong's first steps on the room. And, baby boomers and generation-Xers alike shared in two historic flights, John Glenn's first orbit of the Earth aboard Friendship VII in 1962, and his return to space 36 years later aboard the Shuttle Discovery.

This rule and its underlying bill will allow NASA and America's space program to move forward with a multinational space station.

In addition to our Nation's contribution, 15 other countries have invested $5 billion in the International Space Station program, and continued U.S. support will show the world our commitment to the international science projects. Further, the ISS means over 75,000 American jobs. With this space station, with moving our space program forward, young Americans will continue to be attracted to fields and job markets like science and engineering, areas that are key to making American industry more competitive across the globe.

□ 1030

I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) for their hard work on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to both support this open rule and the underlying bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 174 is an open rule, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1654, which will authorize NASA for the next fiscal year.

Although I support the bill, Mr. Speaker, I do not support waiving the requirement that committee reports lay over for 3 days. Even though this is a good bill, I think Members should have a chance to examine it before they have to vote on it. The Committee on Science report was not even given to the Democratic members of the Committee on Rules before our meeting yesterday to report this rule to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the House has not exactly been working at a breakneck pace over the last few weeks, so I really cannot understand why my Republican colleagues decided not to let us see this bill in advance.

Lately this seems to be part of the pattern. Since this Congress began 5 months ago, 12 of the 34 rules we have considered have contained waivers of the 3-day layover requirement. That is one-third of all the rules in the 106th Congress waiving the 3-day layover requirement.

And, the committee report that we received in the Committee on Rules did not even contain some of the things it

was supposed to contain. It was supposed to contain the Ramsayer and the proceedings of the full committee markup. Mr. Speaker, it did not. I am sure they are probably contained somewhere in the printed version of the report, but I still think they should have been given to the Committee on Rules before it began its deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, nearly all of NASA reauthorizations are bipartisan, and that is the way they should be. Americans have always been pioneers, and NASA is agency of the pioneers. They expand our frontiers into space. They perform research in the heavens to benefit us here on Earth.

Thirty years ago, NASA put Neal Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Buz Aldrin on the moon. Three years ago NASA set up the Mars Pathfinder, which has expanded knowledge of our close neighbors and given us an idea of the possibilities of life off of Earth. This March NASA finishes a project mapping Mars.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has discovered new galaxies and planets in our solar system.

NASA's Hubble Telescope gave us incredible color pictures of space. They discover new worlds, enrich our minds, and stir our spirits.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that NASA is partly to thank for the long, long lines referred to by my dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) that are now currently outside the new Star Wars Phantom Menace.

So I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues have decided to make it partisan. They singled out one particular project for elimination, one out of all the projects, Mr. Speaker. That project has been championed by Vice President GORE. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no reason for the elimination of this particular project except partisan politics.

In the future, Mr. Speaker, I hope my Republican colleagues will allow us to see the bills before we actually vote on them. I urge my colleagues to support this open rule and to support this bill. NASA does provide the research for the future and the explanations for the past.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1553, NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 175

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1553) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 175 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1553, the National Weather Service and Related Agencies Authorization Act of 1999.

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Science.

The rule further provides that it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and now printed in the bill.

The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be open for amendment at any point. The Chair is authorized by the rule to grant priority to recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration.

The rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that House Resolution 175 is a fair rule. It is an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 1553, the National Weather Service and Related Agencies Authorization Act of 1999.

It is my understanding that some Members may wish to offer germane amendments on this bill, and under this open rule they will have every opportunity to do so. H.R. 1553 authorizes funding for several very important weather service programs in the United States. In fact, funding for the National Weather Service alone is about one-third of the total annual National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration budget.

Mr. Speaker, as the events of Monday, May 3, in Oklahoma showed us, we are still often powerless against the fury of Mother Nature. An outbreak of more than 40 tornadoes claimed 44 lives, destroyed or heavily damaged 5,200 homes, and left more than $1 billion in property damage in its wake. The damage to life, property, and community was devastating, but it could have been even worse without the National Weather Service's first tornado warning at 4:45 p.m.

This rule, and its underlying bill, will help improve, modernize and automate

weather observations and improve public forecasts and warnings of severe weather events.

The fact is the National Weather Service provides a valuable source of early warning and observations to the American people. Whether a tornado or hurricane, blizzard or tropical storm, this rule and its underlying bill can save countless lives and property by assuring early and accurate warning systems.

Further, atmospheric research programs have helped improve severe weather forecast and warning capabilities, and improved knowledge about severe storms and the science of weather modification, important for U.S. transportation and agriculture.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the ranking member, for their hard work on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support both this open rule and the underlying bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 175 is a fair, completely open rule, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. The debate will be equally divided and controlled by the majority, and equally divided, as far as the debate is concerned, between the majority and minority.

The rule permits amendments to come up under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides will have the opportunity to offer germane amendments.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is about research to be conducted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It has tremendous potential to pay off through improved environmental quality and better weather prediction.

This bill provides no increase in funding in fiscal year 2001 for that research. Consequently, inflation will result in a slight cut in spending power. Funding in important areas of research like this should remain stable. Therefore, it is unfortunate that the committee rejected an amendment to provide a modest 3 percent increase in fiscal year 2001.

This rule waives the requirement for a 3-day layover of the committee report. This was necessary because the report was not filed until Tuesday. Waiving this rule gives Members a little less time to examine the bill and to draft amendments.

Despite these concerns, the bill is relatively uncontroversial. The rule is an open rule which will give Members the opportunity to offer amendment. The rule was adopted by voice vote of the Committee on Rules. For these reasons, I can support the rule.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on this resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1045

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS). Pursuant to House Resolution 174 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1654.

The Chair designates the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1045

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a 3-year authorization for our civil space program. When combined with separate legislation authorizing government-wide programs and high performance computing and information technologies, that represents a 1 percent annual increase over NASA's budget requests.

The bill provides full funding for the baselined International Space Station, which moved from a dream to a reality last year with the successful launch of the first two elements. At the same time, the bill promotes fiscal and programmatic responsibility by prohibiting NASA from adding content to the program in a costly new structure called Trans-Hab. Together, this constraint and the 3-year authorization will provide the Space Station with the stability it needs to achieve the same success fiscally that the program is demonstrating technically.

The bill also includes modest funding increases in areas of key scientific research. In the past few years the administration has cut some $742 million out of life and microgravity research accounts in NASA. This bill restores some $228 million of that over 3 years to take a small step towards ensuring that the science community is prepared to maximize the research potential of the International Space Station.

It also contains increases for space science to put the Near Earth Object Survey back on track, to promote research in space solar power that will have applications here on Earth, and to offset the cost of NASA's emergency Hubble Space Telescope repair mission.

More importantly, the bill increases funding for NASA's work in advanced space transportation technologies. Last year we learned the perils of launching U.S.-built payloads on foreign rockets. In the last 6 months we have seen a string of launch failures that have reminded us how critical reliable, low-cost access to space is for our economy, our scientific endeavors, and our national security.

H.R. 1654 accelerates and increases the funding for NASA's programs to develop a new generation of space transportation vehicles. The NASA administrator and the head of the U.S. Space Command have both said frequently that this must be a high national priority. H.R. 1654 ensures that it is.

We have developed this bill on a bipartisan basis and reached agreement on a wide range of issues. I think our efforts to work together come through in the bill's list of bipartisan original cosponsors and its bipartisan endorsement by the Committee on Science last week.

There are a few remaining points on which the majority and minority disagree, and I want to thank Members of both parties for working together to iron out most of these over the past few days. For now we may have to agree to disagree on the few outstanding issues that remain, but they should not get in the way of such a sound and comprehensive bill upon which to build our future in space.

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

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

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to include for the RECORD a letter from Administrator Goldin of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in which, among other things, he states ''NASA strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1654.''

The letter is as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Ranking Member, Committee on Science, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BROWN: This letter is to provide NASA's views on H.R. 1654, the ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1999,'' authorizing appropriations for FY 2000–2002, as ordered reported by the Committee on May 13, 1999.

NASA strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1654. The authorization levels in the bill do not conform to the President's request, which is based on a balanced and affordable space and aeronautics program. H.R. 1654 would authorize a total of $13,625.6 million in FY 2000, $13,747.1 million in FY 2001 and $13,839.4 million in FY 2002. As ordered reported, total funding for FY 2000 exceeds the President's request by a net of $47.2 million; total funding for FY 2001 is below the President's request by a net of $82 million. The majority of the additional funding provided is for Life and micro gravity Sciences and Applications, Advanced Space Transportation Technology, and Academic Programs. At the same time, funding authorized in H.R. 1654 reflects significant reductions ($174.4 million in FY 2000, $211.1 million in FY 2001, and $216.6 million in FY 2002) for High Performance Computing and Communications (HPCC) and Information Technology for the 21st century (IT2).

While the Administration recognizes that the Committee strongly supports NASA program efforts for which they have recommended augmentations, such additional spending must be evaluated against the imperative to maintain an overall balance in NASA's aeronautics and space research program and against the impacts resulting from the resulting reductions in other critical programs. Failure to fund NASA's HPCC and IT2 activities in a timely manner would be unacceptable.

NASA appreciates the Committee's authorization of funding for the International Space Station (ISS) Program consistent with the President's request. That request reflects an Administration policy decision to reduce the level of risk to the ISS with a net increase of $1.4 billion over the next five years, to enhance Station budget reserves and to make NASA's Contingency Plan against potential Russian shortfalls more robust. The Committee's support for these efforts is appreciated, and I look forward to continuing to work together on this very important program.

While NASA supports those portions of H.R. 1654 that are consistent with the President's request, we have serious objections to several provisions that are contrary to the President's budget. I request that you and the Committee take NASA's objections, outlined below, into consideration as this bill proceeds through Congress.

TRIANA

NASA and the Administration are greatly disappointed in the Committee's adoption of an amendment (Section 130) terminating the Triana science mission. Triana is good science, was subject to a rigorous peer review process, and will provide the scientific community with valuable research data. We strongly object to the Committee's arbitrary and partisan recommendation to terminate the Triana science mission.

In October 1998, after an exacting peer-review evaluation of nine competing proposals, NASA selected the Scripps Institution of Oceanography as the Principle Investigator for the Triana mission. The Conference Report accompanying the FY 1999 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act (P.L. 105–276) directed NASA to identify funding for the initiation of Triana as part of NASA's FY 1999 Operating Plan. NASA identified $35 million in the FY 1999 Operating Plan submitted to this and other Committees, and responded to questions thereon. NASA's FY 2000 budget requests $35 million to complete development of Triana, and launch it in December 2000 as a secondary payload on the Space Shuttle.

Triana has sound science objectives and will present valuable practical applications in: solar influences on climate; solar wind and space weather; ultraviolet (UV) radiation effects of clouds, aerosols, and surface radiation; cloud microphysical properties and the effect of solar radiation on climate models; and vegetation canopy measurements, detecting changes in the amount of vegetation-leaf structure, or fraction of covered land.

NASA is also formulating an Earth Science education initiative using Triana imagery, and is planning to issue an open, competitive solicitation for educational tools and applications this fall. NASA has received inquiries from three commercial firms regarding Triana participation. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography is currently working to structure a commercialization approach.

INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION RESEARCH

Section 101 of H.R. 1654 limits the flexibility of the ISS program to accommodate unforeseen requirements by restricting the use of ISS research funds. Should program difficulties result in further schedule delays, such a restriction could result in research equipment being developed prior to the Station's readiness to accommodate it. This could exacerbate the delay by not allowing the flexibility to shift research funds and address Station contingencies. Such restrictions could, therefore, prolong delays in research flight opportunities and further harm the research community intended to be helped.

EARTH SCIENCE COMMERCIAL DATA ACQUISITION

Section 126 of H.R. 1654 would require that NASA spend $50 million in FY 2001 and FY 2002 for the purchase of commercial remote sensing data. NASA objects to a mandated minimum level of spending for such acquisitions, at the expense of other research opportunities in the Earth Science enterprise. There is no guarantee that such commercial data will be available for acquisition in such amounts stipulated in the bill. NASA should not be precluded from directing its resources in the most efficient and effective manner.

As a matter of policy, NASA's Earth Science Enterprise will not build new missions where commercial data is available at market prices, and the Enterprise has instituted a process under which all Announcements of Opportunity include statements of data buy preferences. The Earth Science Enterprise will release, in the near future, two Requests for Information (RFI's), one for determining sources of Landsat-class observations, and a second for determining sources of tropospheric wind measurements. The Enterprise is also working toward the objective of having each scientific and application research proposal identify the source of data sets required, and including an estimate of the funding requirement for such data sets. This approach is intended to establish a direct dialog between the providers and users of data, and NASA does not have to second-guess the user requirements and unduly constrain the provider's capabilities.

Finally, the NASA Inspector General recently released a report on the Commercial Remote Sensing Program, and concluded ''additional congressionally directed data buy programs are not warranted.''

TRANS-HAB

Section 128 of H.R. 1654 would prevent NASA from further research on inflatable technology, such as Trans-Hab, which would accommodate humans in space. Inflatable module technology offers the potential for significant stowage volume, crew habitability and safety advantages over current approaches for building pressurized space structures using reinforced aluminum. The technology holds considerable potential for advancement of space exploration. NASA shares the Committee's concern that added cost and risk to the ISS should be avoided. NASA desires to continue to explore potential commercial partnering for the development, construction, and use for the ISS Trans-Hab module. We will not pursue the development of a Trans-Hab module for the ISS unless it can be done through a partnership with industry that results in a cost-neutral solution to the baseline cost for the aluminum Habitation module. Additional technical definition and design work is necessary before potential commercial interests can be assured of the viability of the concepts. H.R. 1654 would preclude any work on this very promising set of technologies.

ULTRA-EFFICIENT ENGINE TECHNOLOGY

I am very concerned that Section 103(4) eliminates the Ultra-Efficient Engine Technology (UEET) program as a Focused Program. We understand that it is the Committee's intent to permit these activities to be conducted within the R&T base. We strongly urge the continuation of this effort as a Focused Program.

UEET as a Focused Program gives all interested parties—other Government agencies (e.g., DoD) and the private sector—assurances that resources have been identified to meet defined goals over a specified period of time. Fully 80% of program funding for UEET will be spent in-house, primarily for the operation of test stands and facilities, in coordination with the ongoing DoD program. The UEET Program is designed to address the most critical propulsion issues: performance and efficiency. The primary benefits of these technologies will be to improve efficiency and reduce emissions for a wide range of civil and military applications.

Loss of the UEET effort could have major consequences for the future competitiveness of the U.S. aircraft engine industry and the U.S. balance of trade. Research associated with understanding the technical issues of engine emissions supports a major portion of U.S. scientific analysis that provides a basis for informed policy making and U.S. influence on international civil aviation policies. Finally, it should be noted that significant interaction and dependencies have been formed over the years in engine technology efforts between NASA's Space Programs, DoD's Acquisition Programs and DOE's Energy Programs; while the impact of the restriction in H.R. 1654 upon these interdependencies has not yet been completely assessed, there will be implications to U.S. strategic interests in these critical areas.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS

H.R. 1654 does not include ten important legislative proposals proposed by the Administration in the draft FY 2000 NASA authorization bill, submitted to the Congress on April 28, 1999. Many of these proposed provisions are legislative ''gap fillers''—providing NASA the same authority already provided to the Department of Defense in title 10 of the U.S. Code and to other civilian agencies in title 41 of the U.S. Code.

NASA is covered by the acquisition provisions of title 10, but is frequently overlooked when amendments to that title are enacted. Section 203 of the Administration's bill

would provide NASA the same authority as that available to DoD and other civilian agencies to withhold contract payments based on substantial evidence of fraud. Section 209 would make NASA's claim payment process consistent with procedures already required by other law and with those used by other agencies. Section 210 would provide NASA the same authority as that available to DoD and other civilian agencies to exempt contractor proposals from release under the Freedom of Information Act.

The remaining provisions contained in the Administration's bill address the need to adapt NASA's legal authorities to the world in which we now operate. The role of the commercial sector has been ever increasing. With the support of this Committee, NASA has been changing the way it does business, looking for opportunities to engage in joint endeavors with industry, and attempting to leverage the private sector investment in space and aeronautics research and development. These activities present new and different working relationships and legal hurdles. We are asking the private sector to invest not only money, but also ideas. We must be able to protect these ideas from disclosure to competitors—foreign as well as domestic—which have not invested their time or capital. In order to attract industry partners and their investments, we must be able to grant them some form of exclusive right to use the software or other inventions arising from their joint endeavor with us before it is released to the general public. Our space program should benefit not only from the increased investment of private capital, but also from the royalties derived from such licensing authority. We must be able to attract more private investment—and thus reduce the cost to the Government—by being able to transfer title to personal property used in our joint endeavors to the partner whom we are asking to invest the capital. I urge the Committee to incorporate these provisions as the bill progresses through Congress.

HPCC AND IT2

As reported, H.R. 1654 deletes all funding for NASA's High Performance Computing and Communication program (HPCC) and Information Technology for the 21st century (IT2) initiative, including the very important Intelligent Synthesis Environment (ISE) program. Although the Committee has indicated its intent to hold hearings and mark up a separate, multi-agency, ''computer research'' bill later this year, in the absence of the introduction of a companion measure that fully funds those activities, NASA's support for H.R. 1654 will continue to be qualified.

Not authorizing funding requested for NASA's HPCC and IT2 would essentially remove all of the Agency's research in information technology, and severely impact NASA's remaining programs and missions. Both programs are structured to contribute to broad Federal efforts, but also to address NASA-specific computational, engineering, and science requirements spanning many programs. Not authorizing HPCC and IT2 would severely limit NASA's ability to deliver key capabilities needed to support Earth, space, and aeronautical programs, with impacts such as the following:

Cut Earth and Space Sciences and directly impact NASA's ability to use advanced computing technology to further our ability to predict the dynamic interaction of physical, chemical and biological processes affecting the Earth, the solar-terrestrial environment, and the universe;

Cut Space Science and eliminate NASA's capability to develop low-power, fault-tolerant, high-performance, scaleable computing technology for a new generation of micro-spacecraft;

Cut Aero-Space Technology and eliminate critical advances in aeronautics algorithms and applications, software, and computing machinery needed to enable more than 1000 fold increases in systems performance in the 21st century;

Cut Aero-Space Technology and limit implementation of the tools and processes for a revolution in engineering practice and science integration in modeling, design, development and execution of all NASA's missions; and,

Cut Space Science and eliminate NASA's Self-Sustaining Robotic Networks program to develop the critical set of technologies necessary to support potential future decisions on establishing outposts of self-tasking, self-repairing, evolvable rover networks at key sites of scientific interest throughout the solar system.

We are preparing a more detailed analysis of additional concerns regarding H.R. 1654, which we believe will hamper our ability to manage our space and aeronautics research programs most effectively. I urge the Committee to consider these concerns as the bill proceeds through the legislative process.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to submission of this report for the Committee's consideration.

Sincerely,

DANIEL S. GOLDIN,
Administrator.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1999.

Hon. BART GORDON,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, Committee on Science, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GORDON: This letter is to provide NASA's views on H.R. 1654, the ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1999,'' authorizing appropriations for FY 2000–2002, as ordered reported by the Committee on May 13, 1999.

NASA strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1654. The authorization levels in the bill do not conform to the President's request, which is based on a balanced and affordable space and aeronautics program. H.R. 1654 would authorize a total of $13,625.6 million in FY 2000, $13,747.1 million in FY 2001 and $13,839.4 million in FY 2002. As ordered reported, total funding for FY 2000 exceeds the President's request by a net of $47.2 million; total funding for FY 2001 is below the President's request by a net of $5.3 million and total funding for FY 2002 exceeds the President's request by a net of $82 million. The majority of the additional funding provided is for Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications, Advanced Space Transportation Technology, and Academic Programs. At the same time, funding authorized in H.R. 1654 reflects significant reductions ($174.4 million in FY 2000, $211.1 million in FY 2001, and $216.6 million in FY 2002) for High Performance Computing and Communications (HPCC) and Information Technology for the 21st century (IT2).

While the Administration recognizes that the Committee strongly supports NASA program efforts for which they have recommended augmentations, such additional spending must be evaluated against the imperative to maintain an overall balance in NASA's aeronautics and space research program and against the impacts resulting from the resulting reductions in other critical programs. Failure to fund NASA's HPCC and IT2 activities in a timely manner would be unacceptable.

NASA appreciates the Committee's authorization of funding for the International Space Station (ISS) Program consistent with the President's request. That request reflects an Administration policy decision to reduce the level of risk to the ISS with a net increase of $1.4 billion over the next five years, to enhance Station budget reserves and to make NASA's Contingency Plan against potential Russian shortfalls more robust. The Committee's support for these efforts is appreciated, and I look forward to continuing to work together on this very important program.

While NASA supports those portions of H.R. 1654 that are consistent with the President's request, we have serious objections to several provisions that are contrary to the President's budget. I request that you and the Committee take NASA's objections, outlined below, into consideration as this bill proceeds through Congress.

TRIANA

NASA and the Administration are greatly disappointed in the Committee's adoption of an amendment (Section 130) terminating the Triana science mission. Triana is good science, was subject to a rigorous peer review process, and will provide the scientific community with valuable research data. We strongly object to the Committee's arbitrary and partisan recommendation to terminate the Triana science mission.

In October 1998, after an exacting peer-review evaluation of nine competing proposals, NASA selected the Scripps Institution of Oceanography as the Principle Investigator for the Triana mission. The Conference Report accompanying the FY 1999 VA–HUD–Independent Agencies Appropriations Act (P.L. 105–276) directed NASA to identify funding for the initiation of Triana as part of NASA's FY 1999 Operating Plan. NASA identified $35 million in the FY 1999 Operating Plan submitted to this and other Committees, and responded to questions thereon. NASA's FY 2000 budget requests $35 million to complete development of Triana, and launch it in December 2000 as a secondary payload on the Space Shuttle.

Triana has sound science objectives and will present valuable practical applications in: solar influences on climate; solar wind and space weather; ultraviolet (UV) radiation effects of clouds, aerosols, and surface radiation; cloud microphysical properties and the effect of solar radiation on climate models; and vegetation canopy measurements, detecting changes in the amount of vegetation-leaf structure, or fraction of covered land.

NASA is also formulating an Earth Science education initiative using Triana imagery, and is planning to issue an open, competitive solicitation for educational tools and applications this fall. NASA has received inquiries from three commercial firms regarding Triana participation. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography is currently working to structure a commercialization approach.

INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION RESEARCH

Section 101 of H.R. 1654 limits the flexibility of the ISS program to accommodate unforeseen requirements by restricting the use of ISS research funds. Should program difficulties result in further schedule delays, such a restriction could result in research equipment being developed prior to the Station's readiness to accommodate it. This could exacerbate the delay by not allowing the flexibility to shift research funds and address Station contingencies. Such restriction could, therefore, prolong delays in research flight opportunities and further harm the research community intended to be helped.

EARTH SCIENCE COMMERCIAL DATA ACQUISITION

Section 126 of H.R. 1654 would require that NASA spend $50 million in FY 2001 and FY

2002 for the purchase of commercial remote sensing data. NASA objects to a mandated minimum level of spending for such acquisitions, at the expense of other research opportunities in the Earth Science enterprise. There is no guarantee that such commercial data will be available for acquisition in such amounts stipulated in the bill. NASA should not be precluded from directing its resources in the most efficient and effective manner.

As a matter of policy, NASA's Earth Science Enterprise will not build new missions where commercial data is available at market prices, and the Enterprise has instituted a process under which all Announcements of Opportunity include statements of data buy preferences. The Earth Science Enterprise will release, in the near future, two Requests for Information (RFI's), one for determining sources of Landsat-class observations, and a second for determining sources of tropospheric wind measurements. The Enterprise is also working toward the objective of having each scientific and application research proposal identify the source of data sets required, and including an estimate of the funding requirement for such data sets. This approach is intended to establish a direct dialog between the providers and users of data, and NASA does not have to second-guess the user requirements and unduly constrain the provider's capabilities.

Finally, the NASA Inspector General recently released a report on the Commercial Remote Sensing Program, and concluded ''additional congressionally directed data buy programs are not warranted.''

TRANS-HAB

Section 128 of H.R. 1654 would prevent NASA from further research on inflatable technology, such as Trans-Hab, which would accommodate humans in space. Inflatable module technology offers the potential for significant stowage volume, crew habitability and safety advantages over current approaches for building pressurized space structures using reinforced aluminum. The technology holds considerable potential for advancement of space exploration. NASA shares the Committee's concern that added cost and risk to the ISS should be avoided. NASA desires to continue to explore potential commercial partnering for the development, construction, and use for the ISS Trans-Hab module. We will not pursue the development of a Trans-Hab module for the ISS unless it can be done through a partnership with industry that results in a cost-neutral solution to the baseline cost for the aluminum Habitation module. Additional technical definition and design work is necessary before potential commercial interests can be assured of the viability of the concepts. H.R. 1654 would preclude any work on this very promising set of technologies.

ULTRA-EFFICIENT ENGINE TECHNOLOGY

I am very concerned that Section 103(4) eliminates the Ultra-Efficient Engine Technology (UEET) program as a Focused Program. We understand that it is the Committee's intent to permit these activities to be conducted within the R&T base. We strongly urge the continuation of this effort as a Focused Program.

UEET as a Focused Program gives all interested parties—other Government agencies (e.g., DoD) and the private sector—assurances that resources have been identified to meet defined goals over a specified period of time. Fully 80% of program funding for UEET will be spent in-house, primarily for the operation of test stands and facilities, in coordination with the ongoing DoD program. The UEET Program is designed to address the most critical propulsion issues: performance and efficiency. The primary benefits to these technologies will be to improve efficiency and reduce emissions for a wide range of civil and military applications.

Loss of the UEET effort could have major consequences for the future competitiveness of the U.S. aircraft engine industry and the U.S. balance of trade. Research associated with understanding the technical issues of engine emissions supports a major portion of U.S. scientific analysis that provides a basis for informed policy making and U.S. influence on international civil aviation policies. Finally, it should be noted that significant interaction and dependencies have been formed over the years in engine technology efforts between NASA's Space Programs, DoD's Acquisition Programs and DOE's Energy Programs; while the impact of the restriction in H.R. 1654 upon these interdependencies has not yet been completely assessed, there will be implications to U.S. strategic interests in these critical areas.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS

H.R. 1654 does not include ten important legislative proposals proposed by the Administration in the draft FY 2000 NASA authorization bill, submitted to the Congress on April 28, 1999. Many of these proposed provisions are legislative ''gap fillers''—providing NASA the same authority already provided to the Department of Defense in title 10 of the U.S. Code and to other civilian agencies in title 41 of the U.S. Code.

NASA is covered by the acquisition provisions of title 10, but is frequently overlooked when amendments to that title are enacted. Section 203 of the Administration's bill would provide NASA the same authority as that available to DoD and other civilian agencies to withhold contract payments based on substantial evidence of fraud. Section 209 would make NASA's claim payment process consistent with procedures already required by other law and with those used by other agencies. Section 210 would provide NASA the same authority as that available to DoD and other civilian agencies to exempt contractor proposals from release under the Freedom of Information Act.

The remaining provisions contained in the Administration's bill address the need to adapt NASA's legal authorities to the world in which we now operate. The role of the commercial sector has been ever increasing. With the support of this Committee, NASA has been changing the way it does business, looking for opportunities to engage in joint endeavors with industry, and attempting to leverage the private sector investment in space and aeronautics research and development. These activities present new and different working relationships and legal hurdles. We are asking the private sector to invest not only money, but also ideas. We must be able to protect these ideas from disclosure to competitors—foreign as well as domestic—which have not invested their time or capital. In order to attract industry partners and their investments, we must be able to grant them some form of exclusive right to use the software or other inventions arising from their joint endeavor with us before it is released to the general public. Our space program should benefit not only from the increased investment of private capital, but also from the royalties derived from such licensing authority. We must be able to attract more private investment—and thus reduce the cost to the Government—but being able to transfer title to personal property used in our joint endeavors to the partner whom we are asking to invest the capital. I urge the Committee to incorporate these provisions as the bill progresses through Congress.

HPCC AND IT2

As reported, H.R. 1654 deletes all funding for NASA's High Performance Computing and Communication program (HPCC) and Information Technology for the 21st century (IT2) initiative, including the very important Intelligent Synthesis Environment (ISE) program. Although the Committee has indicated its intent to hold hearings and mark up a separate, multi-agency, ''computer research'' bill later this year, in the absence of the introduction of a companion measure that fully funds those activities, NASA's support for H.R. 1654 will continue to be qualified.

Not authorizing funding requested for NASA's HPCC and IT2 would essentially remove all of the Agency's research in information technology, and severely impact NASA's remaining programs and missions. Both programs are structured to contribute to broad Federal efforts, but also to address NASA-specific computational, engineering, and science requirements spanning many programs. Not authorizing HPCC and IT2 would severely limit NASA's ability to deliver key capabilities needed to support Earth, space, and aeronautical programs, with impacts such as the following:

Cut Earth and Space Sciences and directly impact NASA's ability to use advanced computing technology to further our ability to predict the dynamic interaction of physical, chemical and biological processes affecting the Earth, the solar-terrestrial environment, and the universe;

Cut Space Science and eliminate NASA's capability to develop low-power, fault-tolerant, high-performance, scaleable computing technology for a new generation of micro-spacecraft;

Cut Aero-Space Technology and eliminate critical advances in aeronautics algorithms and applications, software, and computing machinery needed to enable more than 1000 fold increases in systems performance in the 21st century;

Cut Aero-Space Technology and limit implementation of the tools and processes for a revolution in engineering practice and science integration in modeling, design, development and execution of all NASA's missions; and,

Cut Space Science and eliminate NASA's Self-Sustaining Robotic Networks program to develop the critical set of technologies necessary to support potential future decisions on establishing outposts of self-tasking, self-repairing, evolvable rover networks at key sites of scientific interest throughout the solar system.

We are preparing a more detailed analysis of additional concerns regarding H.R. 1654, which we believe will hamper our ability to manage our space and aeronautics research programs most efficiently. I urge the Committee to consider these concerns as the bill proceeds through the legislative process.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to submission of this report for the Committee's consideration.

Sincerely,

DANIEL S. GOLDIN,
Administrator.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Act. First, I wish to commend Chairman ROHRABACHER for his efforts in developing H.R. 1654. I believe that he made a serious effort to include a number of positive provisions in the bill and to work with the minority.

Thus, while it was by no means a perfect bill, I thought that H.R. 1654 was a reasonably constructive piece of legislation as introduced. In fact, I was a

cosponsor of the bill as introduced, with the understanding that we would continue to work to improve its provisions.

At this point I have to say that I do not think that H.R. 1654 is ready for floor consideration. I have not reached this position easily. As a supporter of NASA, I want to provide a solid, fiscally responsible foundation for the space agency's activities. I also want to make sure that we do not micromanage NASA in ways that will hurt its ability to carry out its programs effectively and efficiently. Unfortunately, I think that H.R. 1654 falls short of the mark in meeting these two goals.

The NASA Administrator has sent over a letter outlining a number of serious concerns with the NASA bill. Let me discuss just a few of them. First, there is the absence of any funding for NASA's information technology programs. While we have received some assurance from the chairman of the Committee on Science that authorization of these programs will be done at a later date, I remain concerned. NASA needs to be on the cutting edge of information technology R&D if it is to deliver missions that are both cost-effective and innovative.

Second, H.R. 1654 would prohibit the Ultra Efficient Energy Technology focused program. That program is a new program that is critical to maintaining NASA's capabilities for long-term aircraft engine R&D. It also is critical to maintaining the competitiveness of the U.S. aeronautics industry.

Moreover, the UEET program will offer important benefits to military aviation by conducting important R&D into improved engine performance. I am afraid that H.R. 1654 attempts to micromanage NASA's aeronautics R&D efforts in ways that can do real damage over the long term.

Third, the bill as amended at full committee would cancel the Triana scientific mission. Triana is an Earth observing spacecraft that would deliver both scientific and educational benefits. This mission was selected out of nine competing proposals, and it has undergone scientific peer review. It already was funded in last year's VA-HUD appropriations conference report. If we cancel it now, we would waste $40 million, which is more than it would cost to save it.

Fourth, H.R. 1654 has a provision that would have the effect of holding NASA's Earth science research program hostage to a ''data buy'' earmark. While I support a healthy commercial remote sensing industry, the bill's provisions will do real harm to NASA's programs while doing little to help grow industry. It is a misguided and ultimately unworkable position.

Fifth, the bill would prohibit NASA from spending any money on the Trans-Hab or other innovative inflatable structure technologies. While I am as careful with taxpayers' dollars as anyone, I do not believe that we should prohibit NASA from doing research to improve our space program.

H.R. 1654's Trans-Hab prohibition would keep NASA from getting the data Congress will need if we are to make informed decisions on these innovative technologies.

Mr. Chairman, I raise these issues not to diminish the efforts of Chairman ROHRABACHER in drafting this bill. I simply believe the bill we have before us today is not ready for prime time. I think that the bill needs more work.

I intend to vote ''no'' on H.R. 1654 on final passage, and I would urge my colleagues to also oppose the bill.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics that handled this bill.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for allotting me this time.

Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Act of 1999, which I am pleased to sponsor. I want to publicly thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the ranking member, for his spirit of cooperation during the process. I am saddened, however, that he is unable to cosponsor the bill and vote for it at this time, but I do understand that there are some areas of disagreement and perhaps some areas that he feels that was not dealt with in the way that he would prefer for it to be dealt with, and I am sorry for that.

But I do think that we do have a spirit of cooperation among the members of the subcommittee, and I am trying my best to maintain that spirit as well as the spirit of cooperation among the staffs on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate the work that they put in to trying to put this bill together, although the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) cannot support it at this time.

It contains one or two controversial provisions, surely. This bill, however, is overwhelmingly bipartisan. At least it was my intent to make it bipartisan. It includes several provisions and modifications that actually came from the Democratic side.

Furthermore, I plan to offer a manager's amendment which will make a few additional refinements, including one that specifically addresses the concerns of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) who has put a tremendous amount of effort into a project that is very meaningful to his district.

This is not a perfect bill, and I admit that. We have asked for an open rule because we want the House to work its will on this legislation. To the degree that we have an open rule and to the degree there are disagreements, I would hope that the open rule would provide us a way of coming to grips with some of the disagreements that are still in place.

If any government agency belongs to the American people, surely it is NASA. I am committed to NASA's programs and policies, to make sure that they are reflecting the priorities of the people in the United States as reflected here in the House of Representatives, the people's House.

Even so, I believe this piece of legislation is a solid piece of legislation because it sends three messages which are supported by the overwhelming majority of the Committee on Science and I believe the House itself.

First, we tell the President and the appropriators that America's civil space agency should be rewarded for the sacrifices and reforms that it has made over the past several years by providing it a steady increase of 1 percent a year, if you take into account the information technology program that we are authorizing separately.

Secondly, H.R. 1654 sets realistic overall funding levels and real priorities to guide appropriators. We focus additional resources on areas that our hearing record shows are underfunded and which have bipartisan support, including life and microgravity research, advanced space transportation technology, space science, and education.

Third, H.R. 1654 pushes NASA to stay on the road to reform, especially on space privatization and commercialization. We do not want to destabilize the International Space Station or set up programs just to keep people busy. This bill does not micromanage NASA, but it does set clear goals and guides NASA towards them.

Mr. Chairman, in closing let me just say that the other body has already marked up a NASA authorization bill and it should be reported to the floor for consideration soon. So after we complete our business today, I hope we can aggressively move forward to negotiate compromises with the Senate and, for the first time since 1992, enact a NASA authorization into law this year.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), a leader in education in this body.

□ 1100

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss an exciting opportunity I think that this NASA authorization bill provides our Nation's schools to promote math and science education.

However, first I would like to say how disappointed I am that this bill has fallen victim I think to some partisan wrangling because it really did start out as a bipartisan bill. It is my hope that, as we go forward to an eventual conference that will take place with the other body, which will pass a bipartisan bill out of their committee, hopefully, very soon, that we can once again act in a bipartisan way and send a bill to the President that he will sign.

With the exception of the conflict over Triana and some other issues, the committee I think has put together a pretty decent bill. I appreciate the majority's willingness to work with me on my concerns in the area of education and to accept the amendments in those areas that I offered in committee, and I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their help.

I will vote for H.R. 1654, with the hope and faith that a bipartisan conference report can be brought back before this body before this year is out.

I am proud to discuss an important education initiative contained in this legislation. This bill directs NASA to develop an educational initiative for our Nation's schools in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the first powered flight, which will take place on December 17, 2003.

On that date in 1903, Orville and Wilbur Wright took their dream of powered flight from the drawing board of their Ohio bicycle shop to the Crystal Coast of North Carolina. It was there at a place called Kitty Hawk that the Wright brothers' dream took flight. On that day, our world was changed forever.

The anniversary of this historic accomplishment provides an excellent opportunity for our Nation's schools to promote the importance of math and science education. And as a North Carolinian and a former educator, I am proud to bring recognition to the Wright brothers and their fantastic accomplishment.

As a former North Carolina superintendent of schools, I worked for many years to help improve math and science education in our State. America's future will be determined by the ability of our citizens to adapt to the changes in technology that would dominate life in the 21st century.

Recent studies show, unfortunately, that America's students are falling behind their counterparts around the world in the areas of math and science. As we watch the sun rise on the dawn of a new millennium, it has never been more important to encourage our children to excel in these important areas. It is no longer good enough for our children to simply be able to read, write, add, and subtract. If today's students are going to succeed in tomorrow's jobs, a firm foundation in math and science is required and it is an imperative.

The Committee on Science has taken a leading role in starting a national dialogue on math and science education. One of the most difficult challenges we face has been to interest students in participating in the most challenging math and science courses. That is not unique. It happens in every State. Such a lack of interest could spell doom down the road as fewer students enter the teaching profession in these important areas. And even fewer are prepared for the jobs of the 21st century.

The 100th anniversary of Flight Educational Initiative is intended to use the history of flight, the benefit of flight on society, and the math and science principles used in flight to generate interest among students in math and science education.

As a young boy, like most Americans, the space program captured my imagination. Unfortunately, today video games and other distractions are more likely to occupy the time of our young people than the space program. However, the 100th anniversary of flight and NASA's plans to send a plane to Mars to coincide with that date provides an excellent springboard to recapture our young people's interest in the space program and in math and science education.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman for bringing this bill, authorizing our Nation's space program, to the floor on the same day that the new Star Wars trilogy has opened in our Nation's theaters. Just as the Star Wars movie has captured the imagination of a generation of Americans, NASA and the 100th anniversary of Flight Educational Initiative will help our students sore in math and science education.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the vice chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I am very pleased to rise to speak in favor of the bill as presented to the House. The Committee on Science has done a very careful job of analyzing the needs of the NASA program and has come up with a workable allocation of funds.

There are two areas in particular I want to mention. One relates to the work that I put into the science policy study (Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New Science Policy; published by GPO) last year under the auspices of the Science Committee and which has been adopted by the committee and by the House of Representatives. In that study, we emphasized the importance of basic research to the future of this Nation. And I am pleased to say that NASA continues, under this bill, to maintain a strong basic research program.

There has been some criticism that the Space Station has decimated the basic research program at NASA. That is not true. They are continuing with their basic research efforts and they continue to make important discoveries both in space and on this planet.

One of the important parts of this issue, of course, is to make sure that the results of basic research are available to the public, to companies who may make use of it and, that this may benefit the general public in many ways.

The second point I want to make is that I believe NASA has done an excellent job of adding to the education of our students in this Nation regarding math and science. That is an area of great need. We must improve our math and science programs in elementary and secondary schools. It has to be done in a coordinated, thoughtful, careful way as we work toward that goal.

But in the meantime NASA, through its supplementary programs, has aided greatly in the education of students of this Nation. In particular, they have developed experiments that students can do at home or in their schoolroom by accessing NASA data on the Internet and using the results of NASA's satellite research, or data from their Mars Rover, to use in their experiments. This has provided a meaningful, lifetime experience for kids in the elementary and secondary schools. They learn from the Internet what has happened, and they can then use this directly to come to the same scientific conclusion that the NASA scientists operating the experiment have reached.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Act. I believe it is a good bill that will continue to support NASA in its science and exploration endeavors while maintaining balance and cost-effectiveness within its priorities. This morning, I would specifically like to address the opportunity provided through this bill to continue NASA's strong and vital emphasis on education initiatives.

As we have discussed earlier this year, our Nation is at a critical juncture in its efforts to provide our children with the quality education that they will require to succeed in the technology-driven economy and culture of tomorrow. To do this, we must find innovative ways to excite and encourage young students about the possibilities open to them through an understanding of mathematics and the sciences. I am not talking strictly about career opportunities, but as consumers, parents and citizens.

NASA has clearly demonstrated their dedication to this responsibility through the multitude of individual programs which they offer to students from grade school to grad school and, importantly, to their teachers. In FY 1998 alone, NASA reached over two million students and over a hundred thousand teachers. Of those, all but a fraction of these students and teachers were at the K–12 level. It is at this level that it is so critical to engage our young people, and it is also at this point that our education system is in need of the most assistance. NASA is offering their help, and they are doing so through the use of inquiry-based methods and real-life applications.

I would also like to highlight that, in developing their educational programs, NASA has shown insight into the complexity of their subject material and the need to balance it with state and regional agendas. To best serve its ''customers'', NASA collaborators with external organizations such as the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education, discipline-specific professional associations,

and State education coalitions to develop materials for local use ''when and where appropriate''. As another indication of their commitment to providing relevant and useful information, NASA solicits evaluations of their programs from its users, the teachers in the classroom.

In closing, it is my hope that other Federal agencies would follow the example set by NASA in its education goals. As Dan Goldin, the NASA administrator, testified at a recent Science Committee hearing on this issue, ''It is our education system that will prepare our future workforce to design and use [the tools for our future]''. By supporting this bill, you will enable the continued development and support of these crucial programs.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my good friend from Tennessee for yielding me time to speak this morning.

NASA's mission is one of exploration, discovery, and innovation. The innovation of new technology and the continued understanding of our planet and solar system has led to many advances in science that have benefitted our country and our economy.

When we fund NASA activities, we fund our future. We fund the development of new technologies, and we push our educational limits. Because of this, NASA and their continued innovation has made us the world leader in space exploration.

I stand today, though, reluctantly in support of H.R. 1654 because I do have some serious concerns with some of the provisions and possible amendments to the bill.

First, I applaud the Committee on Science for crafting a bill that does look to increase funding for NASA. However, I am very disappointed that they removed any funding for the continued development study of the Trans-Hab program from the Johnson Space Center.

The Trans-Hab is a proposed replacement for the International Space Station habitation module and uses new inflatable structural technology to house a larger living and work space in the limited payload of the Space Shuttle. As drafted, this bill would hinder the development and eliminate the option of this new technology which would give our astronauts more space to work and to live.

One of NASA's greatest assets is their commitment to providing the private sector with technological assistance through the Technology Outreach Program. The program applies scientific and engineering innovations originally developed for space applications to technical problems experienced by other companies that are in all of our districts.

Through the support of its own research laboratories, NASA has solved technical problems of businesses of all sizes and varieties, from making ink dry faster in the manufacture of American flags to improving the fit of a prosthetic foot.

I also know that NASA provides educational assistance and leadership in math and science education and particularly at the Johnson Space Center in Houston. My district is not in that area but it is close, and over the last 2 years I have had two astronauts, Dr. Ellen Ochoa and Dr. Franklin Chang-Diaz, astronauts who took time to spend the day with me in middle schools in my district in Houston, and they motivate students to take math and science.

The schools that participated include Grantham Middle School, Woodland Acres Middle School, Edison Middle School in Houston Independent School District, Burbank in HISD, Galena Park Middle School in Galena Park School District, and Hambrick Middle School.

Watching these 7th and 8th graders, Mr. Chairman, with the astronauts is very rewarding and educational. It is my hope that when these middle school students go to high school they will then be energized to take math and science.

Again, I reluctantly support H.R. 1654. I hope we will continue to work on this legislation and make it better by providing funding for the Trans-Hab project and for the Triana satellite.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) the vice chair of the subcommittee.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this bill.

I commend the chairman and the ranking member for crafting a bill that I think all Members should be able to support. In particular, I want to commend them for the funding that they have provided for authorized in this bill for ongoing improvements in the Shuttle and Shuttle upgrades. By enhancing the performance of the Shuttle, we can ultimately in the end have a manned space flight system that will perform more safely and more efficiently, clearly something that is in the interest of the American taxpayers.

I am, additionally, pleased for the additional funding for the Space Station program. We now have a large amount of Space Station hardware in the Space Station Processing Facility at Kennedy Space Center that is being tested and that is ready for launch.

I would like to clarify my position on the issue regarding the satellite Triana and why I chose to introduce the amendment in committee calling for the elimination of this program.

I certainly do not enjoy introducing partisanship into a bill that is normally considered to be a nonpartisan issue. But I want Members on both sides of the aisle to know that, in the fall of 1997, it was announced by NASA that they were going to have to lay off 600 people at Kennedy Space Center because of a $100 million funding shortfall.

These layoffs did proceed to go ahead in the winter of 1998. And it was approximately around that time I believe that the President had his dream, the vision for Triana, and NASA was very quickly able to fund tens of millions of dollars to go towards this program and is now looking for the additional funds authorized to complete it.

I personally felt to do nothing and say nothing about this, in light of what happened to the men and women who got laid off in my district, would be an insult.

Now, some people may say, ''Well, congressman, if the Shuttle can continue to fly safely and efficiently with 600 fewer people, then we ought to go ahead and let that happen.'' But I want Members on both sides of the aisle to be aware that the Shuttle managers tell me the principal reason that they are able to continue to fly safely with that many fewer people is because the launch rates are way, way down to only maybe four flights a year because of the delays. And the Shuttle managers tell me that, as we go back up to eight and nine flights a year, as is hoped as the Space Station program gets back on track, that they may need to actually go out and hire additional people to keep the program flying safely.

So I believe that, to me, it was really an insult to the working men and women out at Kennedy Space Center for the agency to be laying off hundreds of people on one day and then finding tens of millions of dollars to fulfill a vision for the vice president.

I have a chart over there that I would like to show later that clearly spells out that we can right now, using current technology, produce an image of the Earth using existing satellite images. And this program was just not necessary and, therefore, I would encourage all my colleagues to support not funding it.

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

Although I appreciate the comments of my friend from Florida, I think it is ironic that he is concerned about laid off NASA employees yet he is not concerned about the fact that, by his amendment, we are going to waste more money canceling the program than has already been spent and he does not seem to be concerned about those employees and those scientific projects that are going to be laid off and missing because of his amendment. It is really, I think, a disingenuous argument, totally parochial, totally partisan; and this bill and this committee deserves better.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

□ 1115

Mr. COSTELLO. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the NASA authorization bill before us today. This bill before us today cancels the Triana spacecraft mission. Last year, this Congress approved $35 million for Triana. The

Triana project was competitively awarded and its scientific content has been peer reviewed. It offers important scientific and educational benefits.

Next, the bill prohibits funding for the high performance computing and other information technology initiatives contained in the President's request. Although the gentleman from Wisconsin has agreed to provide for those activities in a forthcoming bill, I want to make it clear that I believe that NASA needs these funds. I support their inclusion within the NASA budget.

Another area of concern in this bill is the prohibition against any funding for the ultraefficient engine technology focus program. Long-term R&D efforts in engine technology, including the construction of engineering models when appropriate, are vitally important to both our national security and to continued competitiveness in worldwide aerospace markets. We should not abandon those efforts.

In addition, I support NASA's aviation safety and system capacity research as well as research directed toward aircraft noise and emission reduction. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I will vote against this legislation and ask that it be sent back to the committee to address these important issues.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1654, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1999. I would like to thank the sponsors of this bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for their leadership on this issue.

As a member of the Committee on Science, I am especially pleased with H.R. 1654 because it will be the first reauthorization legislation for NASA spending since 1992. The administration has cut NASA's budget 6 years in a row, leaving the agency to do much more with much less. I commend NASA for rising to the occasion by streamlining and reforming its projects. However, this history of chipping away at NASA's budget is proving to be detrimental to our Nation's technological research and development. To reverse this trend, H.R. 1654 provides increased funding for NASA's programs critical to maintaining and advancing our leadership in space, science and technology through fiscal year 2002, for investing in science and technology today serves to create a better tomorrow for everyone.

At the same time, H.R. 1654 continues to promote the fiscal discipline in our space programs. For example, this legislation fully funds NASA's request for the International Space Station and Space Shuttle operations but it prohibits funding for Trans-Hab as a replacement for the station's habitation module because of its higher cost. H.R. 1654 also redirects funding for the controversial, untested Triana satellite program, which would transmit new pictures of the Earth to the Internet, toward cutting-edge microgravity research that will be used to support human exploration and development of space enterprise. This is a far more useful investment than the $75 million plus Triana screen saver.

A final attribute of this legislation is its commitment of NASA resources to science education. H.R. 1654 allots $20 million for the continuation of the highly successful National Space Grant College and Fellowship Program. This program uses the assets of NASA for education and public service purposes. It has been a highly innovative leader in California, bringing together community-based alliances composed of educational institutions, industry and government to work together on projects which are both related to space and are of community importance. The student-mentor process involved in this program has shown significant results in workforce preparation and science literacy. Once again I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my classmate, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I have never failed to vote for a bill from this committee of significance. I have eaten some tough votes by some neighboring politicians who have come back and talked about the pork in space, in the Space Station. I have been beat up pretty good on the votes. I am going to vote ''no'' on this bill today. It takes a new and efficient engine technology that is at the John Glenn Center in Cleveland, formerly Lewis, and takes it out of this bill, and I will oppose it.

My purpose standing here today is I am offering a couple of amendments. They are basically sense of the Congress, because, you know what? Congress does not do a whole hell of a lot here. So we are going to encourage them. The encouragement is basically this. If NASA is going to develop any new programs or facilities, do not do them at the existing bases. Take NASA to the people. When you have a supplemental like we had last night, everybody has some of the military and they feel an alignment and a personal relationship with our Pentagon and military structure. That does not exist here at NASA. NASA is a program for America, but it is located in very few facilities, and I think it is good political wisdom and common sense to open this program up to the people.

The Traficant amendment says, whenever possible, on these new facilities, look at other sites other than existing sites and look at those depressed communities that could become a part of this great national program. Look, this ivory tower business is over. These accidents have brought NASA down to earth. Now we are looking at a tough budget climate trying to carve out money.

I will say this to the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has done a remarkable job. This vote is no reflection on his efforts. I think he has done a great job and he is a great chairman of this committee. But I want this committee to look back at that engine technology at the John Glenn Center. I think it is good for the future, and I think it is something in conference you should look at very seriously.

Finally, the second amendment says, buy American wherever you can. I know the committee is working with this, but I do not know how many of my colleagues saw and heard the news from last night. A classified report says Russia is spying on America in the Balkans and sharing the fruits of their gain with Milosevic. How much more money are we going to give to the Russians? How much more technology transfers are there going to be through open, goodhearted, good-faith, spirited work with Russia? I think if these participating countries do not pay, they should be thrown out of the program. If American taxpayers are going to finance these projects, then dammit, save that technology and keep it here.

So the two amendments are straightforward. I would appreciate Members' support on them. But I would appreciate looking at that engine technology that will be taken from the John Glenn Center. Just remember that. The John Glenn Space Center in Cleveland, Ohio, that is a tremendous program up there and that is a tremendous project. I would appreciate it if you would look at that.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, when I read the Washington Post this morning, I learned that the Vice President's spokesman had called the majority a party of troglodytes because we think it is more important to spend $32 million on medical research than on funding the Vice President's late night inspiration for a multimillion-dollar screen saver called Triana. Personally, I do not think that making medical research a higher priority is a reason to descend into name calling.

I am disappointed, however, that the minority in this Chamber has decided to transform a matter of priority-setting into a partisan political dispute. I thought better of them. That is why I have worked for the last 2½ years to mend fences and to build a sense of bipartisanship on the Committee on

Science. For the majority members of the Committee on Science, that meant compromising with the minority and trying to bridge the differences between us. I thought we had made a good-faith effort to do that.

In developing the NASA authorization bill in committee, we made 13 separate changes to accommodate the minority even before the bill was introduced. We rewrote findings on international cooperation that the committee endorsed for 4 years. But when the minority changed its mind, we changed the language at their request.

We added findings on the importance of the Deep Space Network at the request of the minority. We added findings on the Hubble space telescope at the request of the minority. We changed language authorizing upgrades to the Space Shuttle and prohibited obligation of those Shuttle funds pending a report, at the request of the minority. We added funding for space science to offset the added costs associated with an emergency repair mission for the Hubble space telescope, at the request of the minority.

We delayed implementation of the small demonstration program of space science data purchases until fiscal year 2002, at the request of the minority. We reduced the level and details of increased funding for advanced space transportation, at the request of the minority. We changed the language requiring NASA to conduct earth science data purchases, at the request of the minority.

That did not satisfy them. But they made no effort to meet us halfway. We changed the requirement that NASA consider the impact of its international missions on the competitiveness of the U.S. space industry, at the request of the minority. We removed two positions related to the consolidated space operations contract, at the request of the minority.

We rewrote a section directing NASA to begin prioritizing Shuttle upgrades, at the request of the minority. We added a new section establishing in law a White House technology program for human space flight, at the request of the minority. By the way, if we were interested in making this a partisan bill at the Vice President's expense, we never would have done any of that.

In the committee markup, we accepted an amendment increasing funding for space grant universities, by the minority. We accepted an amendment increasing funding for historically black colleges and universities, at the request of the minority. We accepted an amendment changing NASA's educational responsibilities, at the request of the minority. We accepted an amendment on report language, at the request of the minority. And for the last week, the subcommittee chairman and I have been working with other minority members to add or change report language and develop colloquies to support their goals.

How does the minority respond to all of these efforts? Its presidential candidate calls us troglodytes. Democrats withdrew their names as cosponsors of the bill and withdrew their support increasing NASA's budget over the President's request, and the minority mobilizes to defeat the bill along partisan lines, at the same time complaining that we should add more money, add more money, to some of these other programs.

Now, I would hope that we can rise above such tactics and agree to disagree on the one issue that still divides us. This bill increases NASA's funding over the level of the President's request and contains many changes requested by the minority. It should be passed on a bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, let me first concur with the fact that the gentleman has brought a much better atmosphere to our committee. I think that we are working in a much better way. We need to since, when we think, there has not been a bill passed since 1992. Certainly there needs to be some improvements.

Let me also point out that the gentleman said, and he went through a litany, a variety of acceptances of the majority to minority position. Let us put this in perspective. There was never a subcommittee markup. The minority was given a bill 10 days in advance and said, ''Here it is.'' So I hardly think that it is a mammoth undertaking that the majority would accept some positive, I think constructive ways to make this bill better so we can get it passed in a bipartisan way.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman from Tennessee is rewriting history a bit. We gave them a draft of the bill. Before it was introduced there were 13 separate changes made to the text of the bill at the request of the minority, as has been the policy of this chairman of the Committee on Science, to try and narrow some issues and to be as bipartisan as possible and where there is a disagreement, to be able to fight those out and to debate the issue on the merits.

□ 1130

Now we did not call anybody any names during the committee markup or afterwards, and it wrecks the bipartisan nature of dealing with NASA and supporting NASA when I pick up the Washington Post this morning and see the Vice President's spokesman calling the majority party a bunch of dinosaurs because we have a disagreement over the Triana program. Our priority is to put money that my colleagues want to go into Triana into medical research, and that was the amendment that was adopted when the Committee on Science marked this bill up. This may be a legitimate disagreement where we think we should put more money into medical research and less into Triana.

But dealing with the budget, and that is what an authorization bill is, is dealing with priorities. I will lay my priorities against my colleague's priorities, the gentleman from Tennessee, but he ought to tell his former senator and his spokesman that when we have got a disagreement in priorities let us not devolve into name calling.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, let me again concur that this should be about issues, not name calling, and I completely agree with the gentleman. I suspect part of this probably resulted from the fact that the chairman of the Republican National Committee had earlier released news releases condemning it and calling the Vice President names. That was wrong, and it was wrong on each side.

As my colleagues know, this is about issues. As my colleague pointed out, this is about a variety of disagreements, this is about trying to get the best bill possible, and we should rise above name calling, and I had no part in that, but I would offer my apologies for anything that goes beyond the real merits of this bill.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would hope the gentleman from Tennessee would tap his predecessor on the shoulder and tell him to discipline his staff a little bit more, not calling people who are on the Committee on Science and dealing with the issues of setting priorities in good faith the names that appeared in the paper this morning.

Mr. GORDON. If I can just finally thank the gentleman for explaining what that term meant? I read it, but I did not know what it meant, so I thank him for that definition.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the last time the Congress sent a NASA Authorization Bill to the President was in 1992. Since then the appropriators have worked, year after year, to analyze the needs of NASA and allocate those funds necessary to maintain our nation's aeronautics and space priorities. 1999 looked like the year that the authorizers in the House Science Committee would step up to the plate. In this regard I would like to commend Chairman JAMES SENSENBRENNER and Subcommittee Chairman DANA ROHRABACHER for putting together H.R. 1654 and presenting it to this body.

This original bill eliminated funding for the Ultra-Efficient Engine Technology Program, a focused program by NASA that will set the stage for the development of revolutionary new aircraft engines. The UEET continues the aeronautics research that NASA has pursued for many years, and it deserves widespread support.

First, the UEET is important to the environment. The advanced engines being developed will produce less emissions that are harmful to the environment, and this goal is essential to allow US aircraft to compete with those manufactured in Europe. The next generation of engines will also be quieter, a big step forward for neighborhoods located around airports.

The UEET is also important to consumers and the flying public. Advanced engines will use fuel more efficiently, helping to keep down ticket prices.

The UEET is also important to the competitive position of major American firms. The aerospace and aeronautics industry is one of the few American industries still dominated by US firms in the global marketplace. But that leadership is threatened by foreign manufacturers, working hand-in-glove with foreign governments that provide huge subsidies. We must compete and survive on the basis of high technology and the most sophisticated research available. We must develop the aircraft engines that will allow US airplanes to fly into European airports. This is a major sector of our economy, and hundreds of thousands of high skill jobs hang in the balance.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the UEET is closely related to our national security and the future of military aircraft. Since its development several years ago, the UEET has been coordinated with the Department of Defense and its High Performance Turbine Engine Program. By supporting the UEET, this Congress is supporting the sort of advanced aircraft that foster our national defense. I join with Representative JAMES TRAFICANT and Representative STEVEN C. LATOURETTE in supporting an amendment to remove the language from the bill that cut funding for this program.

Originally, the bill also cut funding for NASA's Aircraft Noise Research Program. The results of this research are essential to protecting people who live near airports nationwide. Continued funding of the UEET and the Aircraft Noise Reduction programs will ensure that new aircraft will be quieter and less disruptive for people who live near airports.

Air travel is increasing at a dramatic rate across the country. The economy is good; airline ticket prices are affordable; airlines are serving more and more airports. Cleveland Hopkins International Airport, which is in my congressional district, is expected to experience an increase of 200 daily flights this summer. 200 more flights means that the residents and schools surrounding the airport will experience 200 times the aircraft noise. The current level of aircraft noise is already very disruptive to these people's lives, and an increase will cause them even more suffering.

I joined with Representative ANTHONY WEINER in supporting an amendment to restore NASA's Aircraft Noise Research program to last year's funding level by adding $11 million in FY 2000, $10 million in 2001 and $8.5 million in 2002. NASA has set a goal of reducing aircraft noise by one-half over the next ten years. Without full funding, this goal will not be attained. Great strides have already been made in making aircraft engines quieter and more efficient. By maintaining funding for the Noise Research program, we can ensure that the next phase of engines, State IV, will soon be able to provide relief to neighborhoods and schools surrounding airports.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following letters for the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NETHERCUTT: Without support for life science research, the investment in the Space Station won't pay off. Just as the National Institutes of Health long-term commitment to basic research has revolutionized medicine, NASA can do the same for maintaining people in space. As president-elect of the American Society for Gravitational and Space Biology, I encourage you to support the $32 million increase in the life science research budget (HR 1654). We strongly oppose any amendment to strike those funds.

Life science research at NASA benefits more than our space program. The problems seen during and after spaceflight—trouble with balance, muscle loss, bone loss, low blood pressure and radiation damage to cells—affect millions on the ground too. The basic research on how the body senses and adapts to gravity will pay off in the long run against problems like osteoporosis and balance disorders.

Recently, I flew in space on the Neurolab Space Shuttle mission (STS–90). This dedicated life sciences mission demonstrated the quality and importance of the science that NASA can do in space. The results from this mission's experiments on balance, sleep, blood pressure and nervous system development are changing how we understand the brain and nervous system.

NASA's and the United States' goal is to keep people in space for longer periods of time and we need to learn how to do it effectively. The key to this is a strong research program that (1) maintains an active ground-based research program with a 9–10/1 ground to flight experiment ratio, (2) supports new students and fellows (I personally started my career with a NASA-supported fellowship program), (3) increases the percentage of high-scoring scientific proposals that can be funded (the current level is quite low).

We appreciate the support life science research has received in the past and encourage you to vote to increase funding for research that will be the foundation for success on the International Space Station.

Sincerely,

JAY C. BUCKEY, JR., M.D.,
President-Elect, American Society for Gravitational and Space Biology.

JUVENILE DIABETES FOUNDATION INTERNATIONAL, THE DIABETES RESEARCH FOUNDATION,

May 19, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NETHERCUTT: On behalf of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International (JDF), I wish to express our support for increased funding for NASA's Office of Life and Microgravity Science.

As you know, JDF enjoys a mutually beneficial relationship with NASA to conduct diabetes research. The JDF–NASA partnership has successfully led to research projects exploring diabetes-related eye disease, noninvasive blood glucose sensors, islet cell transplantation and other areas of research that may benefit people with diabetes. Your role as Co-Chairman of the Congressional Diabetes Caucus has continued to reinforce this essential partnership,

I applaud your championing of sound and scientific medical research policies. I hope that your work to increase funding for Life and Microgravity science research will speed the path to a cure for diabetes and its complications. I realize that funding decisions are difficult because many of the programs are meritorious and promising. However, the JDF and I are thankful that you have made finding cures for disease and saving lives your priority in Congress.

Sincerely,

LEAH MULLIN,
Chair, Government Relations Committee.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Bill. Although the bill authorizes funding for NASA's priorities including the International Space Station, the Space Shuttle Program and the Hubble Space Telescope, I am concerned with the bill's provision barring funding for the Triana Satellite, a project directed by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in La Jolla, California in conjunction with the Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland.

The Triana Mission, named for the sailor on Columbus' voyage who first spotted the New World, will provide not only a real-time view of the Earth for distribution on the internet, but will also include instruments to study solar influences on climate, ultraviolet radiation, space weather, the microphysical properties of clouds, and the measurement of vegetation canopies. $35 million is already being spent on this project in FY'99 and researchers and scientists at Goddard Space Flight Center are working hard on the design of the spacecraft and the ground system for the satellite as well as providing program integration and support.

I am disappointed that this important project has become mired in a partisan debate over the Vice President's involvement.

Despite the absence of the Triana program, the bill does support many worthwhile programs important to NASA and to the Goddard Space Flight Center. With continued funding of projects in the fields of earth and space science like funding for the Earth Orbiting System (EOS) and an additional $30 million in FY'00 for the Hubble Space Telescope servicing mission, the bill authorizes funding crucial to these programs' continued success.

The bill also authorizes funding to repair an aging infrastructure at Goddard. The $2.9 million for repair of the steam distribution network and $3.9 million for chilled water distribution are key construction projects for maintaining the Space Flight Center's status as one of NASA's premier facilities.

Despite the many beneficial projects in this authorization bill, I cannot support a bill that puts politics before programs intended to provide a better understanding of our last true frontier.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, in 1803, President Thomas Jefferson successfully gained approval from Congress for a truly visionary project. This project was to become one of America's greatest explorations. Congress appropriated funds for the small U.S. Army unit, led by Lewis and Clark, to explore the Missouri and Columbia rivers. From this exploration, we gained invaluable information for future settlement.

Exploration is as engrained into American heritage as freedom is. America is a nation that has been supportive of exploration from our earliest years. Congress is again challenged to appropriate funding for America's continued exploration. The return we receive from every dollar we invest in space exploration is an average of 9 dollars. Space exploration is an extraordinary investment.

For the last ten years, I have had the privilege of aiding in the continuation of American exploration. The Space Program is one of the most important areas of exploration that we can support. The benefits of the space program to improving human life are innumerable.

Two of the more important results to me personally are in the health field—pacemakers and laser eye surgery. Pacemakers have saved thousands of lives, including the life of one of my staff's father. The technology gained by electronics testing during space

flights is priceless. The innovations implemented after space testing has revolutionized life for thousands with pacemakers.

Another life improving benefit is laser eye surgery. Lasers being developed by NASA would aid in the early detection of eye disease and spot cataracts before they are severe enough to require surgery. Cataracts in Florida, especially among the elderly are a constant threat, but thanks to a NASA-developed laser light, opthamologists are beginning clinical trials on investigating the early formation, detection and treatment of cataracts.

These examples barely scratch the surface. I could continue listing benefits, but time will simply not allow it. The technology created from the space program will improve the lives of all Americans—in many ways—and will be the basis for profound technological advances for generations to come.

The space program deserves our continued support.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address provisions added to H.R. 1654, which are in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, specifically Section 219, the ''100th Anniversary of Flight Educational Initiative.''

I wish to thank the Chairman of the Science Committee and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, Mr. ROHRABACHER, for working with me to modify this section. The provision, as originally adopted by the Committee on Science, would have called for federal curriculum development regarding a specific subject matter. As I have been an opponent of federal involvement in curriculum development and as Section 438 of the General Education Provisions Act currently prohibits such federal activity, I am pleased that these provisions have been modified to recognize the importance of educating our nation's children regarding the 100th Anniversary of Powered Flight, without the intrusion of oppressive federal authority. Again, I wish to thank the gentleman for working with me and the Committee on Education and the Workforce and I look forward to working with you in conference negotiations with the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1654

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1999''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorizations

Sec. 101. International Space Station.
Sec. 102. Launch Vehicle and Payload Operations.
Sec. 103. Science, Aeronautics, and Technology.
Sec. 104. Mission Support.
Sec. 105. Inspector General.
Sec. 106. Total authorization.
Sec. 107. Aviation systems capacity.

Subtitle B—Limitations and Special Authority

Sec. 121. Use of funds for construction.
Sec. 122. Availability of appropriated amounts.
Sec. 123. Reprogramming for construction of facilities.
Sec. 124. Limitation on obligation of unauthorized appropriations.
Sec. 125. Use of funds for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses.
Sec. 126. Earth science limitation.
Sec. 127. Competitiveness and international cooperation.
Sec. 128. Trans-hab.
Sec. 129. Consolidated Space Operations Contract.
Sec. 130. Triana funding prohibition.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Requirement for independent cost analysis.
Sec. 202. National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 amendments.
Sec. 203. Commercial space goods and services.
Sec. 204. Cost effectiveness calculations.
Sec. 205. Foreign contract limitation.
Sec. 206. Authority to reduce or suspend contract payments based on substantial evidence of fraud.
Sec. 207. Space Shuttle upgrade study.
Sec. 208. Aero-space transportation technology integration.
Sec. 209. Definitions of commercial space policy terms.
Sec. 210. External tank opportunities study.
Sec. 211. Eligibility for awards.
Sec. 212. Notice.
Sec. 213. Unitary Wind Tunnel Plan Act of 1949 amendments.
Sec. 214. Innovative technologies for human space flight.
Sec. 215. Life in the universe.
Sec. 216. Research on International Space Station.
Sec. 217. Remote sensing for agricultural and resource management.
Sec. 218. Integrated safety research plan.
Sec. 219. 100th anniversary of flight educational initiative.
Sec. 220. Internet availability of information.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration should continue to pursue actions and reforms directed at reducing institutional costs, including management restructuring, facility consolidation, procurement reform, and convergence with defense and commercial sector systems.

(2) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration must continue on its current course of returning to its proud history as the Nation's leader in basic scientific, air, and space research.

(3) The overwhelming preponderance of the Federal Government's requirements for routine, unmanned space transportation can be met most effectively, efficiently, and economically by a free and competitive market in privately developed and operated space transportation services.

(4) In formulating a national space transportation service policy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should aggressively promote the pursuit by commercial providers of development of advanced space transportation technologies including reusable space vehicles, and human space systems.

(5) The Federal Government should invest in the types of research and innovative technology in which United States commercial providers do not invest, while avoiding competition with the activities in which United States commercial providers do invest.

(6) International cooperation in space exploration and science activities serves the United States national interest—

(A) when it—

(i) reduces the cost of undertaking missions the United States Government would pursue unilaterally;

(ii) enables the United States to pursue missions that it could not otherwise afford to pursue unilaterally; or

(iii) enhances United States capabilities to use and develop space for the benefit of United States citizens; and

(B) when it—

(i) is undertaken in a manner that is sensitive to the desire of United States commercial providers to develop or explore space commercially;

(ii) is consistent with the need for Federal agencies to use space to complete their missions; and

(iii) is carried out in a manner consistent with United States export control laws.

(7) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense can cooperate more effectively in leveraging their mutual capabilities to conduct joint space missions that improve United States space capabilities and reduce the cost of conducting space missions.

(8) The Deep Space Network will continue to be a critically important part of the Nation's scientific and exploration infrastructure in the coming decades, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should ensure that the Network is adequately maintained and that upgrades required to support future missions are undertaken in a timely manner.

(9) The Hubble Space Telescope has proven to be an important national astronomical research facility that is revolutionizing our understanding of the universe and should be kept productive, and its capabilities should be maintained and enhanced as appropriate to serve as a scientific bridge to the next generation of space-based observatories.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) the term ''commercial provider'' means any person providing space transportation services or other space-related activities, primary control of which is held by persons other than Federal, State, local, and foreign governments;

(3) the term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given such term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a));

(4) the term ''State'' means each of the several States of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States; and

(5) the term ''United States commercial provider'' means a commercial provider, organized under the laws of the United States or of a State, which is—

(A) more than 50 percent owned by United States nationals; or

(B) a subsidiary of a foreign company and the Secretary of Commerce finds that—

(i) such subsidiary has in the past evidenced a substantial commitment to the United States market through—

(I) investments in the United States in long-term research, development, and manufacturing (including the manufacture of major components and subassemblies); and

(II) significant contributions to employment in the United States; and

(ii) the country or countries in which such foreign company is incorporated or organized, and, if appropriate, in which it principally conducts its business, affords reciprocal treatment to companies described in subparagraph (A) comparable to that afforded to such foreign company's subsidiary in the United States, as evidenced by—

(I) providing comparable opportunities for companies described in subparagraph (A) to participate in Government sponsored research and development similar to that authorized under this Act;

(II) providing no barriers to companies described in subparagraph (A) with respect to local investment opportunities that are not provided to foreign companies in the United States; and

(III) providing adequate and effective protection for the intellectual property rights of companies described in subparagraph (A).

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorizations

SEC. 101. INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for International Space Station—

(1) for fiscal year 2000, $2,482,700,000, of which $394,400,000, notwithstanding section 121(a)—

(A) shall only be for Space Station research or for the purposes described in section 103(2); and

(B) shall be administered by the Office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications;

(2) for fiscal year 2001, $2,328,000,000, of which $465,400,000, notwithstanding section 121(a)—

(A) shall only be for Space Station research or for the purposes described in section 103(2); and

(B) shall be administered by the Office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications; and

(3) for fiscal year 2002, $2,091,000,000, of which $469,200,000, notwithstanding section 121(a)—

(A) shall only be for Space Station research or for the purposes described in section 103(2); and

(B) shall be administered by the Office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications.

SEC. 102. LAUNCH VEHICLE AND PAYLOAD OPERATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Launch Vehicle and Payload Operations the following amounts:

(1) For Space Shuttle Operations—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $2,547,400,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $2,649,900,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $2,629,000,000.

(2) For Space Shuttle Safety and Performance Upgrades—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $456,800,000, of which $18,000,000 shall not be obligated until 45 days after the report required by section 207 has been submitted to the Congress;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $407,200,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $414,000,000.

(3) For Payload and Utilization Operations—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $169,100,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $182,900,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $184,500,000.

SEC. 103. SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS, AND TECHNOLOGY.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Science, Aeronautics, and Technology the following amounts:

(1) For Space Science—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $2,202,400,000, of which—

(i) $10,500,000 shall be for the Near Earth Object Survey;

(ii) $472,000,000 shall be for the Research Program;

(iii) $12,000,000 shall be for Space Solar Power technology; and

(iv) $170,400,000 shall be for Hubble Space Telescope (Development);

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $2,315,200,000, of which—

(i) $10,500,000 shall be for the Near Earth Object Survey;

(ii) $475,800,000 shall be for the Research Program; and

(iii) $12,000,000 shall be for Space Solar Power technology; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $2,411,800,000, of which—

(i) $10,500,000 shall be for the Near Earth Object Survey;

(ii) $511,100,000 shall be for the Research Program;

(iii) $12,000,000 shall be for Space Solar Power technology; and

(iv) $5,000,000 shall be for space science data buy.

(2) For Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $333,600,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be for research and early detection systems for breast and ovarian cancer and other women's health issues, and $5,000,000 shall be for sounding rocket vouchers;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $335,200,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be for research and early detection systems for breast and ovarian cancer and other women's health issues; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $344,000,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be for research and early detection systems for breast and ovarian cancer and other women's health issues.

(3) For Earth Science, subject to the limitations set forth in sections 126 and 130—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $1,382,500,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $1,413,300,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $1,365,300,000.

(4) For Aero-Space Technology—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $999,300,000, of which—

(i) $532,800,000 shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine, and with $412,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base;

(ii) $334,000,000 shall be for Advanced Space Transportation Technology, including—

(I) $61,300,000 for the Future-X Demonstration Program; and

(II) $105,600,000 for Advanced Space Transportation Program; and

(iii) $132,500,000 shall be for Commercial Technology;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $908,400,000, of which—

(i) $524,000,000 shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine, and with $399,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $54,200,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity;

(ii) $249,400,000 shall be for Advanced Space Transportation Technology, including—

(I) $109,000,000 for the Future-X Demonstration Program; and

(II) $134,400,000 for Advanced Space Transportation Program; and

(iii) $135,000,000 shall be for Commercial Technology; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $994,800,000, of which—

(i) $519,200,000 shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine, and with $381,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $67,600,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity;

(ii) $340,000,000 shall be for Advanced Space Transportation Technology; and

(iii) $135,600,000 shall be for Commercial Technology.

(5) For Mission Communication Services—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $406,300,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $382,100,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $296,600,000.

(6) For Academic Programs—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $128,600,000, of which $11,600,000 shall be for Higher Education within the Teacher/Faculty Preparation and Enhancement Programs, of which $20,000,000 shall be for the National Space Grant College and Fellowship Program, and of which $62,100,000 shall be for minority university research and education, including $33,600,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $128,600,000, of which $62,100,000 shall be for minority university research and education, including $33,600,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $130,600,000, of which $62,800,000 shall be for minority university research and education, including $34,000,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

(7) For Future Planning (Space Launch)—

(A) for fiscal year 2001, $144,000,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2002, $280,000,000.

SEC. 104. MISSION SUPPORT.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Mission Support the following amounts:

(1) For Safety, Reliability, and Quality Assurance—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $43,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $45,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $49,000,000.

(2) For Space Communication Services—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $89,700,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $109,300,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $174,200,000.

(3) For Construction of Facilities, including land acquisition—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $181,000,000, including—

(i) Restore Electrical Distribution System (ARC), $2,700,000;

(ii) Rehabilitate Main Hangar Building 4802 (Dryden Flight Research Center (DFRC)), $2,900,000;

(iii) Rehabilitate High Voltage System (Glenn Research Center), $7,600,000;

(iv) Repair Site Steam Distribution System (GSFC), $2,900,000;

(v) Restore Chilled Water Distribution System (GSFC), $3,900,000;

(vi) Rehabilitate Hydrostatic Bearing Runner, 70 meter Antenna, Goldstone (JPL), $1,700,000;

(vii) Upgrade 70 meter Antenna Servo Drive, 70 meter Antenna Subnet (JPL), $3,400,000;

(viii) Rehabilitate Utility Tunnel Structure and Systems (Johnson Space Center (JSC)), $5,600,000;

(ix) Connect KSC to CCAS Wastewater Treatment Plant (KSC), $2,500,000;

(x) Repair and Modernize HVAC System, Central Instrument Facility (KSC), $3,000,000;

(xi) Replace High Voltage Load Break Switches (KSC), $2,700,000;

(xii) Repair and Modernize HVAC and Electrical systems, Building 4201 (Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC)), $2,300,000;

(xiii) Repair Roofs, Vehicle Component Supply buildings (MAF), $2,000,000;

(xiv) Minor Revitalization of Facilities at Various Locations, not in excess of $1,500,000 per project, $65,500,000;

(xv) Minor Construction of New Facilities and Additions to Existing Facilities at Various Locations, not in excess of $1,500,000 per project, $5,000,000;

(xvi) Facility Planning and Design, $19,200,000;

(xvii) Deferred Major Maintenance, $8,000,000;

(xviii) Environmental Compliance and Restoration, $40,100,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $181,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $191,000,000.

(4) For Research and Program Management, including personnel and related costs, travel, and research operations support—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, $2,181,200,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2001, $2,195,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2002, $2,261,600,000.

SEC. 105. INSPECTOR GENERAL.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Inspector General—

(1) for fiscal year 2000, $22,000,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2001, $22,000,000; and

(3) for fiscal year 2002, $22,000,000.

SEC. 106. TOTAL AUTHORIZATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the total amount authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration under this Act shall not exceed—

(1) for fiscal year 2000, $13,625,600,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2001, $13,747,100,000; and

(3) for fiscal year 2002, $13,839,400,000.

SEC. 107. AVIATION SYSTEMS CAPACITY.

In addition to amounts otherwise authorized, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for aviation systems capacity.

Subtitle B—Limitations and Special Authority

SEC. 121. USE OF FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION.

(a) AUTHORIZED USES.—Funds appropriated under sections 101, 102, 103, and 104(1) and (2), and funds appropriated for research operations support under section 104(4), may be used for the construction of new facilities and additions to, repair of, rehabilitation of, or modification of existing facilities at any location in support of the purposes for which such funds are authorized.

(b) LIMITATION.—No funds may be expended pursuant to subsection (a) for a project, the estimated cost of which to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including collateral equipment, exceeds $1,000,000, until 30 days have passed after the Administrator has notified the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of such project.

(c) TITLE TO FACILITIES.—If funds are used pursuant to subsection (a) for grants to institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities, title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in the grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to ensure that the United States will receive therefrom benefits adequate to justify the making of that grant.

SEC. 122. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATED AMOUNTS.

To the extent provided in appropriations Acts, appropriations authorized under subtitle A may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 123. REPROGRAMMING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations authorized for construction of facilities under section 104(3)—

(1) may be varied upward by 10 percent in the discretion of the Administrator; or

(2) may be varied upward by 25 percent, to meet unusual cost variations, after the expiration of 15 days following a report on the circumstances of such action by the Administrator to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

The aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for construction of facilities under section 104(3) shall not be increased as a result of actions authorized under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—Where the Administrator determines that new developments in the national program of aeronautical and space activities have occurred; and that such developments require the use of additional funds for the purposes of construction, expansion, or modification of facilities at any location; and that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities, the Administrator may use up to $10,000,000 of the amounts authorized under section 104(3) for each fiscal year for such purposes. No such funds may be obligated until a period of 30 days has passed after the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives a written report describing the nature of the construction, its costs, and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 124. LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than—

(A) 30 days after the later of the date of the enactment of an Act making appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2000 and the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) 30 days after the date of the enactment of an Act making appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2001 or 2002,

the Administrator shall submit a report to Congress and to the Comptroller General.

(2) CONTENTS.—The reports required by paragraph (1) shall specify—

(A) the portion of such appropriations which are for programs, projects, or activities not authorized under subtitle A of this title, or which are in excess of amounts authorized for the relevant program, project, or activity under this Act; and

(B) the portion of such appropriations which are authorized under this Act.

(b) FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.—The Administrator shall, coincident with the submission of each report required by subsection (a), publish in the Federal Register a notice of all programs, projects, or activities for which funds are appropriated but which were not authorized under this Act, and solicit public comment thereon regarding the impact of such programs, projects, or activities on the conduct and effectiveness of the national aeronautics and space program.

(c) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be obligated for any programs, projects, or activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2000, 2001, or 2002 not authorized under this Act until 30 days have passed after the close of the public comment period contained in a notice required by subsection (b).

SEC. 125. USE OF FUNDS FOR SCIENTIFIC CONSULTATIONS OR EXTRAORDINARY EXPENSES.

Not more than $30,000 of the funds appropriated under section 103 may be used for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses, upon the authority of the Administrator.

SEC. 126. EARTH SCIENCE LIMITATION.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for Earth Science under section 103(3) for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002, $50,000,000 shall be for the Commercial Remote Sensing Program at Stennis Space Center for commercial data purchases, unless the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has integrated data purchases into the procurement process for Earth science research by obligating at least 5 percent of the aggregate amount appropriated for that fiscal year for Earth Observing System and Earth Probes for the purchase of Earth science data from the private sector.

SEC. 127. COMPETITIVENESS AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

(a) LIMITATION.—As part of the evaluation of the costs and benefits of entering into an obligation to conduct a space mission in which a foreign entity will participate as a supplier of the spacecraft, spacecraft system, or launch system, the Administrator shall solicit comment on the potential impact of such participation through notice published in Commerce Business Daily at least 45 days before entering into such an obligation.

(b) NATIONAL INTERESTS.—Before entering into an obligation described in subsection (a), the Administrator shall consider the national interests of the United States described in section 2(6).

SEC. 128. TRANS-HAB.

(a) REPLACEMENT STRUCTURE.—No funds authorized by this Act shall be obligated for the definition, design, or development of an inflatable space structure to replace any International Space Station components scheduled for launch in the Assembly Sequence released by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on February 22, 1999.

(b) GENERAL LIMITATION.—No funds authorized by this Act for fiscal year 2000 shall be obligated for the definition, design, or development of an inflatable space structure capable of accommodating humans in space.

SEC. 129. CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CONTRACT.

No funds authorized by this Act shall be used to create a Government-owned corporation to perform the functions that are the subject of the Consolidated Space Operations Contract.

SEC. 130. TRIANA FUNDING PROHIBITION.

None of the funds authorized by this Act may be used for the Triana program, except that $2,500,000 of the amount authorized under section 103(3)(A) for fiscal year 2000 shall be available for termination costs.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. REQUIREMENT FOR INDEPENDENT COST ANALYSIS.

Before any funds may be obligated for Phase B of a project that is projected to cost more than $100,000,000 in total project costs, the Chief Financial Officer for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall conduct an independent cost analysis of such project and shall report the results to Congress. In developing cost accounting and reporting standards for carrying out this section, the Chief Financial Officer shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with other laws, solicit the advice of expertise outside of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SEC. 202. NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958 AMENDMENTS.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE.—Section 102 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f) and redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) in subsection (g), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by striking ''(f), and (g)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''and (f)''.

(b) REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.—Section 206(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2476(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''January'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''May''; and

(2) by striking ''calendar'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''fiscal''.

SEC. 203. COMMERCIAL SPACE GOODS AND SERVICES.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall purchase commercially available space goods and services to the fullest extent feasible, and shall not conduct activities that preclude or deter commercial space activities except for reasons of national security or public safety. A space good or service shall be deemed commercially available if it is offered by a United States commercial provider, or if it could be supplied by a United States commercial provider in response to a Government procurement request. For purposes of this section, a purchase is feasible if it meets mission requirements in a cost-effective manner.

SEC. 204. COST EFFECTIVENESS CALCULATIONS.

In calculating the cost effectiveness of the cost of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration engaging in an activity as compared to

a commercial provider, the Administrator shall compare the cost of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration engaging in the activity using full cost accounting principles with the price the commercial provider will charge for such activity.

SEC. 205. FOREIGN CONTRACT LIMITATION.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall not enter into any agreement or contract with a foreign government that grants the foreign government the right to recover profit in the event that the agreement or contract is terminated.

SEC. 206. AUTHORITY TO REDUCE OR SUSPEND CONTRACT PAYMENTS BASED ON SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF FRAUD.

Section 2307(i)(8) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and (4)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(4), and (6)''.

SEC. 207. SPACE SHUTTLE UPGRADE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator shall enter into appropriate arrangements for the conduct of an independent study to reassess the priority of all Phase III and Phase IV Space Shuttle upgrades.

(b) PRIORITIES.—The study described in subsection (a) shall establish relative priorities of the upgrades within each of the following categories:

(1) Upgrades that are safety related.

(2) Upgrades that may have functional or technological applicability to reusable launch vehicles.

(3) Upgrades that have a payback period within the next 12 years.

(c) COMPLETION DATE.—The results of the study described in subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 208. AERO-SPACE TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION.

(a) INTEGRATION PLAN.—The Administrator shall develop a plan for the integration of research, development, and experimental demonstration activities in the aeronautics transportation technology and space transportation technology areas. The plan shall ensure that integration is accomplished without losing unique capabilities which support the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's defined missions. The plan shall also include appropriate strategies for using aeronautics centers in integration efforts.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit to the Congress a report containing the plan developed under subsection (a). The Administrator shall transmit to the Congress annually thereafter for 5 years a report on progress in achieving such plan, to be transmitted with the annual budget request.

SEC. 209. DEFINITIONS OF COMMERCIAL SPACE POLICY TERMS.

The Administrator shall ensure that the usage of terminology in National Aeronautics and Space Administration policies and programs is consistent with the following definitions:

(1) The term ''commercialization'' means the process of private entities conducting privatized space activities to expand their customer base beyond the Federal Government to address existing or potential commercial markets, investing private resources to meet those commercial market requirements.

(2) The term ''commercial purchase'' means a purchase by the Federal Government of space goods and services at a market price from a private entity which has invested private resources to meet commercial requirements.

(3) The term ''commercial use of Federal assets'' means the use by a service contractor or other private entity of the capability of Federal assets to deliver services to commercial customers, with or without putting private capital at risk.

(4) The term ''contract consolidation'' means the combining of two or more Government service contracts for related space activities into one larger Government service contract.

(5) The term ''privatization'' means the process of transferring—

(A) control and ownership of Federal space-related assets, along with the responsibility for operating, maintaining, and upgrading those assets; or

(B) control and responsibility for space-related functions,

from the Federal Government to the private sector.

SEC. 210. EXTERNAL TANK OPPORTUNITIES STUDY.

(a) APPLICATIONS.—the Administrator shall enter into appropriate arrangements for an independent study to identify, and evaluate the potential benefits and costs of, the broadest possible range of commercial and scientific applications which are enabled by the launch of Space Shuttle external tanks into Earth orbit and retention in space, including—

(1) the use of privately owned external tanks as a venue for commercial advertising on the ground, during ascent, and in Earth orbit, except that such study shall not consider advertising that while in orbit is observable from the ground with the unaided human eye;

(2) the use of external tanks to achieve scientific or technology demonstration missions in Earth orbit, on the Moon, or elsewhere in space; and

(3) the use of external tanks as low-cost infrastructure in Earth orbit or on the Moon, including as an augmentation to the International Space Station.

A final report on the results of such study shall be delivered to the Congress not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Such report shall include recommendations as to Government and industry-funded improvements to the external tank which would maximize its cost-effectiveness for the scientific and commercial applications identified.

(b) REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS.—The Administrator shall conduct an internal agency study, based on the conclusions of the study required by subsection (a), of what—

(1) improvements to the current Space Shuttle external tank; and

(2) other in-space transportation or infrastructure capability developments,

would be required for the safe and economical use of the Space Shuttle external tank for any or all of the applications identified by the study required by subsection (a), a report on which shall be delivered to Congress not later than 45 days after receipt of the final report required by subsection (a).

(c) CHANGES IN LAW OR POLICY.—Upon receipt of the final report required by subsection (a), the Administrator shall solicit comment from industry on what, if any, changes in law or policy would be required to achieve the applications identified in that final report. Not later than 90 days after receipt of such final report, the Administrator shall transmit to the Congress the comments received along with the recommendations of the Administrator as to changes in law or policy that may be required for those purposes.

SEC. 211. ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall exclude from consideration for grant agreements made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration after fiscal year 1999 any person who received funds, other than those described in subsection (b), appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1999, under a grant agreement from any Federal funding source for a project that was not subjected to a competitive, merit-based award process, except as specifically authorized by this Act. 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 the receipt of Federal funds by a person due to the membership of that person in a class specified by law for which assistance is awarded to members of the class according to a formula provided by law.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''grant agreement'' means a legal instrument whose principal purpose is to transfer a thing of value to the recipient to carry out a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by a law of the United States, and does not include the acquisition (by purchase, lease, or barter) of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the United States Government. Such term does not include a cooperative agreement (as such term is used in section 6305 of title 31, United States Code) or a cooperative research and development agreement (as such term is defined in section 12(d)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a(d)(1))).

SEC. 212. NOTICE.

(a) NOTICE OF REPROGRAMMING.—If any funds authorized by this Act are subject to a reprogramming action that requires notice to be provided to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, notice of such action shall concurrently be provided to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(b) NOTICE OF REORGANIZATION.—The Administrator shall provide notice to the Committees on Science and Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Appropriations of the Senate, not later than 15 days before any major reorganization of any program, project, or activity of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SEC. 213. UNITARY WIND TUNNEL PLAN ACT OF 1949 AMENDMENTS.

The Unitary Wind Tunnel Plan Act of 1949 is amended—

(1) in section 101 (50 U.S.C. 511) by striking ''transsonic and supersonic'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''transsonic, supersonic, and hypersonic''; and

(2) in section 103 (50 U.S.C. 513)—

(A) by striking ''laboratories'' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof ''laboratories and centers'';

(B) by striking ''supersonic'' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof ''transsonic, supersonic, and hypersonic''; and

(C) by striking ''laboratory'' in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof ''facility''.

SEC. 214. INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—In order to promote a ''faster, cheaper, better'' approach to the human exploration and development of space, the Administrator shall establish a Human Space Flight Commercialization/Technology program of ground-based and space-based research and development in innovative technologies.

(b) AWARDS.—At least 75 percent of the amount appropriated for the program established under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be awarded through broadly distributed announcements of opportunity that solicit proposals from educational institutions, industry, nonprofit institutions, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Centers, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, other Federal agencies, and other interested organizations, and that allow partnerships among any combination of those entities, with evaluation, prioritization, and recommendations made by external peer review panels.

(c) PLAN.—The Administrator shall include as part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's budget request to the Congress for fiscal year 2001 a plan for the implementation of the program established under subsection (a).

SEC. 215. LIFE IN THE UNIVERSE.

(a) REVIEW.—The Administrator shall enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academy of Sciences for the conduct of a review of—

(1) international efforts to determine the extent of life in the universe; and

(2) enhancements that can be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's efforts to determine the extent of life in the universe.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The review required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the direction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's astrobiology initiatives within the Origins program;

(2) an assessment of the direction of other initiatives carried out by entities other than the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to determine the extent of life in the universe, including other Federal agencies, foreign space agencies, and private groups such as the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence Institute;

(3) recommendations about scientific and technological enhancements that could be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's astrobiology initiatives to effectively utilize the initiatives of the scientific and technical communities; and

(4) recommendations for possible coordination or integration of National Aeronautics and Space Administration initiatives with initiatives of other entities described in paragraph (2).

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit to the Congress a report on the results of the review carried out under this section.

SEC. 216. RESEARCH ON INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator shall enter into a contract with the National Research Council and the National Academy of Public Administration to jointly conduct a study of the status of life and microgravity research as it relates to the International Space Station. The study shall include—

(1) an assessment of the United States scientific community's readiness to use the International Space Station for life and microgravity research;

(2) an assessment of the current and projected factors limiting the United States scientific community's ability to maximize the research potential of the International Space Station, including, but not limited to, the past and present availability of resources in the life and microgravity research accounts within the Office of Human Spaceflight and the Office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications, and the past, present, and projected access to space of the scientific community; and

(3) recommendations for improving the United States scientific community's ability to maximize the research potential of the International Space Station, including an assessment of the relative costs and benefits of—

(A) dedicating an annual mission of the Space Shuttle to life and microgravity research during assembly of the International Space Station; and

(B) maintaining the schedule for assembly in place at the time of enactment.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the study conducted under this section.

SEC. 217. REMOTE SENSING FOR AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.

The Administrator shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary of Agriculture to determine data product types that are of use to farmers which can be remotely sensed from air or space;

(2) consider useful commercial data products related to agriculture as identified by the focused research program between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Stennis Space Center and the Department of Agriculture; and

(3) examine other data sources, including commercial sources, LightSAR, RADARSAT I, and RADARSAT II, which can provide domestic and international agricultural information relating to crop conditions, fertilization and irrigation needs, pest infiltration, soil conditions, projected food, feed, and fiber production, and other related subjects.

SEC. 218. INTEGRATED SAFETY RESEARCH PLAN.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than March 1, 2000, the Administrator and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall jointly prepare and transmit to the Congress an integrated civil aviation safety research and development plan.

(b) CONTENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an identification of the respective research and development requirements, roles, and responsibilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration;

(2) formal mechanisms for the timely sharing of information between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration, including a requirement that the FAA-NASA Coordinating Committee established in 1980 meet at least twice a year; and

(3) procedures for increased communication and coordination between the Federal Aviation Administration research advisory committee established under section 44508 of title 49, United States Code, and the NASA Aeronautics and Space Transportation Technology Advisory Committee, including a proposal for greater cross-membership between those 2 advisory committees.

SEC. 219. 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FLIGHT EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVE.

(a) EDUCATION CURRICULUM.—In recognition of the 100th anniversary of the first powered flight, the Administrator, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, shall develop and provide for the distribution, for use in the 2000–2001 academic year and thereafter, of an age-appropriate educational curriculum, for use at the kindergarten, elementary, and secondary levels, on the history of flight, the contribution of flight to global development in the 20th century, the practical benefits of aeronautics and space flight to society, the scientific and mathematical principles used in flight, and any other topics the Administrator considers appropriate. The Administrator shall integrate into the educational curriculum plans for the development and flight of the Mars plane.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than May 1, 2000, the Administrator shall transmit a report to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on activities undertaken pursuant to this section.

SEC. 220. INTERNET AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.

The Administrator shall make available through the Internet home page of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the abstracts relating to all research grants and awards made with funds authorized by this Act. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or permit the release of any information prohibited by law or regulation from being released to the public.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. ROHRABACHER:

In section 103(2)—

(1) in subparagraph (A), insert ", and of which $77,400,000 may be used for activities associated with International Space Station research" after "rocket vouchers";

(2) in subparagraph (B), insert ", and of which $70,000,000 may be used for activities associated with International Space Station research" after "health issues"; and

(3) in subparagraph (C), insert ", and of which $80,800,000 may be used for activities associated with International Space Station research" after "health issues".

In section 103(4)(A)(i), insert "focused program" after "Ultra-Efficient Engine".

In section 103(4)(A)(ii)(I), insert ", including $30,000,000 for Pathfinder Operability Demonstrations" after "Demonstration Program".

In section 103(4)(B)(i), insert "focused program" after "Ultra-Efficient Engine."

In section 103(4)(C)(i), insert "focused program" after "Ultra-Efficient Engine."

In section 209(1), insert "encouraging" after "process of".

In section 219—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) strike "EDUCATION CURRICULUM.—" and insert "EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVE.—";

(B) strike "an age-appropriate educational curriculum" and insert "age-appropriate educational materials";

(C) insert "related" after "and any other"; and

(D) strike "the educational curriculum plans" and insert "the educational materials plans"; and

(2) in subsection (b), strike "Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate" and insert "Congress".

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes five minor changes to the language of H.R. 1654, most of which are clarifications rather than substantive changes.

One substantive change is that I specify that the bill's increase of $30 million for Future-X in Fiscal Year 2000 should go toward fast Pathfinder class operability demonstrations. My purpose here is to tell NASA that they should not only fund Future-X concepts which demonstrate advanced component technology but which are innovative in using existing technology to prove out the all important issue of

flexibility, reliability and low cost operations. So we are talking about money that would go for full-scale prototypes and operational systems and an overall system rather than just on a small segment of that development.

My amendment then makes four different clarifying changes to H.R. 1654, the first three of which I will briefly summarize.

It makes clear that the additional funding the bill provides for life and microgravity research would be available to fund research experiments to go on to the International Space Station.

It adds the word ''encourage'' to the definition of space commercialization to make it clear that we expect government to take affirmative steps to encourage the private sector to commercially develop space.

Third, we clarify the language describing an educational initiative on the centennial flight that is 1903, which we have heard about already this morning, so that the provisions address concerns raised by another committee of the House.

Finally, my amendment clarifies H.R. 1645's limitation on the Ultra Efficient Engine Technology program, and I would like to spend the remainder of this statement on that item, which I included in this address specifically to deal with the concerns of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), who has put out a tremendous effort dealing with this specific issue.

First and foremost, let me say there is no prohibition, and I heard earlier a statement on the floor suggesting that there is a prohibition in this bill on the use of funds for the ultra efficient technology engine. That analysis does Mr. LARSON a great disservice, and I would hope that the Members on the other side of the aisle realize that when they are making that argument, it is going into the RECORD, that is not an accurate portrayal of what we are doing at all.

In Fiscal Year 2000 NASA proposed the creation of a new 5-year focused program out of the remnants of two other focused astronautic programs in which NASA had abruptly canceled. The committee is concerned that frequently NASA will defend focused aeronautics program to the death even as they grow in cost and scope and then suddenly cancel them when the priorities of the agency changes.

My goal with this amendment is to make it clear that NASA has the discretion whether or not to spend these resources and these funds on this project and that it is encouraged to pursue this engine in question and that the requested funding of $50 million per year will be spent within the aeronautics research and technology base.

What we are then doing is providing NASA with the discretion, but in no way are we prohibiting NASA from moving forward with this engine project. The resulting language only prohibits a focused program. The bill and report language are not prejudicial in any way regarding using these funds to build or demonstrate this model engine.

In short, we have not eliminated, as my colleagues know, we have not eliminated this program. What we have eliminated is the mandate that NASA spend its funds on this project, but in no way do we prohibit these funds from being spent in developing this engine or showing or building a prototype of this ultra efficient jet engine.

I would hope that the NASA Administrator uses this discretion, which is the purpose of why we put this change in, and uses fully the funds requested for these next 3 years to obtain industry cost sharing. We are trying to encourage industry to get in by giving NASA some discretion here, because this will make this whole project a much better deal for the taxpayers, and in the end it will be better for the engine project to make sure the private sector is putting some money in.

So finally I would like to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) because had he not put so much time and energy in, we would not be just making sure that we have clarified this position, and it would not be as good as it is today. But please do not, and there should be no interpretation of this, that this is some type of eliminating these funds. We are actually giving more discretion to NASA, trying to attract public sector investment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that none of the changes are controversial, and I believe that all of them improve the base of the bill, and I respectfully request the adoption of this manager's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to this amendment, but I will take time since the chairman discussed the ultra efficient engine technology so belaboredly to see if I am right in my assessment of this bill, and if there is some staff that might give me that information, I would appreciate it because around here what they say is, as my colleagues know, red is white or white is blue.

The information I have says H.R. 1654, the NASA authorization bill reported out of the Committee on Science, specifically eliminates funding. I want to use the terms again: specifically eliminates funding for the ultra efficient engine technology as a focused NASA program.

Now I want someone to, if they could answer that question, am I right or am I wrong?

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I reclaim my time.

We give these administrators all kinds of discretion, and we get screwed too. We are the policymakers. We have foreign manufacturers subsidizing their aviation industries, their space industries completely, their aircraft engine technology, putting strict environmental restrictions and regulations in their country on American craft, knocking out our business and economic infrastructure, and we are going to let someone have discretion.

Where is the analytical data to support that this program deserves to be taken off the focus program list? What data, what studies, what conclusions, what empirical evidence has been brought forward, what oversight body has made the decision to throw out this ultra efficient technology engine and let some bureaucrat at NASA make the decision?

I do not think that is the way to govern here, Mr. Chairman. That happens to be in northeast Ohio. That is not my district. But that is a great space center up there, and that is a great program, and it speaks to the core, the economic core, of some of the beating up we are getting overseas.

So I am not going to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but I will say this to him:

We are going to start having some rough and tumble times here with this space program if we do not come to some oversight agreements, and I have never taken exception.

Finally, in closing my little comments, just very briefly here:

The luster and the glory of space has all Americans cheering, but they are now starting to come down to earth, and they are starting to look at the budget and line items, and they better not just do that. Congress better start providing very, very stringent oversight.

I think the joy ride at NASA is over, and I think the time for some monitoring and oversight is at hand.

I will again leave by making this statement:

I am going to ask the chairman to change that language in conference, but that language cannot be changed today, and I will look and see if that language can be inserted in the form of amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Does the gentleman realize that this is being done in an effort to save the taxpayers money, to put more so that we can attract more money into the project by an investment from the private sector rather than having the focus program?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, if it is the intent to save taxpayer money and to leverage participation with the private sector, maybe that should have been listed in the bill as a priority in this regard, but not take it out as a focus program.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It is in the report language.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of confusion relative to what the bill does in this area, and I would like to dwell on two points.

First of all, the manager's amendment that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has introduced makes it clear that NASA will be able to continue research in the ultra efficient engine.

□ 1145

There is $50 million a year that is authorized for that. I think that that is a very wise move, because I do not think we should back away from this program altogether.

The second misconception that I am afraid is floating around here is that if NASA designates a program as a focus program, then that program is protected against raids by NASA or OMB or the Congress or anybody else to take the money away from a focus program and put it into something else. That is not the case.

OMB in the past has canceled focus programs and stuck the money into other NASA programs, and there have been reprogramming requests that have come up from the administrator and which have been approved either by the Congress by not acting or have been in transfer authority in appropriation bills.

The one that immediately comes to mind is the high speed research and advanced subsonic focus program which was in the aeronautics budget that NASA canceled and put the money in the International Space Station when the International Space Station ran short.

So I think that what is being done here is to continue the research but not to make it a focus program, and thus not to have what effectively is an earmark but an earmark without teeth.

Now having said all of that, one of the things that the science policy study attempts to do, which received overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle when it was approved last year, is to leverage government dollars with private sector dollars and dollars from other sources so that we have a bigger research pot, and that is what the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is trying to do in this program.

We do not have enough government money to do everything that we want to do, and the NASA administrator has criticized this bill for being above the President's request. What we would like to do is we would like to bring the private sector in, and it is the private sector that is going to be able to reap the financial rewards of a successful development of an ultra-efficient engine. To have the taxpayers pay for the entire cost of developing the ultra-efficient engine is going to give the private sector a free ride, let us face it.

So this is a way to bring about cost sharing, to bring about the fact that the private sector has to put their money where their benefits will flow, and I think is a very, very constructive step in the right direction to start this program out.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), and I want to compliment him for trying to provide some wiggle room for the ultra-efficient energy technology program. However, I think it simply falls short, in that NASA has pointed out that anything less than a focused effort on the ultra-efficient energy technology would not be as efficient or effective a program.

So although the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has good intentions, I am afraid his intention falls short; yet it certainly does no harm and, if anything, can be more good than bad. So I would support his amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I think we can both compliment the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) on the hard work that he has put into this. We would not be having this discussion right now if it was not for the diligence on the part of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) to oversee this project. We want to make sure that we are on the record knowing that although the designation has changed, the Congress certainly wants this project to move forward.

Mr. GORDON. I agree, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) has done yeoman's work in trying to educate us to really the benefits of this program. Hopefully that education will continue as we go through conference and as we try to bring a final bill to this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

In § 103(4)(A)(i) strike out '', with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine''.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment strictly strikes and simply strikes the sentence from the bill that takes out the ultra-efficient technology engine and it would, in fact, put it back in to focus and leave the project as it was last year. The amendment strictly says that the project would continue; it would be and continue to be a focus project. It would not be at the discretion of the administrator. Copies of the amendment can be delivered from the desk.

The language in the bill says, starting on line 4, section (i), it says $532 million shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine, comma.

The Traficant amendment says $532-plus million shall be for Aeronautical Research and Technology, and with $412 million to be for the Research and Technology Base. It simply removes the sentence that says, and I quote, ''with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine.'' It would strictly take the sentence from the bill. It would leave it as a focus program, and the gentleman should support it.

Lastly, I would like to say for the Members, because we may have a vote on this but I would hope not, and I would hope that the wisdom of the Chair would very carefully review it, I want to read a quote from the aviation industry.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, let me ask a couple of questions, if I could, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The amendment that the gentleman has offered, if it is adopted, would not increase the total amount of money that was authorized for NASA; am I correct in that?

Mr. TRAFICANT. That is correct. That is correct.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. It would give the NASA administrator the authority to use some of the aerospace technology funds, which is almost a billion dollars, for the ultra-efficient engine at the discretion of the NASA administrator?

Mr. TRAFICANT. What the amendment specifically states is this: That the language, ''with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine,'' would be stricken from the bill and the engine would thus be a part of the focus program of the administrator.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from California, the subcommittee Chair.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, is that last part in the amendment of the gentleman or is that what the gentleman is explaining to us?

Mr. TRAFICANT. The amendment is very simple.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, we need to see a copy of the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. A removal of this sentence, and I want the gentleman to listen, there is a sentence in here that says, quote, and this is the language verbatim to be stricken, ''with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine.'' The Traficant language removes that sentence.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. That is it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. The intent of the Traficant language would thus be to

place the discretion with the administrator as it was focused under last year, and to remain with the same priority that it was in the past year's bill.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, with that understanding, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

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

MR. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the report language already, we tried to discuss earlier and put this on the record.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there is report language and there is bill language. If the intention of the gentleman is to do it in the report, then certainly this language that is so specific, there should be no problem about it being removed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) has expired.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, finally, let me say this: There would have to be a reduction for the R&T base, and I believe that reduction would have to be in the amount of $362,800,000 from $412 million. As the chairman had asked, those would be the figures.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, we need to see the language of this amendment. The gentleman just stated a couple of things that we did not know were in his amendment. Could we have a copy of this amendment, please?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Absolutely. It is at the desk.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Could the Clerk reread the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would announce that the Clerk is preparing copies for the majority and for distribution.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman is looking at the amendment, the gentleman had stricken the language for the ultra-efficient engine and put in $50 million for these new participatory private sector types of agreements. What the Traficant language says is we do not need to spend the additional $50 million, but if it be the decision of the committee that they want to retain the money in there and just strike the language for the engine, this Member will accept that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Could the gentleman please repeat that?

Mr. TRAFICANT. There was an increase and $50 million was put into the Research and Technology Base fund in this bill.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is correct.

Mr. TRAFICANT. What I am doing is just simply wanting to strike that sentence that says ''with no funds to be used for the Ultra-Efficient Engine.'' My amendment would take that out.

Actually, the additional $50 million that was put in should be either taken out or the legislative history should show that my colleagues want to leave it in for their purposes. That is fine with me.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is acceptable.

Mr. TRAFICANT. That is acceptable to the gentleman?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is acceptable.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) after I make a point.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I just wanted to say that is acceptable.

So the amendment would strictly be with no funds to be used for ultra-efficient engine. That would be removed; nothing to deal with the funds.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very acceptable amendment because it actually goes to the purpose of the bill originally.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. It is understood that that would be for all 3 years of the bill as well? It would be for all 3 years, a 3-year bill?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, it eliminates that language for the bill for all 3 years, sure, it does.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Fine.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, the purpose of this segment of the bill and the purpose of the changes that we have made was aimed not at prohibiting funds from being used for this ultra-efficient jet engine. That, in fact, is not the purpose at all and that is why the gentleman's suggestion is accepted.

However, with the gentleman's amendment being accepted, this in no way suggests this program is becoming a focus program or that we are mandating that the money be spent.

□ 1200

What the purpose of this whole enterprise was all about was to try to give discretion to the people over at NASA to attract not just government money, but to attract private sector money into this project.

This is not the first time that this method has been used. Let me mention that we had a project, the EELV project, and, I might add, a lot of it would be built in my district, and I opposed it for the very reason that there was not any incentive to get the private sector involved and to get some extra money from the private companies involved in the development of this new rocket system. That project was changed and we managed to save the taxpayers $500 million and to get a better rocket as a result, because we brought the private sector in.

The purpose of our changes here were to try to save the taxpayers some money by getting the private sector to invest into a project from which those companies would benefit. To the point that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) eliminates some language that might suggest that there is some sort of prohibition on spending funds for this engine, we accept that language, but it in no way suggests that this will be a focus program and that NASA must spend the money on the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

In section 217—

(1) insert ''(a) INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT.—'' before ''The Administrator shall''; and

(2) add at the end the following new subsections:

(b) PLAN.—After performing the activities described in subsection (a) the Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture shall develop a plan to inform farmers and other prospective users about the use of availability of remote sensing products that may assist with agricultural and forestry applications identified in subsection (a). The Administrator shall transmit such plan to the Congress not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the plan has been transmitted under subsection (b), the Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture shall implement the plan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to help farmer and ranchers is in the bill before us. It provides that the Administrator of NASA shall discover and catalog the kind of remote sensing information, commercial and otherwise, that might be usable to help farmers and others determine potential crop shortages and surpluses and ultimately how much of what crop to plant in this country.

We have advanced tremendously over the last 30 years in our ability to discover what yields to expect from crop production around the world by means of satellite and other remote sensing monitoring. We are now able to estimate yields of some of the major crops within a plus or minus 10 percent deviation, up to sixty days before harvest. This information could be of great use to farmers.

The amendment now before us simply provides a way to disseminate this information to farmers.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, part of this amendment is in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

Has the gentleman from Michigan obtained the consent of the chairman of that committee to offer this amendment today?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we have obtained the consent of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member, who support this amendment, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, with that understanding, I am prepared to accept the amendment as well. It is a constructive addition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 AND AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that both amendments be taken together.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 and amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Administrator shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Sense of Congress; requirement regarding notice.

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. USE OF ABANDONED AND UNDERUTILIZED BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, AND FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In meeting the needs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for additional facilities, the Administrator shall select abandoned and underutilized buildings, grounds, and facilities in depressed communities that can be converted to National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities at a reasonable cost, as determined by the Administrator.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term ''depressed communities'' means rural and urban communities that are relatively depressed, in terms of age of housing, extent of poverty, growth per capita income, extent of unemployment, job lag, or surplus labor.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Use of abandoned and underutilized buildings, grounds, and facilities.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) working with me on the language of the previous amendment. I appreciate that very much. The gentleman has been very fair and thankful, and I will vote for final passage of the bill.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

This is kind of a tough act to follow, but this is going to be an easier sell than the last amendment that the gentleman from Ohio sold to us. It is my understanding that these amendments relate to a buy-American provision and a utilization of abandoned buildings provision in the bill. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, these are also two very constructive additions and we are prepared to accept them as well.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

In meeting the needs of NASA, the Administrator shall, whenever feasible, select abandoned and under-utilized buildings, grounds and facilities for projects not at existing facilities. In other words, he does not have to, but wherever possible. We do not want some existing base to come in and say we are in a depressed community, which is the legislative history here, and say, therefore, send the business here. So wherever feasible and possible, select sites outside of the existing structure where there are economic hardships and give them an opportunity and a shot.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COOK

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. COOK:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. SPACE STATION COMMERCIALIZATION.

In order to promote commercialization of the International Space Station, the Administrator shall—

(1) allocate sufficient resources as appropriate to accelerate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's initiatives promoting commercial participation in the International Space Station;

(2) instruct all National Aeronautics and Space Administration staff that they should consider the potential impact on commercial participation in the International Space Station in developing policies or program priorities not directly related to crew safety; and

(3) publish a list, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter with the annual budget request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, of the opportunities for commercial participation in the International Space Station consistent with safety and mission assurance.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Space Station commercialization.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, the space program has brought enormous growth to our economy and has created many high-wage, high-tech jobs for American workers. Throughout the world, commercial spending on space activity is booming. NASA and the taxpayers can both benefit from this trend through increased commercialization of the new International Space Station.

My amendment directs the NASA Administrator to commit appropriate resources to accelerate its International Space Station commercialization activities. It directs NASA staff to consider the commercial impact of their management decisions unrelated to safety. Finally, it requires NASA to publish within 90 days of enactment of this act a list of commercial opportunities to participate in the space station during 2000 and every year afterwards.

Primarily, the space program has brought high-tech jobs to the American aerospace and communications industry. To keep our American economy healthy and strong, we need to expand these benefits of space exploration to other areas of the private sector. NASA has made a good start in determining how to commercialize the ISS with the release of its draft plan last fall, but we need to push NASA to follow through on its successful planning efforts so that we do not lose the momentum on station commercialization.

By requiring NASA to publish its list of commercial opportunities to use the International Space Station consistent with safety and mission assurance, this amendment will reduce the cost of the space program to the American people by making the private sector a much larger partner.

ADAM SMITH taught us that we need competition to keep costs down and quality up. This amendment will help ensure that competition keeps our

space program the best and the most competitive in the world. Dan Goldin has done an excellent job managing NASA, but we need to get the private sector more involved. By doing this, we can use the benefits of competition to make our space program even better.

This amendment will ensure that our economic boom will continue into the next century by bringing home the benefits of space research to the American people. My amendment is supported by NASA.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for allowing me to offer this amendment and commend him for his hard work in bringing this bill to the floor today.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is a very good one. Again, it is supported by NASA. I would hope that the committee would approve it.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support the amendment of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK), with some qualifications.

First, I want the legislative record to be clear that I do not regard this language as a blank check for NASA to spend as much as it wants on open-ended initiatives to promote commercial participation in the space station. We have a duty to protect the taxpayers' pocketbook and vague language can be dangerous in that regard.

Second, I read paragraph two to simply mean that NASA will also consider impacts on commercial participation in the space station when it makes policies, along with all other impacts it may consider. These other impacts include the impact of the station's research capabilities on the utilization of the station, on international agreements and so forth. It is my understanding that this amendment makes commercial participation neither the only consideration when making station policies, nor the highest priority consideration.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment and congratulate the gentleman from Utah for putting it forward and also for laying down a marker. I think that what we are talking about here is a fundamental consciousness that we are trying to instill, not only in America's space program, but in most government activities.

Mr. Chairman, the time has passed when we could look at projects just as a bureaucratic endeavor or just something that would be taxpayer-funded totally. If there is any challenge that we have in maintaining a balanced budget and making sure that we put taxpayer dollars to the best use, it is that we have to attract dollars from the private sector into these endeavors to make sure that they are done efficiently, so that they are done in a way that will be beneficial not only to the people who work in the government, but the people who work in the private sector, so that there can be a multiplier effect in terms of the jobs that are created.

So for making an investment on the one hand into things such as the space station, we must always be conscious that that space station did not just mean the jobs that were created in building the space station, but it also means the jobs that will be created by economic activity in the private sector that will result from the space station's existence. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK) is making sure that we put these dollars to maximum use, so I applaud him for it.

Mr. Chairman, I will be, in the near future, proposing a revolutionary new tax concept called Zero Gravity, Zero Tax. It has not been actually introduced as yet, but it is along this same principle, and that is what we would like to do, is to make sure that there is the maximum incentive for private investment in America's space program. As I say, it creates jobs not only in the projects, but it serves as a multiplier effect to create even more jobs once the project is in operation.

So again, I commend the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEINER:

In section 103(4)(A), strike ''$999,300,000'' and insert ''$1,010,300,000''.

In section 103(4)(A)(i), strike ''$532,800,000'' and insert ''$543,800,000''.

In section 103(4)(A)(i), strike ''$412,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base'' and insert ''$423,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including $36,000,000 for aircraft noise reduction technology''.

In section 103(4)(B), strike ''$908,400,000'' and insert ''$918,400,000''.

In section 103(4)(B)(i), strike ''$524,000,000'' and insert ''$534,000,000''.

In section 103(4)(B)(i), strike ''$399,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base'' and insert ''$409,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including $36,000,000 for aircraft noise reduction technology''.

In section 103(4)(C), strike ''$994,800,000'' and insert ''$1,003,300,000''.

In section 103(4)(C)(i), strike ''$519,200,000'' and insert ''$527,700,000''.

In section 103(4)(C)(i), strike ''$381,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base'' and insert ''$390,100,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including $27,500,000 for aircraft noise reduction technology''.

In section 106(1), strike ''$13,625,600,000'' and insert ''$13,636,600,000''.

In section 106(2), strike ''$13,747,100,000'' and insert ''$13,757,100,000''.

In section 106(3), strike ''$13,839,400,000'' and insert ''$13,847,900,000''.

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee for their great help and efforts that they have committed themselves to to try to make this bill as good as it can be, and while there are some areas of contention, they have at all times, in consideration of this bill, been cordial and decent about trying to deal with these concerns.

At this time I am going to be offering an amendment with some of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH); the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL); the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS); the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and others, to try to deal in a timely fashion with the very important and pressing matter that has emerged in recent years and shows no signs of abating, and that is the problem of noise emanating from our airports.

As we have increased almost exponentially the amount of air traffic that there has been, we have also similarly increased the burden that is created to those of us who represent areas around airports, large and small.

What my amendment would do, it would take the very valuable research that is done by NASA on noise research and bring it back up to last year's level and ensure that it stays there for at least the duration of this authorization.

There was some concern raised in the full committee about whether we were taking from one program to add to another, and what we would do here is in fiscal year 2000 simply add $11 million for these programs that wind up being funded in this way.

□ 1215

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not in any level bust the budget. In fact, it restores last year's level for noise reduction. The overall aggregate number of the NASA authorization would again be the same as it was last year, but what this will do is allow us at this important time to continue research on the next generation of the most quiet aircraft that we can have.

We are now, by the end of this year, going to be phasing in the Phase III aircraft, which are the most modern, the most quiet aircraft, but still are akin to having a thunderclap over one's head whenever they take off. This will allow us to do the research for

Stage IV. This will allow us to have even more quiet aircraft in the years to come.

The research that is being done by NASA may some day help us strike the delicate balance that we have been trying to reach in this House between the rights of air travelers, the rights of those who depend on air traffic for commerce, and those of us, and there are dozens of us in this House, who have areas that are nearby airports.

We are in negotiations now with the European community, we are in negotiations now with the private sector to encourage the development of this quieter aircraft. Now is not the time for us to weaken that research by reducing the funding that this authorization does.

This is an opportunity for us to send a message also to the private sector that we seek to have their participation as well. We send entirely the wrong message if we in our budget say, we are going to ratchet back our research into these important matters when we are trying to bring the private sector along.

The chairman of the subcommittee has done great work in trying to encourage the private sector to do their research. I consider these funds to be leveraging those, and I think it would be helpful for us to do that now.

This is an opportunity, and perhaps our last opportunity this year. We are going to be passing an FAA reauthorization bill that I believe is going to, regardless of how it emerges, increase air traffic. There are proposals to almost entirely deregulate all of our airports.

That is going to mean another increase in air noise. This is, I would remind my colleagues, perhaps the last opportunity for us to go on record as being in support of whatever technological advantages we can support to bring about the quietest aircraft possible.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is in the right place on this amendment, but this is not a fiscally responsible way of going about addressing this problem, since the amendment is an add-on of approximately $10 million additional authorization for each of the next 3 years.

NASA is committed to spending $25 million for aircraft noise reduction in fiscal year 2000. So it is not a question of whether we spend nothing on aircraft noise reduction research or some money, because NASA has got that money allocated within one of their accounts.

The bulk of NASA's aeronautic research into aircraft noise reduction technology was conducted within the research and technology base of the advanced subsonic technology program. The administration, and I emphasize the administration, decided to terminate the advanced subsonic technology program when a determination was made that NASA needed additional funding for the International Space Station.

That was budget discipline. That was setting priorities. That was something that the administration decided that it had to do in terms of meeting its obligations.

For us to turn and go around and say we should forget about budget priorities, we should simply add to the authorization, I think diminishes the credibility of the efforts of the Committee on Science to figure out how we will be able to give NASA the money that is available for this year to the highest and best effect.

NASA has already testified before Congress that they are meeting their goals on aircraft noise reduction technology research within the money that is available. Because of this, we should accept the fact that they know how much they can spend on it. We should not be dealing with this problem simply by throwing more money at it.

I would love to be able to meet everyone's desires, but that is not the way life is in the real world and in the budget climate we are facing. We have to be responsible. This amendment is not fiscally responsible. It runs counter to NASA's expert opinion on their requirements. It breaks our obligations to the taxpayers, and I would ask the committee to reject it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Weiner-Udall-Crowley, et al., amendment to increase funding for airport noise reduction research and technology in the research and technology base of the NASA authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, airport noise is perhaps the single most important local quality of life issue to my constituents. Every day my district office receives calls from people living near LaGuardia Airport who complain about the noise from planes landing and taking off. In fact, along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), I have worked hard to preserve the high-density rule and mitigate airport noise in Queens County.

Mr. Chairman, NASA has listed airport noise reduction as one of its top 10 goals. They want to reduce perceived aircraft noise by 50 percent over a 10-year period, beginning in 1997. Under current funding this goal will not be realized.

The Weiner amendment would restore funding for aircraft noise reduction research to roughly fiscal year 1999 levels. It would bring NASA's overall budget to a 13.655 billion, which is exactly the same dollar amount that it was appropriated at in fiscal year 1999.

I applaud my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for bringing this important issue to the floor of the House. The people who invented the rocket engine are the best people to study aircraft noise and ways to reduce it.

I urge my fellow Members of Congress to support this increase in funding for airport noise reduction, research, and technology. Their constituents who live near airports will appreciate their vote to make their homes, schools, parks, and neighborhoods quieter. The Weiner amendment would do just that.

I would just like to add, taking away the high-density ruling will increase air traffic in high-density airports like LaGuardia, Kennedy Airport, O'Hare Airport in Chicago. Unless we are moving realistically towards a Stage IV engine and unless there is real effort on the part of NASA to develop new technologies to reduce aircraft engines' jet noise, what we are doing to inner cities like New York City is unconscionable. It really, truly is unconscionable, to be increasing air traffic.

Putting aside for the moment the air traffic safety issues and focusing simply on the level of noise that is created by these engines taking off and landing at airports like LaGuardia Airport in my district, it is unconscionable to be standing here at the same time and supporting a bill that will reduce the effort to bring about technology to reduce the level of noise emitting from those jet airplanes.

I cannot support a bill that will gut and take away monies from that very needed project, and leaving it in the hands of NASA to develop that needed technology.

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

When we are looking at the arguments on this amendment, Mr. Chairman, let us take a look. We are not talking about gutting money for research into jet engine noise.

Again, this has often been the case in the past where people on the other side of the aisle have taken a look at money that was projected to be spent, increases that were projected, and then when the increase is reduced, that is portrayed as some kind of gutting of a program. That is just not the case.

In fact, NASA documents provided to Congress suggest that there would be a $46 million figure spent for this type of research from fiscal year 2000 to 2002. However, updated documents from that agency suggest that NASA will now be spending $71.3 million for noise reduction, which means even without the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), NASA is planning to spend $25 million more than what it was on this particular issue.

So while I believe that the amendment is well-intended, I do believe that, number one, it is an inaccurate portrayal to suggest that we are reducing the spending; but number two, it is irresponsible in an overall budgetary sense.

What we have here is an attempt by the administration to set priorities.

The money is necessary for the International Space Station, so it decided to reduce the increase in spending, so the administration was trying to act responsibly. Now we have an amendment here to undercut the administration when they have tried to set priorities with a limited budget.

I have one more point to make in regard to that. The administration has had to set priorities because it is trying not to bust the budget, not to put us back on this road to irresponsibility that led to such massive deficits in the past.

Instead, what is happening here, and again, we have amendments similar to this in the full committee, we find that we cannot just spend money. It just does not come out of nowhere. In this particular case, the gentleman now has decided to try to add on money, rather than take it out of other research areas in the science budget.

But then, where does that extra $11 million come from? It comes from what we have designated, we have tried to hold off and protect, not as the social security trust fund, but social security surplus money. We have said we are going to try to keep all the money we do not spend and put it back into social security as a protection of that system.

This $11 million is just one example of, yes, it is just a little bit of money, but everybody here has a little bit of money here, a little bit of money there, and eventually we have that surplus that we hope to spend on social security and to solidify social security just being whittled away to nothing again. I do not think that would be responsible.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Just so we do not lose perspective here, I agree, we should keep things in mind. We should keep in mind that the bill the gentleman is bringing forward is above the President's request, so the outrage that I hear about we are changing the President's priorities, I think perhaps the chairman doth protest too much.

I also want to point out exactly the parameters we are talking about. I am talking about restoring to last year's level, not above, to last year's level of roughly $10 million in the context of a bill in the aggregate that is $42 billion. It is $14 billion this year.

What we are saying is, look, at the same time that we are taking this technology and devoting a significant portion of it to thinking about the problems we are going to be encountering in the future, ought we not to be thinking of the problems we are going to be encountering in a couple of months when we pass the FAA reauthorization, which is something NASA admits they did not take into their calculation when they estimated whether or not the funds provided for noise reduction were sufficient? This is a relatively small amount of money.

I would just respond to one other point that the gentleman made. In this research and technology base, which, just to keep perspective, is about $362 million, there was criticism, and legitimate criticism, raised in the committee consideration of this bill about whether we were taking from one pocket to fund this program.

I accepted that criticism as valid, so now I am saying, in the aggregate, let us do this one-one thousandth increase for this purpose.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was responsive to the debates that we had, and I applaud him for this. This is a learning process around here. But then again, the money, by plussing it up in the way the gentleman now is suggesting, it does again come from another source. That source is money that we had hopefully to protect social security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROHRABACHER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. One last point, Mr. Chairman. NASA has listened to the gentleman, and people have been listening to the gentleman's arguments, because NASA has already agreed to a plus-up or an increase in their spending, in their prioritized spending, of $25 million in this area. I would believe it probably is in reaction to the arguments that the gentleman has been presenting. So in a way the gentleman has won this fight. Adding another $11 million I think is not necessarily the right way to go. I appreciate very much the gentleman's sincerity, but I would have to oppose this amendment.

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

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

□ 1230

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and do so because their amendment is about quality of life, quality of life not just in space but here on Earth, not just for six astronauts housed in an International Space Station but for people in inner city conditions, in poor areas.

This amendment is about balance and perspective and fairness. It is also fiscally responsible. It merely takes us back up to last year's level. It is a concern about noise reduction for aircraft, especially in big airports, that fly over inner city areas.

Mr. Chairman, if we are not careful and if we do not come back and abide by the concerns expressed by the gentleman from New York in the aeronautics area of this bill, this bill is soon going to be called not the NASA bill, ''aeronautics'' is going to be dropped out, it is just going to be the National Space Administration. We are not going to be able to help our aeronautics industries in this country, where they are competing more and more every day with Airbus and the fledgling industries in Japan and Korea and the southeast countries of Asia.

It used to be, when I got on the Committee on Science 8 years ago, that we provided a $30 million or a $40 million or a $50 million plus-up for the aeronautics. Now we cannot seem to find any money to help.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is simply saying let us take us back to last year's level. Let us increase this slowly, $10 million a year. Let us make sure that money in the NASA budget goes in a fair and qualified and quality of life manner.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) said that the administration made the decision to take the money away from aeronautics because of the Space Station. That is one of my concerns, that the Space Station continues to eat up more and more and more of the available funds to do wonderfully enriching scientific and space-oriented and aeronautics programs.

So we are going to have the opportunity later today to cap funding on the Space Station, that is one option; to get the Russians out of the critical path, that is a second option; or to kill the Space Station, the third option. We will see if this body wants to go along with any of those options.

Finally, I say, Mr. Chairman, that the administration has issued a statement of administration policy. In that the President has said the authorization levels in the bill do not conform to the President's request, which is based on a balanced and affordable space and aeronautics program.

That is exactly the point of the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER). We are losing that balance for aeronautics. We are losing that support for our aircraft industry in this country. Boeing competes more and more on the cutting edge every day with Airbus.

We have people living in inner city conditions with loud aircraft flying over their homes every single day, hour upon hour upon hour. We want to provide some more research monies to help alleviate the noise of those engines. I think that is a fair request. I think that we should be able to find $10 million this year. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) did not propose it, but I would propose take that $10 million away from the International Space Station that has gone from $8 billion in costs to $98 billion in life cycle costs.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support the responsible, balanced quality of life

amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), and let us keep the aeronautics portion of this bill in the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is very articulate, and he is a very responsible Member of this House and has kept our feet to the fire on the Space Station program for many years. I might add that his focus on the Space Station has, I think, improved the Space Station in the end, because people have known that he has been there and watching very closely.

However, this money does not come from Space Station. As designed, it is coming out of money that, again, would come right off the top of the bat, which we were hoping to secure for Social Security. So the points the gentleman from Indiana made are very valid, but that is not why the money is coming.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me. I just want to respond to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

First of all, I appreciate his comments about our efforts to control the costs on the Space Station, try to make sure that it can do what it was supposed to do scientifically.

But, secondly, Mr. Chairman, I think that the NASA budget, which has gone between about $13.4 billion and slightly over $14 billion, has had more and more erosion in that budget from now the Space Station growing from in previous years $2.1 billion being allocated, to $2.4 billion being allocated this year for it.

So that is where I am saying the growth is coming in the Space Station, and good programs like what the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is trying to accomplish with noise reduction are falling by the wayside.

Shuttle safety we are concerned about. Education grants we are concerned about. Science programs and space science we are concerned about. So those are some of the things we are talking about.

I share the gentleman's concern for Social Security and the trust fund, and I hope he will work with us to put as much of the budget surplus as possible back in that surplus.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I think that the arguments that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) are making are certainly valid arguments. When we decided to move forward, and this body has decided on many occasions to move forward with the International Space Station, all of us who were voting on that should very well have remembered that we were prioritizing our spending and that it was going to have an impact in other areas just like the areas the gentleman is suggesting and I might add just like the areas that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is bringing up today.

We are foregoing spending in certain areas in order to be responsible and not suck up money that should be going into bolstering Social Security. The gentleman is absolutely right. This is part of the cost of the Space Station. The amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) does not, however, take this out of Space Station.

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

Mr. SALMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond to the chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend, would he then not object to an amendment which took the money out of the research and technology base?

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not support taking it out of Space Station. But we have to realize what the gentleman's amendment is actually doing. It is not taking it out of Space Station. It is adding to that. The money does not come from anywhere. The gentleman from New York is doing a diligent job in trying to meet those objections.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) would further yield, I will gladly change my amendment and take it from that huge pot of money that is Research and Technology Base. If he will support that, I will be glad to do it. But it seems like I have a moving target here. We cannot take money from a $400 million Research and Technology Base because then any numbers of projects could fall from the sky. But, on the other hand, if I say let us plus it up just to last year's level and no higher, then that, too, raises an objection.

It seems to me that what we are trying to say here, and I will try to do anything that I can to meet the objections of the subcommittee Chair, is to try to say, look, all we want to do is take the level that we had last year in this important program and meet it this year. I will do it the gentleman's way, and I stand ready here to amend my amendment in any way necessary.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, again I compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for showing due diligence to the arguments that were offered in committee and trying to find another funding level.

I would just suggest that he come forward with a specific suggestion. It is not, as has been implied by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) that this is not being funded out of Space Station. His arguments about Space Station are valid, in that it is eating money up from programs like the one the gentleman were offering.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) has expired.

(On request of Mr. WEINER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SALMON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. SALMON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I am willing and able, and I think my colleagues who are cosponsoring this amendment would be more than willing. The gentleman said where shall it come from. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) said I have not proposed it comes from the Space Station, although I will be glad to accept that proposal as well. I understand from the gentleman's concerns that he would accept it if I took that $10 million from the existing Research and Technology Base.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way: I will seriously consider any proposal that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) has that takes money specifically from something that I believe has lower priority than what he is suggesting, but it is up to the gentleman to come up with a specific.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) would further yield, I just did.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) would further yield, let me put it this way: Taking from the overall research and develop budget is not acceptable because it is not specific. It would not be specific, for example, that money would have to come from another research project. Maybe the project of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) then would be defunded by what the gentleman from New York is proposing, if we went the route that he is suggesting. Unless the gentleman from New York can be more specific than that, I could not.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Weiner-Udall-Crowley-Kucinich-Rivers amendment. I would like to talk on two points of the amendment. One is just the fiscal issues that we have been discussing here. I would also like to speak to the point of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) about the discussion about the quality of life issues that are at stake.

Let us again remind ourselves that the Weiner amendment would restore funding for aircraft noise reduction research to fiscal 1999 levels in the NASA budget. If we look out a little further, it would increase in fiscal year 2000 by $11 million; fiscal 2001, $10 million; and fiscal 2002, $8.5 million for aircraft noise reduction research and technology.

Now, in 1999, this noise reduction technology was funded at a level of $36 million. In fiscal year 2000, it is scheduled only for $25 million; in fiscal year 2001 for $26 million; and fiscal year 2002, $19 million.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) would restore the funding for aircraft noise reduction to levels that are commensurate with 1999. The Weiner amendment would bring us back up to NASA's overall budget levels of $13.655 billion, which is exactly the same amount of money that was appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

So with all due respect, this is not a budget buster. This is in fact being fiscally responsible. In the long run, we are going to save money by making sure that we put these monies into investing in reducing noise at our airports.

The Department of Transportation estimates that over 3 million Americans are affected by airport noise every day. This FAA authorization bill that we are facing later on in our session is likely to increase traffic at our Nation's busiest airports. By supporting this amendment, we are going to provide some relief for the people that live around those airports.

I want to talk briefly about my State. We have Denver International Airport, known as DIA. It is the jewel of our Nation's airport system at this point. But we want to build a sixth runway. We cannot do that right now because increased noise has become an issue, not only for urban residents but for farmers, for business people, and for all the people that live in the mountains of Colorado.

We ought to be doing all we can to solve that problem now so that people all over the country who use Denver International Airport know that that airport is going to be open in all kinds of weather conditions.

Historically, the FAA has been great at running the trains, if you will, running the airports in our country, but NASA has done the important research and development. We ought to be encouraging that combination, and this amendment will do that.

If we want to reduce opposition to airport operations and expansion, we ought to pass this amendment now. This is going to be our only chance this session to reduce the din around our cities and airports. Rather than create more delay and litigation over our airports, let us encourage the development of quieter engines so our air transportation system can help us meet the challenges and the opportunities facing us in this next century.

□ 1245

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) in sponsoring this amendment, and I rise in support of its passage here today.

I think anyone who is interested in economic development in this country should give very close consideration to this particular proposal. I am convinced that progress in noise reduction is imperative to continued economic growth in this country.

The tension exists today between growth in traffic in the air and concerns about quality of life on the ground, and this tension represents a formidable barrier to economic expansion all across the country.

We all know that increased air traffic is inevitable, whether it is through legislation of this body or through simple population increase over the next several years. We know that we have a problem and it is going to get bigger.

The FAA currently puts monies towards abatement and remediation efforts but, in fact, they have not been adequate, and those efforts may end up being negated to some extent as the FAA moves to change traffic patterns and navigation methodology into the future. And we may see traffic movement from the existing contours and this problem spread to more and more families.

The NASA bill that we are talking about is about researching new technologies, not about abating problems that currently exist but dealing with the future. And, of course, we need both. We need remediation of existing problems, and we must eliminate any future problems before they start.

What we are hoping to see developed here is next-stage aircrafts, necessary, absolutely necessary, if we hope to support both quality of life for the families who are affected by this problem, as we just heard 3 million and growing, as well as the economic needs of communities, regions of the country, and indeed the country as a whole.

If my colleagues are interested in economic development, if they are interested in protecting both the growth of air travel and the economic growth that is incumbent with that, as well as the quality of life for people on the ground, this is a very good place to spend a vote today.

I urge that my colleagues support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to summarize here what we have had a chance to learn. We have learned that there is virtual consensus in this body, even on those that are opposed to my amendment, that aircraft noise has reached almost chronic proportions. We have agreed that we need to do more about it. We have agreed in the years to come there will be even more aircraft taking off, more people living in those paths, and more people being harmed every day several times an hour by that air traffic.

But what we have heard is that my amendment to add $10 million this year to a package that includes $42 billion of spending, including $14 billion just this year alone, is somehow too rich. And we found out that instead of offering this amendment in the way that I have to bring it up to last year's level, no higher, that instead I should identify places in the budget and seek to have this funded from those areas.

Well, perhaps I can have it funded from the Advanced Space Transportation Technology section of this bill. $80 million plus-up, an $80 million additional allocation is in this bill, above and beyond what the President proposed. Perhaps it can come from that research and technology base that I had a brief colloquy with my chairman about, which is a $362 million pot of money that is essentially fungible that we are saying, as this Congress, we want to give the authority to NASA to decide how that should be spent.

But if we agree on the fundamental premise that we need to do more research, that we need to ensure that when the stage-four aircraft are ready that we in the United States are able to put them on our aircraft as quickly as possible, then perhaps this is the place to start.

There is concern, and it is legitimate concern, that we not bust the budget. Well, we are not busting the budget by restoring this to last year's level. We are not busting the budget if we are going to be approving a bill with this amendment, which is exactly at the same level as it was this year. And all of the protest about us not paying enough diligence, not paying enough respect to the request that the President submitted I believe is a false concern.

I believe that there are many areas in this budget where we exceed the President's request. This is an opportunity for us to touch people's lives all over this country. It might be our last chance this year to say, in addition to trying to foster greater air commerce, in addition to trying to foster growth at airports, in addition to trying to track new jobs, we should do a little bit, a very little bit, to add to the amount of research that we do that, perhaps with the great assets that we have in this country, intellectual and otherwise, in years to come we might be able to look back at this bill and say give us the extra push to get even quieter aircraft flying over our country.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) now amending his amendment or proposing a new amendment that suggests that the $11 million come from the Advanced Space Transportation Technology section?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, would he support that amendment if I did?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, is that the proposal of the gentleman?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I am always guided by the wisdom of my subcommittee chair. Would the chairman support that amendment if I crafted it in that manner?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, let me suggest this, if the gentleman would continue to yield:

I had extensive meetings on this budget with Mr. Goldin, who, of course, is the head of NASA. And I know that we have a big budget and I know $10 million or $11 million seems like it is a small portion, but believe it or not, the people in government who have to deal with this budget actually have ideas of how this money should be spent and have ideas and know that if it is not spent in another way it will come out of these other priorities.

Mr. Goldin has emphasized to me, as the chairman of the subcommittee, that the Advanced Space Technology portion is third highest priority. And frankly, this is something that we should have been discussing and going through for the last two or three weeks rather than here on the floor of trying to find an area.

So I would imagine Dan Goldin and the administration would oppose it coming out of that themselves. It is something that, and I agree with the gentleman, I mean, I think that he has hit an area that needs research. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, NASA has already decided to increase, due to probably some of the arguments he has provided, by $25 million.

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

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, as the chairman is aware, we did not mark this up in the subcommittee so we did not have an opportunity to fully vet it. And when we did offer a similar amendment, the type that my colleague seems to be supporting, I won on a tie vote, a moral victory perhaps; and that is why I chose to draft it this way using the guidance of the gentleman.

And I am comfortable with the idea of a $14 billion NASA budget this year, having an additional $10 million that does not exceed last year's level. I am comfortable with that amendment and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Weiner/Kucinich/Udall/Rivers amendment. I have been actively working to ameliorate aircraft noise and pollution problems affecting my district and the New Jersey/New York Region for many years.

Recently, I helped secure language in the FAA reauthorization act to urge the FAA to complete its redesign of the New York/New Jersey airspace as expeditiously as possible. I also joined other Members in signing a letter to the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee urging full funding for the airport improvement program.

Recently, too, I have met with NASA representatives to better understand their ongoing research efforts that would help reduce aircraft noise. These efforts are leading to the next phase of quieter aircraft, often referred to as ''state IV''. However, NASA is many years away from deploying this technology. To increase their ability to develop this technology more rapidly, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Weiner amendment. The amendment would restore funding for NASA's aircraft noise research program to last year's appropriated level, and would only do so over the next three years. This funding is critical to providing noise relief to our citizens, improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and increasing safety of residents and flight passengers nationwide.

This amendment is important not only for residents in the New Jersey/New York region, but for our entire nation. And I commend my freshman colleague from New York for initiating this important amendment that will improve the quality of life for people across the U.S. Help begin the new millennium with greater noise and pollution relief for our constituents by voting ''Yes'' today on the Weiner/Kucinich/Udall/Rivers amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. WEINER to the FY 2000 NASA Authorization bill. This measure would restore funding for NASA's Aircraft Noise Research Program to last year's level. The research conducted by this program would be of great benefit for all those who live, work, or travel near airports throughout the country.

The New York metropolitan area air space is the busiest in the nation. While many people enjoy the benefits of frequent flights into and out of New York, my constituents are forced to endure the noise of a plane landing or taking off every 30 seconds at LaGuardia Airport. Moreover, the FY 2000 FAA Re-Authorization bill which the House will be considering in the next few weeks, may well increase this flight activity. The issue of airplane noise is a quality of life issue for the people who live, work, and go to school in the areas surrounding our nation's airports. The least we can do is work to make these planes quieter, and lessen the burden on those who reside near airports in my district, as well as throughout the country.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. WEINER, for his initiative and leadership on this critical issue for so many New Yorkers and others throughout the country. I urge my colleagues to support this critical issue and vote ''yes'' on the Weiner amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. SALMON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. SALMON:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. ANTI-DRUG MESSAGE ON INTERNET SITES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, shall place anti-drug messages on Internet sites controlled by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following new item:

Sec. 221. Anti-drug message on Internet sites.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It requires the NASA Administrator to consult with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to place antidrug messages on NASA Internet sites.

The NASA Internet site is the most popular Government Web site, receiving hundreds of millions of hits. For example, the Mars Pathfinder Web site logged roughly 750 million hits during its mission to Mars. John Glenn's return to space generated 732,000 Web pages being downloaded from NASA's server, and each week about 250,000 Web pages are downloaded from NASA's server.

Many of these hits on the NASA site are from children, our young people. Thousands of schools around the country have incorporated the NASA Web site into their science curriculum. Furthermore, NASA has targeted students with interactive Web sites designed to engage young minds.

In an era where our children are constantly bombarded and surrounded by the influence of drugs and where more than half of all high school students are found to have dabbled with illicit drugs by the time they have graduated, now is the time to step up our prevention efforts to protect our children from the scourge of drugs. The NASA Web site is an excellent and cost-free way to send these antidrug messages to our young children.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona is a very constructive one and I am happy to accept it.

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

Mr. SALMON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I also recommend accepting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 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 No. 4 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

After section 130, insert the following new section:

SEC. 131. COST LIMITATION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

(a) LIMITATION OF COSTS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the total amount appropriated for—

(1) costs of the International Space Station through completion of assembly may not exceed $21,900,000,000; and

(2) space shuttle launch costs in connection with the assembly of the International Space Station through completion of assembly may not exceed $17,700,000,000 (determined at the rate of $380,000,000 per space shuttle flight).

(b) COSTS TO WHICH LIMITATION APPLIES.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT COSTS.—The limitation imposed by subsection (a)(1) does not apply to funding for operations, research, and crew return activities subsequent to substantial completion of the International Space Station.

(2) LAUNCH COSTS.—The limitation imposed by subsection (a)(2) does not apply to space shuttle launch costs in connection with operations, research, and crew return activities subsequent to substantial completion of the International Space Station.

(3) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION.—For purposes of this subsection, the International Space Station is considered to be substantially completed when the development costs comprise 5 percent or less of the total International Space Station costs for the fiscal year.

(c) AUTOMATIC INCREASE OF LIMITATION AMOUNT.—The amounts set forth in subsection (a) shall each be increased to reflect any increase in costs attributable to—

(1) economic inflation;

(2) compliance with changes in Federal, State, or local laws enacted after the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) the lack of performance or the termination of participation of any of the International countries participating in the International Space Station; and

(4) new technologies to improve safety, reliability, maintainability, availability, or utilization of the International Space Station, or to reduce costs after completion of assembly, including increases in costs for on-orbit assembly sequence problems, increased ground testing, verification and integration activities, contingency responses to on-orbit failures, and design improvements to reduce the risk of on-orbit failures.

(d) NOTICE OF CHANGES.—The Administrator shall provide with each annual budget request a written notice and analysis of any changes under subsection (c) to the amounts set forth in subsection (a) to the Senate Committees on Appropriations and on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and to the House of Representatives Committees on Appropriations and on Science. The written notice shall include—

(1) an explanation of the basis for the change, including the costs associated with the change and the expected benefit to the program to be derived from the change; and

(2) an analysis of the impact on the assembly schedule and annual funding estimates of not receiving the requested increases.

(e) REPORTING AND REVIEW.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF COSTS.—

(A) SPACE SHUTTLE.—As part of the overall space shuttle program budget request for each fiscal year, the Administrator shall identify separately the amounts of the requested funding that are to be used for completion of the assembly of the International Space Station.

(B) INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.—As part of the overall International Space Station budget request for each fiscal year, the Administrator shall identify the amount to be used for development of the International Space Station.

(2) ACCOUNTING FOR COST LIMITATIONS.—As part of the annual budget request to the Congress, the Administrator shall account for the cost limitations imposed by subsection (a).

(3) VERIFICATION OF ACCOUNTING.—The Administrator shall arrange for a verification, by the General Accounting Office, of the accounting submitted to the Congress within 60 days after the date on which the budget request is transmitted to the Congress.

(4) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Within 60 days after the Administrator provides a notice and analysis to the Congress under subsection (d), the Inspector General of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall review the notice and analysis and report the results of the review to the committees to which the notice and analysis was provided.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 130, insert the following new item:

Sec. 131. Cost limitation for the International Space Station.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, there is a quote from Justice Louis Brandeis and it goes like this: ''Publicity is justly commended as a remedy for social and industrial diseases. Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants, electric light the most efficient policeman.''

Sunlight, policing, publicity, how can we be against that? This amendment is about all three of those things. This is not my annual amendment to kill the Space Station. This is an amendment to responsibly cap the costs of the Space Station.

Mr. Chairman, we need to do something about the Space Station; and this body, in its eminent wisdom and sense of fair play, has a number of options today. We can cap the costs of the Space Station for the assembly at $21.9 billion. We can cap the Shuttle costs in connection with the assembly at $17.7 billion and follow the lead of the other body.

The other body put these caps into their bill. Senator MCCAIN, a Republican, who I believe supports the Space Station, put this language into the Senate bill. I do not think that it was even contested. I think it was voice voted. And probably people that support the Space Station, although I do not, I admit it, I do not support the Space Station, this simply tries to get a fencing and a cap and some accountability and some sunshine on the rising and escalating inefficiencies and cost overruns in the Space Station.

Now, we just had a debate on a reasonable amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) to try to plus up to last year's level an aeronautic account to try to do more research on noise and its impact from engines, commercial engines, on inner city people.

Both the respected chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the respected subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) have, in effect, said that we must prioritize the Space Station. And it has gone from $2.1 billion in this bill to $2.4 billion in this bill. So, naturally, when the bill is only $13.4 billion, lots of other things are going to fall by the wayside.

So this amendment that I respectfully offer simply says let us fence this money, let us cap this money, let us make NASA accountable for this money.

□ 1300

I remind my colleagues, I gently remind my colleagues that this is the same Space Station that was supposed to cost $8 billion when it was first designed in 1984. Now the General Accounting Office says the total cost for launching and construction assembly are going to be $98 billion. Mr. Chairman, we have had cost overruns in the last couple of years equal to the entire cost that the Space Station was originally designed to cost the American taxpayer.

This amendment simply says, if you are going to build it, be accountable to the taxpayer. Do not continue to have a program replete with inefficiencies and infected with cost overruns. Let us make sure that NASA does it the way they have done so many other things so efficiently, with the hope and the glory and the promise of the Pathfinder that went to Mars recently for $263 million on the dot.

Are we going to be able to do those anymore if the Space Station continues to escalate in cost and eats up the rest of the $13.4 billion that we have for NASA? I ask my colleagues, will we even have a NASA that has an aeronautics component? Maybe we should just rename the bill the National Space Administration and not help out our aeronautics companies anymore. That is where we are moving. That is what happened to the gentleman from New York's amendment. Let us make sure we prioritize accountability and disinfectant and fairness in this budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the rites of spring that occurs in our Nation's

capital city every year. The cherry blossoms come up, there are a lot of tourists, particularly schoolchildren, that come to see our Nation's capital, and the gentleman from Indiana starts to kill the Space Station again.

First, there is a cap for the next 3 years contained in the bill that is before us. That cap is contained in the authorization amounts of $2,482,700,000 for fiscal year 2000, $2.328 billion for fiscal year 2001 and $2.91 billion for fiscal year 2002. That cap is there. That fully funds the administration's request on this subject. We are being very bipartisan on that.

Secondly, the amendment that the gentleman is proposing now will be directly in conflict with the next amendment that the gentleman intends to propose which gets the Russian government out of the critical path, because the budgets that NASA has put together assume that the Russians will be able to fulfill their obligations under the Space Station agreement. The gentleman from Indiana and I happen to agree that the Russians have not done that. But if he removes the Russians from the program, it is going to cost more money.

So the cap that he puts on will prevent NASA from spending more money which will be caused by the next amendment that the gentleman from Indiana intends to propose. Really, I think the gentleman ought to go to his third amendment which kills the Space Station altogether, because that implements what he wants to do. What he wants to do there is wrong and has been rejected overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives in the past, and I would hope would be rejected again in the future.

The conflicting messages that are being sent by the different caps that are being discussed here is not going to do NASA any good, is not going to do the program any good, and it is just going to confuse everyone in terms of responsible budgeting. I hope that that is not what the gentleman from Indiana has in mind.

Because in determining how much the Space Station costs, an essential element is going to be the economic and political direction that Russia takes and how the United States of America, which includes the President, the Congress and the American people, respond to it. I just would hope that NASA's hands would not be tied through the adoption of the amendment that the gentleman from Indiana is proposing at the present time, that NASA be able to have the flexibility in dealing with Russian contingencies head-on.

For that reason, I would urge the committee to reject the amendment that he has proposed.

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

Let me thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) as well as the chairman and ranking member of our Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics. Let me also acknowledge the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) and wish him a speedy recovery and thank him for his leadership.

I enjoy the friendship of the gentleman from Indiana, and of course I enjoy his constant reminder that we must be vigilant and diligent in the use of the people's money. I vigorously rise, Mr. Chairman, to oppose his amendment on the capping of development funds and launching funds for the Space Station, and prospectively rise to oppose what might be an amendment to eliminate the Space Station, and ask my colleagues to consider where we are.

In committee, someone made a very important note that the gentleman from Indiana's eloquence was missed in the Committee on Science, and they thought because of his leadership of past years he had gotten promoted to another committee. Maybe we should not say it on the floor, but I know he misses us and he knows the good work that this committee does, and that is why he is back with us again.

But I would share with my colleagues that we went through this even before I came to Congress, when we in essence did not support the continuation of the super collider, of course, costing a lot of dollars. But yet there is much evidence that suggests superconductivity research, which is now international, would have generated into many, many jobs and as well would have brought us a large amount of research and input.

I say that this is the same thing that we have with the Space Station. I support the NASA reauthorization, with certainly a number of concerns. But I would think at this point in the furtherance of what we have done, where we have gotten the Space Station, the efficiency, the effectiveness, the tight budget.

I just happened to visit one of our contractors a couple of weeks or so ago. I walked through their plant, I watched their employees, saw the fine line of the budgeting process that they watch, the around-the-clock workers that they have there at USA, United Space Alliance, and saw that they had an attention to detail with respect to doing this job right.

The research that we are getting out of the Space Station on diabetes, HIV, heart disease, the fact that the NASA Johnson Space Center, in fact, using International Space Station as an umbrella, is able to solve some of the problems that impact individuals. For example, there is sort of a connection between the small business community where there are outreach members who go to the small business community and say, ''Do you have a problem? If you have a problem, let's see if we can solve it through the umbrella of the Johnson Space Center and the umbrella of the International Space Station.''

One of those had to do with a gentleman that had a surgery on his arm and had to have various tubes. He could not take a clean bath. This is one of our hospitals. He could not take a shower because infections would start up. We have been able to, under the umbrella of all the research that is done under the Space Station, to be able to solve that individual problem. And so I think it is important. I think, however, that to gut the Space Station, we would be in trouble.

The bill fully funds the Space Shuttle at $2.5 billion. Included in the package is an additional $456 million for the Shuttle. Furthermore, this bill contains a substantial increase from the administration's request for NASA's academic program. I was able to secure further participation for our minority universities, minority-serving universities, Hispanic and African American. The overall bill responds to our concerns about fiscal responsibility.

Yet let me comment, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is not altogether perfect. It steals from Administrator Dan Goldin by prohibiting him from pursuing programs that have the potential to bring great rewards to the United States. The Triana program, Mr. Chairman, I hope, which is a 2-year program which was funded last year in the amount of $40 million, snatched out of the jaws of success, I hope that when we get into conference we can realize the importance of this. Taking away NASA's authority to follow through on this program merely because it was an initiative of the Vice President is certainly irresponsible and a waste of taxpayer dollars. It reminds me of the big hole in north Texas because of opposition to the super collider. Section 126 of the bill also contains a limitation on NASA's earth science program.

So we have many problems, Mr. Chairman, but I would say to you, we do not have a problem with the International Space Station. I would ask my colleagues to defeat this amendment, prospectively to defeat the amendment to eliminate the Space Station, and pass the bill, and work on supporting the Triana project.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, which authorizes the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) for the next three years.

This bill authorizes one of our proudest institutions, NASA. It is an agency that spearheads our search for an understanding about our universe, an agency dedicated to quench our insatiable thirst for knowledge. It is an agency that has done more with less over the past decade, and done so convincingly well. I wish that Congress could perform for them as they have for us, and pass a bill that does not micro-manage, and that does not place new obstacles in the path to achievement.

Thankfully, however, this bill maintains or increases funding for several projects that have consistently been performing well despite yearly budget cutbacks, namely the International Space Station and the Space Shuttle. Up until now, it has been fairly easy to criticize our progress on the station because NASA remained in stages of planning and preparation—but all of that has changed in the past

few months we finally have two pieces of the ISS in orbit—*Zariya* and *Unity.* Under this bill, the funding for the Space Station is set at $1.4 billion for FY2000, of which $394 million is specifically earmarked for microgravity research—which is at the core of station research that will benefit the health of humankind.

This bill also fully funds the Space Shuttle program at $2.5 billion in FY2000, with a slight increase in FY2001. Included in this package is an additional $456 million for shuttle upgrades, which seek to improve the safety of the shuttle, and which can increase efficiency. These upgrades will guarantee that the space shuttle will be more-than-capable in its duties for the next 10 years, while at the same time reduce operating costs and decrease flight turnaround time. These are important in an era where we want to increase access to space while at the same time lowering cost, so that we can better complete worldwide for launch dollars. We should be promoting the use of U.S. launch facilities whenever possible, so as to further develop our launch industry and make our economy more robust than ever.

Furthermore, this bill contains a substantial increase from the Administration's request in the funding for NASA's Academic programs. Although the $128 million is slightly below the appropriated amount last year, it still represents an overall increase in those academic programs when looking at our overall spending pattern over the past five years.

I was also thankful to pass an amendment during Full Committee markup that set aside a proportional amount of funding for minority academic programs. These programs are extremely important, especially when you look at the numbers. African-Americans only represent 6% of the students enrolled in graduate-level science and engineering programs, and Hispanics only 4%. In the workforce, both of those groups together represent less than 6% of those working in the science and engineering fields even though they represent more than 20% of all our workers combined.

My amendment ensured that NASA would spend at least $62 million on minority education efforts, of which $33.6 million would go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This is especially important in my district, which lies just outside of the Johnson Space Center and which contains Texas Southern University and the University of Houston, both of which serve minority youth from all over the country. NASA can have a significant impact on these children's lives—most of you have seen the reaction of the children who were lucky enough to attend the preview of the new ''Star Wars'' movie last night—now imagine NASA being able to dazzle them with real-life possibilities and technology.

This bill is far from perfect, however. NASA has always been an agency about research, setting goals, and solving problems. This bill, however, steals authority from Administrator Dan Goldin by prohibiting him from pursuing programs that have the potential to bring great rewards to the United States.

The first program that is cut by this program is the Triana program, which is a two-year program which was funded last year in the amount of $40 million. By taking away NASA's authority to follow through on this program, merely because it was in some way an initiative of the Vice President is more than irresponsible, it is a waste of taxpayer dollars.

Section 126 of this bill also contains a limitation on NASA's Earth Science program, who is in charge of leveraging our space technology to give us a better understanding of the Earth. The limitation places hard requirements on NASA to commercialize portions of its remote sensing data, but the reality is that the market has not developed to the point where data buys are commonplace. As a result, the entire Earth Science program's future will be in serious jeopardy in Section 126 is not stricken from the bill.

The bill as currently written also contains prohibitions on the development of TransHab, a new technology that has direct application to the Space Station and future space technologies. TransHab is essentially an expandable construct that can be used in outer space to house astronauts or other equipment. Because it is expandable, its capacity for use is greater than conventionally built modules, and at the same time it saves us precious payload space when put into orbit. TransHab technology opens many options for NASA, and makes the lives of astronauts far more bearable. While we should make sure that this technology does not jeopardize our current space station construction timeline or cause cost overruns, this House should not preempt the sound reasoning of our best-trained scientists by prohibiting the development of TransHab.

NASA is an important tile on the American quilt. It permeates the consciousness of a whole generation that watched Neil Armstrong walk on the moon and dreamed they were there with him. NASA continues in the American traditions of exploration and ingenuity—and we should not abandon those traditions by placing limits on our best and our brightest. I urge my colleagues to support NASA, but to do so responsibly and without undue interference.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of all three Roemer amendments. Every year, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out, we come to the floor and debate this issue.

I urge my colleagues to vote down additional funds for the International Space Station. I realize we are going to be facing three amendments today. One is to cap funding, one is to end our partnership with Russia in this program, and the third is to end funding for the Space Station altogether.

But we continue to shovel money into this growing black hole of taxpayer dollars. Two modules have already been launched, but where is the next module? The launch of the third segment, Russia's service module, has been delayed again and again because of Russia's funding problems.

Should we throw more U.S. taxpayer dollars to the Russians to finish their work? I fear that such assistance may become lost, like the $4.8 billion in IMF funds which were squandered by Russian officials. The Clinton administration's ill-fated decision to bring Russia aboard, a decision which they claimed would result in accelerating the Space Station completion by 2 years and reducing costs by $4 billion, has backfired badly. Instead, costs have accelerated and delays have increased.

In the fiscal year 1994 VA-HUD bill which passed the House overwhelmingly, there was report language which said, and I stress this point, Congress stated that Russian participation, and this is where I am quoting, ''should enhance, not enable, the Space Station.'' Despite our best intentions, Russian participation has caused huge U.S. cost overruns and has in effect disabled the program, which is now dependent on Russia.

Will the American taxpayer get their money's worth out of this project? I doubt it. The original scientific justifications for building the station have eroded. The presidents of 10 different scientific societies have called the Space Station a project of little scientific or technical merit that threatens valuable space-related projects and drains the scientific vitality of nations.

I believe the $75 billion not yet spent on the Space Station could provide an enormous benefit to other programs within NASA and other earth-based scientific research. How many more delays, cost overrun and unfulfilled promises must we endure? I continue to support NASA and space exploration, but we must recognize the cost of this particular project far exceeds the potential benefits. I urge my colleagues to support the Roemer amendments and restore common sense to our space program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Indiana's scrutiny of the Space Station over the past few years. I think because of that that we have a better Space Station program, that NASA is more accountable.

But I do have concerns with this amendment, in that, as has been pointed out, two segments of the Space Station have already been launched and placed in orbit. This particular cap would result in a 12 percent approximate reduction in the budget for the projected completion of the Space Station. I think to take 12 percent out really raises questions of safety and efficiency. For those reasons, I think this is just too big a cut and would oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the gentleman from Indiana has been a strong opponent of the Space Station program for years, and for many years traditionally introduced the amendment to kill the funding for the Space Station. He was consistently defeated by the will of this body.

The people of the United States, through the expressed will of the Congress, have chosen to proceed with the construction of the Space Station. Now, today, as we speak, we do have two elements on orbit. We have much

of the construction cost already expended, and most of the hardware is at the Space Station processing facility at Kennedy Space Center and ready to be launched.

□ 1315

Now what was correctly pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan is that we do have significant delays caused by the Russians, and that has been something that I have been very, very concerned about, as have been many Members of this body. We are very, very close to obtaining the delivery of the service module. NASA has worked out a very, very successful program to work around any further Russian delays in the outyears of the program and to ultimately get them out of the critical pathway.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment because of what it really is, and what it is is an attempt on the part of those who have tried to kill the space station for years to instead put forward an amendment that does not appear to do that but what in reality will do that. By putting this cap in place it would require very significant cuts in funding, and I can tell my colleagues as a Member who represents an area of the country where a lot of this work is done, this program is pretty much cut to the bone. They have really done a tremendous job, I believe, in getting it completed with the funding that has been available and that this particular amendment will essentially kill the space station program.

I am told that there is nothing that motivates our kids more to study math and science in our schools than our manned space flight program, and I would encourage our colleagues to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have before me here the official House of Representatives dictionary, and I have turned to page 240 and looked up the word ''boondoggle.''

Boondoggle: work of little or no value done merely to keep or look busy; a project funded by the Federal Government out of political favoritism that is of no real value to the community or the Nation.

Boondoggle, Mr. Chairman, that is what we are talking about here in the three amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) to kill, cut or sever the relationship with the Russians in work performed by the Russians on the space station.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell my colleagues I was a member of the Committee on Science back in 1994. We began talking about the space station. The work was already under way at that time. I was told at that time that the work to be done, to be completed, was going to run a cost of $20 billion to complete the space station. That was in 1995, when I first came to Congress. Today we have just received a study by GAO with revised estimates saying that the space station will cost U.S. taxpayers $95.6 billion over its lifetime, a fourfold increase in 4 years, Mr. Chairman.

This, I believe, should be an added definition for boondoggle in this dictionary that I have before me.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentleman is kind of confusing apples with oranges because the earlier figure was the construction cost. The later figure that the gentleman from Oklahoma is using is the construction cost plus the operations cost over the full 15 to 20-year life cycle of the station.

I will be the first to concede that as a result of the Russian failures to do what they agreed to the construction costs to the U.S. taxpayers have gone up, but the 1994 figures that the gentleman from Oklahoma gave did not include any operations cost whatsoever.

So there has not been a fourfold increase.

Mr. LARGENT. But is it true that the taxpayers will be spending $95.6 billion over the next 15 years or over the lifetime of the space station?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. That is the current estimate, but to say that the cost has gone up by four times, as my colleagues know, uses a figure in the beginning that did not include any operational cost and the figure in the end that does. So it is not a comparable comparison between the current cost estimate and the cost estimate that was utilized in 1994.

Mr. LARGENT. Then in 1994 what were the costs plus operational expenses projected to be?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I do not know.

Mr. LARGENT. I can assure the gentleman it was not $95.6 billion of the taxpayers' money.

I can also tell him that one of the reasons that was given for building the space station was that we could do all these elaborate experiments on crystal formation in a weightless environment, and so the reason for that is that we would be able to develop all these cures for cancer and so forth, and so what I did is I just kind of on my own began calling a number of the drug manufacturing companies in this country and asking them: ''How important is it for you to be able to conduct these experiments to develop these chemicals and these different crystalline formations that are going to cure cancer?''

Their response, all of them across the board, was: ''We could care less. That is not what we are into. We could care less about space station funding.''

So I would just say, Mr. Chairman, that I am rising in support of all the Roemer amendments, and I would ask my colleagues to consider the ramifications of continuing to spend nearly $100 billion of taxpayers' money on a project that is overdue, overfunded and not needed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise this afternoon to voice my very strong opposition to all of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) to H.R. 1654, and I will talk about all of them right now in one fell swoop.

With all due respect to my colleague from Indiana, cancelling or capping the International Space Station, whether it is dealing with the partnership with Russia, killing funding authorization for the space station or setting caps on development of and launch of costs associated with the station is wrongheaded. It is wrongheaded domestic and foreign policy.

When we began the International Space Station, we knew it would be a challenging project, to say the least. To stop now would be sort of like halting the construction of the transcontinental railroad shortly after the engineering survey work had begun and the first few miles of track had been laid in the 1860s.

Mr. Chairman, it would be shortsighted and even foolish to terminate the program now that we are on the verge of realizing its many rewards. We have launched Zarya and Unity, the initial elements of the space station, into orbit where they are now operating, and moreover, shipment of the service module, the permanent crew quarters, will be placed in orbit next year. It is presently under way. NASA experts predict that the space station will be completed and can serve as an outpost for humans to develop, use and explore the last frontier within 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, think about the advances that can positively affect the lives of all Americans that would be prematurely halted. For example, the new space life sciences doctoral program at the University of Texas medical branch in Galveston, my district, could be terminated, and the chances of improving telemedicine and even better access for health care for all Americans would be slowed down. Cutting space station funding would adversely affect Joe Valentine's Alliance for Technology access in San Rafael, California, which is in the district of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), and she is going to speak in a few minutes. The alliance which has 40 resource centers around the country provides assistance to the disabled through a variety of high-tech resources, many of which have been developed through manned space exploration and all of which stand to benefit greatly from current telemedicine-telemedical research.

Mr. Chairman, capping or eliminating space station funding also could stymie progress at the University of Notre Dame's bioscience core facility. At this laboratory in the district of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER)

scientists and researchers are dedicated to providing technical and instrumental support for biological and biochemical research. I do not believe either of these Congress persons wish to do something that would harm the hopes and dreams of what these people are trying to accomplish in their districts, and our Nation's drive to improve the lives of humans and the health of our planet would be waylaid if Congress votes to terminate funding for the International Space Station. It would be a shame to throw away one of the best financial investments our Nation can make, and I have said it several times. For every Federal dollar we spend in space we get a $9 return here on Earth. Nine dollars has created tens of thousands of good jobs for Americans.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to think about their children and their grandchildren when casting their vote on any of these three dangerous amendments. Do we really want to deprive our children and grandchildren the benefits of future improvements and discoveries in medicine, meteorology, microbiology by voting against continued funding of the International Space Station?

Well, I do not want the 106th Congress to go down in history as one of the most myopic in history by endorsing these amendments. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to vote no on the amendments to NASA's budget authorization bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in respectful but still opposition to at least two of the amendments offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROEMER). Perhaps we will talk about the third, but let me just say that now is not the time for us to undermine the space station program.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has made his position very clear. He believes the space station is wasteful, and he believes that it takes away from other priorities. He has made his arguments, and some of his arguments have certainly a flavor of legitimacy to them, not to say that we can agree with him at this time. Perhaps 10 years ago when we were facing this same situation, perhaps when I first came to Congress, would have been a better idea just to go along with Mr. Roemer at that time, but we have gone forward now, and we have reached a point that it would be a tremendously destructive factor to America's space program to try to end the space station project at this time.

If we end the space station project, we follow the lead of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), it will be a death knell to space cooperation throughout the world. We have made agreements with our allies. We also made an agreement and a covenant with the American people. We spent so many billions of their dollars already on this project, it is incumbent now upon us here at the last moments, in the last 2 years of this project, to get the project done.

And I agree with Mr. Goldin. Mr. Goldin, I think, has been a breath of fresh air to the space program, that his number one priority is to get this project done, get on with it, so then we can go on to other things. If we instead decide to cancel this project to go on to other things, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) would like us to do, it will lead to just the opposite. We will not be cancelling to go into other things, we will be undermining public confidence and any other major space programs and commitments in the future.

So, while I sympathize with his responsible efforts to prioritize and to talk about, as my colleagues know, drawbacks in this budget, I simply cannot support, and I do not think it is responsible for us now to pull back at this last moment.

Now let me just say a few words about space station and what it will be and why it is worth moving forward at this time.

The space station, once complete, will be one of the great and historic engineering feats of all times. We are demonstrating that our engineers, and with a combined and cooperative effort with other countries of the world, can build a great edifice in space, a structure that can be used for, yes, scientific research, but also a structure that can be expanded and used for other things in the future that we perhaps cannot foresee now. Just the engineering experience that we get from building space station and the experience we have working with this cooperative relationship with others will educate us and permit us to accomplish other great things in space, perhaps a moon base, perhaps something that I envisioned, a space grid, an electric grid in space that will help us once our oil resources dwindle to provide clean electricity from space to be beamed down from solar collectors onto the Earth.

These are great dreams, but these are dreams that have to start with engineering capabilities that the space station now will enable us to do because it will teach us those techniques and enhance those capabilities.

So, I would respectfully request my colleagues to reject Mr. ROEMER's amendments, at least two of them dealing with the space station, and to support the space station, not to quit and call it off right here at the last moment.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will not take my full 5 minutes. In fact, I will condense it to Mr. ROEMER's pending three amendments. I will rise in opposition to all three, but I will only speak once.

□ 1330

I want to speak to the cutting of the funding, to the striking of the funding, or even to the reducing of the international effort in the International Space Station. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is a fine Member. I would say to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) that I hope I do not give the same speech every year because his amendments obviously I oppose.

The International Space Station represents the future of space exploration in our country, and it represents a high tech lab whose innovations have countless applications in the daily lives of all Americans. It represents an era of international cooperation that everyone can benefit from.

To date, the International Space Station has been a model of international cooperation and responsible management. If Congress does undermine the funding for the Space Station with an unexpected reduction, it would represent a major reversal and a commitment made to the program's stability over the past few years and it would be a betrayal to our international partners.

Critics have said that the cost for the life cycle of the Space Station has drastically risen. It is just not true, Mr. Chairman. In fact, the cost for the life cycle of the station has only gone up 2 percent in the last 3 years. So that is pretty good compared to even our low inflation rate.

We have also said that funding the Space Station would push out any smaller space exploration endeavors like the Mars Pathfinder Mission, the Hubble Space Telescope, that have enormous success. Again, this is not true. NASA, with the development of the Space Station, will have a platform from which future space exploration and research can be continued.

We are standing on the brink of the 21st century and I hope that we will not look back to the last century by cutting the funding for the Space Station, the NASA scientists, researchers and astronauts. We do not want to lose the foothold our country has into the future. So I ask a ''no'' vote on all three of the Roemer amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to support the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) to put caps on the Space Station spending, and I want to urge my colleagues to support his amendment and my amendment to cut our losses on the Space Station and to cancel that project.

In fact, on this issue, to cut our losses and cancel the Space Station, I am very proud to be recognized, since the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is no longer in attendance at the Committee on Science meetings, I am proud to be recognized as ROEMER in a skirt.

First, though, it is important to point out the valuable work of NASA, the work that NASA does to push the envelope of technology in reaching out

to space. But one project in particular, the Space Station, has cost us far too much, casting too large a shadow over our budget.

Speaking of throwing money at a problem, when the Space Station was proposed in 1984 the estimated price tag was about $8 billion. That is a lot of money. Now that price has risen more than a dozen times to almost $100 billion over the life of the project. This is truly unacceptable.

Let us see what we can do with that much money, Mr. Chairman. We could provide low income heating assistance for thousands of families. We could fund child immunization programs, clean up our Superfund sites, fund drug prevention programs, and pay our debt to the United Nations.

To sway some of my colleagues, I would say that for the same amount they could buy three nuclear aircraft carriers, five Seawolf submarines and 30 B–2 bombers, although I would not recommend it nor would I vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, with the immediate savings from this amendment, $2.4 billion in the year 2000, we could offer college education, including tuition fees and books, to over 500,000 students who could not otherwise afford college, right here on Earth.

With $2.4 billion, we could provide prenatal care to pregnant women who do not have access to routine health care, right here on Earth.

With $2.4 billion, we could expand the WIC program so that all eligible pregnant and nursing mothers can get food supplements, and still we would have money left over.

Supporters of the Space Station claim that research in space will advance health research. Well, with $2.4 billion, we could fully fund the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, right here on Earth. And with $2.4 billion, we could make Medicare more affordable to nearly 3 million elderly women living in poverty.

I do not question the ability of our outstanding engineers, Mr. Chairman, and our scientists who would bring this project to reality. However, I believe this is a case of misplaced priorities. With the many needs here on Earth, the Space Station is just too expensive.

With limited funds available for programs right here on Earth, we must focus our resources on our Nation's most urgent needs in order to ensure a bright future for our children. Let us not send our tax dollars out in space when we have unmet needs right here. Let us cancel the Space Station program. I urge my colleagues to support the Roemer amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and just add one other category of where $100 billion might come in handy for a useful down payment, and that is the $5.5 trillion national debt that still hangs over this Nation, that affects us and is definitely going to be affecting the future of our children.

I do rise in strong support of the three amendments the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is offering to kill, cut or control this fiscal irresponsibility known as the International Space Station, although I do so with a great deal of sadness, Mr. Chairman. I commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for the courage that he has displayed year in and year out to bring these amendments to the floor to highlight this issue, to force the Congress to have to make some tough fiscal decisions and just to remind the American people of what is going on with this program.

But I do so sadly, Mr. Chairman. As a representative of western Wisconsin, the home of such outstanding astronauts such as one of the original Mercury astronauts, Deke Slayton, who hails from a small town called Leon in the Sparta area of Wisconsin, and current Shuttle astronaut Mark Lee, I have always been and will always remain a strong proponent of space exploration and our national space program.

I, like many Americans, am very supportive of NASA's efforts to explore the universe and expand human knowledge, but I am not willing to support this cause at the expense of fiscal sanity. The Space Station program, initiated back in 1984 at an estimated cost of roughly $8 billion, has become a budgetary black hole. The GAO estimates, even with its scope and size reduced, it will now cost nearly $100 billion over its life span.

At a time when Congress is trying to abide by the 1997 balanced budget agreement and live within the spending caps that exist, how can we support a Federal program that now is estimated over 1,000 percent over budget?

With this authorization, the space program will consume one-sixth of NASA's entire budget over the next 3 years, a large amount considering the agency will essentially be level funded during that. As the Station's cost has grown, it has crowded out other scientific priorities. Any further slips in construction and schedule will only add to the pressure on other space priorities.

We must know, as an institution, when to say enough. Since its inception, our national space program has represented what is best about our Nation, Mr. Chairman: our ingenuity, our technological skill, our desire for knowledge about our universe and about ourselves. When confronted with seemingly insurmountable odds, the fine men and women in our space program have risen to the occasion time and time again.

Who will forget that memorable moment back in 1961 when Yuri Gagarin was the first Russian and first person to be launched in space and the shock waves that reverberated across our country from that event. And then a mere 23 days later Alan Shepard, sitting courageously on top of the Mercury Redstone rocket, not knowing whether or not when it ignited it was going to blow up from underneath him, was the first American to finally reach outer space. And then 20 days after that a young President by the name of John F. Kennedy challenged our Nation to send a man to the moon and safely return him to Earth by the end of the decade.

For almost 40 years the achievements of our space program have raised the hopes and dreams of people of all ages. Alan Shepard and Deke Slayton were childhood heroes of mine. I had a model of Freedom 7 on my dresser growing up as a child during the 1960s. All who have been involved in our Nation's space program are American heroes, no question about it.

I want to do what I can to extend this fine legacy but I will not do so at any price. The space program is a wonderful program, Mr. Chairman, that there is no question about.

What has to be questioned is the tremendous cost that the American taxpayers are facing today to perpetuate a Space Station that many in the scientific community, outside of the NASA community, believe has limited or no value.

I would encourage my colleagues to seriously consider supporting these amendments which will hopefully restore some fiscal discipline and some fiscal sanity around a program that is sucking up more and more tax dollars every year as we continue to slide down this slope. I commend my friend from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for bringing these amendments again this year.

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

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to all three of the Roemer amendments dealing with funding for NASA's International Space Station. As well intentioned as they might be, I think they are very misguided, and I think that is apparent by the actions taken by previous Houses on this issue.

Some of these amendments are the same old items in new packages. All of them would be destructive and detrimental to the program.

Some of our colleagues have argued that it would be fiscally prudent to eliminate the Space Station in this year's budget, as the previous speaker just mentioned. In my opinion, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, it would be terribly imprudent to kill the program.

We have already invested more than $20 billion in the Space Station. Our 12 international partners have spent more than $5 billion; 250 tons of hardware has been built and two elements are currently in orbit. To eliminate the program now, after so much has been

invested and so much work has been done, would be the height of irresponsibility by allowing our investment to be completely wasted.

The International Space Station is a worthwhile investment in exploration and science, an investment in jobs and economic growth and, most of all, an investment in improving life for all of us here on Earth. The space program and experiments conducted on the Space Shuttle have made remarkable contributions to medical research and the study of life on Earth. The Space Station is the next logical step, a permanent orbiting laboratory.

Let me highlight some of the Station's potential for contributing to medical advancements. For example, Space Station researchers will use the low gravity environment of the Space Station to expand our understanding of cell culture, which could revolutionize the treatment for joint diseases and injuries. The Space Station will provide a unique environment for research on the growth of protein crystal, which aids in determining the structure and function of proteins. Crystals grown in space are far superior to those grown here on Earth.

Such information will greatly enhance drug design and research into cancer, diabetes, emphysema, parasitic infections and immune systems disorders.

The almost complete absence of gravity on the Space Station will allow new insights into human health and disease prevention and treatment, including heart, lung and kidney function, cardiovascular disease, bone, calcium loss and immune system function.

I also share the concern of my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), that the continued Russian participation in this project needs to be carefully examined. The economic difficulties that Russia is currently experiencing have caused several unfortunate delays in their delivery of certain Space Station components and this needs to be scrutinized. This partnership deserves every chance to succeed because of the experience and expertise the Russians bring to the table and the potential foreign policy benefits of continuing this partnership.

Mr. Chairman, the International Space Station is vital to continued human man presence in space and I would urge a defeat of all three of the Roemer amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his tenacity on this issue and I once again join him in his efforts to cap, curtail or eliminate the International Space Station program.

I have heard all of the arguments over the years, just as many of my colleagues have, and I have to say that while I recognize the sincerity with which many of these arguments are advanced, I do not accept the validity of many of them.

For example, I do not believe that this debate should be about jobs. I do not believe that this debate should be about good money after bad. I do not think that it should be entirely about cost, though I would point out that the Roemer-Sanford amendment is supported by the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, the Concord Coalition and Citizens for a Sound Economy.

I do not believe those issues should be central to our discussion today. Our debate today should be about science.

□ 1345

It should be about whether or not the International Space Station represents good science.

Dr. Robert Park of the American Physical Society observed that no scientists not funded by NASA support this station. My experience suggests that is, in fact, true. Dr. Donald Brown, a leading biological scientist and staff member of the Carnegie Institution, says NASA plans for space-based life sciences research is costly and ineffective; ground-based research in other areas are more important.

NASA once boasted that the space station would have eight major scientific objectives. Today, after numerous redesigns and cost overruns, the station retains only two of the original eight. Many experts in space science believe the station no longer represents a worthwhile endeavor, and the science experiments now slated for the station could be conducted aboard unmanned satellites or the space shuttle at a much lower cost.

The station's costs are threatening to crowd out promising projects within NASA. Last year, NASA shifted $200 million from space shuttle safety and space education grants to pay for station overruns. NASA also asked for the authority to shift another $375 million in 1998.

Smaller, cheaper, faster missions will never share the success of other small programs like the Hubble Space Telescope and Mars Pathfinder if we do not cancel the station now. At $1 trillion in life cycle costs, the space station has sucked the air out of space-based research and space-based science that should be allowed to exist on its own.

These proposals are thoughtfully presented, they are fiscally responsible, and most importantly, they are science-based. I would urge my colleagues to support these proposals.

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

Ms. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, first of all, for her ongoing support for this effort that we have put forward, not just this year, not just last year, not just the year before, but the gentlewoman from Michigan comes to the floor to articulate her strongly felt views every single year on this project, and I am grateful to her for her strong support and her words of wisdom.

I do want to say that in reading one of the Congressional Research briefings on the space station, they say on page 2 of 13 that there are no caps in this House bill. There are overall caps in the Senate bill inserted by Senator MCCAIN on the overall costs of the launch and the assembly. Mr. Chairman, $21 billion for one, $17.8 billion for the other. That is all we are asking in this first amendment. An overall $38 billion cap or a fence for disinfectant, for sunshine, for policing, for accountability, for good government so that we can control the costs of this space station.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

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

I would like to state my opposition to this amendment, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote against it.

I extend my full support for the sensible NASA Authorization Act before us today and I would like to commend the hard work and leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

With their guidance and support, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the ranking member of the Committee on Science, and my good friend the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), a member of the Subcommittee on Space, I believe we have a sound bill that will advance scientific research, promote commercial and privatized space efforts, and ensure the United States' role as a preeminent player in the international space community.

I would like to especially commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for maintaining strict oversight throughout the International Space Station program and rightly criticizing the participation by the Russian Space Agency for some of the inefficiencies that certainly they have been involved in.

I am satisfied that this bill has been stripped of pet projects that would take away resources for critical scientific research and development. By increasing the total level of funding above the President's request, while at the same time ensuring that NASA continues to streamline and modernize their operations, I am confident that this bill will allow NASA to focus funding on advanced space research and activities.

I believe this bill addresses NASA's critical priorities, such as space science, life and microgravity sciences, advanced space transportation technology, space shuttle safety and performance upgrades and numerous education programs. By opposing this

amendment we are continuing the scientific integrity of this important legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the NASA Authorization Act and to oppose efforts which would burden NASA by adding unnecessary and wasteful projects to this bill.

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

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, of course, in strong support of H.R. 1654, and I want to talk a little about the amendments. This is an annual matter, and I have such high regard for the author, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). I have said so many times that this is another of those situations where one likes the author, but one cannot stand his amendment. But I am getting used to it, because we have voted on this day in and day out, year in and year out.

I really think some of these amendments are not all that bad. I would say that to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). It is kind of like in gun control. I do not mind the waiting period, I do not mind registering them, but I know that the full intent is to take them away from us. Here, these amendments are steps in the direction of losing the space station. We do not want to do that. We cannot afford to do that.

I am pleased that the International Space Station and the space shuttle operations are fully authorized at the level as requested by NASA and this legislation. I think they are entitled to the respect of this committee because some time ago the chairman of the Committee on Science and I, working together, minority and majority, talked to the Administrator and told him of our desire to cut down the NASA expenditure and try to cut it by say 25 or 30 percent. It seemed like the words were used that if you do not cut the budget here, you know how to cut it because you know all of the ramifications of the budget. We know about as much as we can know, but we will either cut it with a baseball bat or you cut it with a razor and do it in the right manner so that NASA could still operate.

I am happy to say that Mr. Goldin did that and he cut that budget almost 34 percent, more than I think any other budget percent-wise has been cut on Capitol Hill.

So I would just say that NASA's space research has been cut, but they are still operating, and it results in products that improve our quality of life, such as instruments that measure bone density without penetrating the skin, cardiac pacemakers, computer readers for the vision impaired, smoke detectors, voice-controlled wheelchairs, and the list goes on and on of the accomplishments. And yes, the inspiration to the young school children all over this country. If we cancel out this space station, I would say we would have than uprising from the schools, from the intermediate schools on up to the strongest higher education levels that this Congress has never envisioned before. I say to my colleagues, they would come alive.

We need to continue the research that the space station could lead to, the medical breakthroughs of combating cancer, arthritis, diabetes, balance disorders, Alzheimer's, cardiopulmonary diseases and other afflictions that threaten our citizens.

We need this space station. We need the hope that this space station holds out. For those wasting away in cancer wards as we speak, they have one thing in their heart, and that one thing is hope. I hope that this Congress will not let them down and cut off the one operation that could deliver to them the deliverance from the wards they languish in. They are entitled to that hope.

Mr. Chairman, throughout America's rich history, there has always been among the American people and its leaders a deep and abiding belief in that hope, and in that future, a belief that we can and will continue to accomplish great feats and make great discoveries. Space is our last frontier, and NASA is the organization that provides the knowledge, the resources, the heroes and the vehicles necessary for space exploration.

This is important legislation, and just as in the gun control thrust, they will take several steps toward it that look innocuous, but would take the guns away and violate the amendment to the Constitution that these people rely on. This is the same situation. A few amendments can cripple the space station. We do not want to get to that point. I think this legislation deserves our support today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1654, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act of 1999, and for the important work that NASA has consistently accomplished as the world's leader in space endeavors. As a longtime member of the Science Committee, it has been gratifying to see the progress that NASA continues to make in streamlining its programs, controlling its spending, while continuing to deliver good results.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the International Space Station and Space Shuttle operations are fully authorized at the level requested by NASA in this legislation. The space station represents an investment in our future and represents the combined hopes of many nations that microgravity research in space will have far-reaching benefits for our people. Specifically, this legislation designates slightly more than $1 billion over the next three years for life and microgravity sciences and applications.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, NASA's space research has already resulted in products that improve our quality of life, such as instruments that measure bone density without penetrating the skin, cardiac pacemakers, computer-readers for the vision-imparied, smoke detectors, and voice-controlled wheelchairs. We continue to hope that research on the Space Station could lead to medical breakthroughs in combatting cancer, arthritis, diabetes, balance disorders, Alzheimer's, cardio-pulmonary diseases and other afflictions that threaten our citizens.

This legislation provides $6.9 billion for the international space station and $9.6 billion for space shuttle operations. The space station began as a dream and still has its share of critics. But through hard work, careful planning and the financial commitment of many nations, the space station dream is still very much alive. This legislation will help keep it so.

Throughout America's rich history, there has always been among the American people and its leaders a deep and abiding belief in our future—a belief that we can and will continue to accomplish great feats and make great discoveries. Space is our last frontier, and NASA is the organization that provides the knowledge, the resources, the heroes, and the vehicles necessary for space exploration. This is important legislation, Mr. Chairman, that deserves our support today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer amendments, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) again for being tenacious with this particular issue.

We have heard an awful lot of debate about the pros and cons of whether we should move forward with the space station. The reality is, if we had ideal budget numbers, if we had all the money available to us that we wanted for seniors and veterans and for education and environment, and a whole host of other issues that we deal with, then very possibly if we had all of that money, then we could put money towards this. But we do not. We have limited resources, and if we look at the reality and the facts of the space station, of the numerous missed deadlines; if we look at what the original cost estimates were: $8 billion, a lot of money when that was first brought up, and when we look at where it is now, $100 billion, that should speak volumes to us. If we look at the space station as what scientists are saying about it, and we have many scientists who are saying that this is not a good idea and we should not move forward. If we look at what NASA may have to be doing to other very successful programs like Voyager and the Mars mission and space shuttles, and many of my colleagues are talking about the benefits that we derive right here on Earth from many of NASA's projects, and I agree with that, and I am as proud as anyone in this House with the accomplishments that we have had with our space programs.

Those same accomplishments can be made without the space station. Those dollars, those billions of dollars, $80 more billion that will have to be spent on this is money that should be redirected. If we look carefully and we understand what we are committing ourselves to in the long run, we will understand that the Roemer amendments

make sense. The Roemer amendments made sense last year and the year before, and I supported them very proudly. I think they make even more sense this year.

So once again, I will ask my colleagues to say that enough is enough, to look at where we are and where we need to go and to understand that the right thing to do is to support the Roemer amendments.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I support efforts to explore space and believe the benefits to high technology research and to the private sector are vast. But I have grave concerns about our space station program.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing a time of tight budget caps, which I support. But these caps force us to make some tough spending choices. By making a decision now to cancel the space station, we can fund other priority areas within our discretionary budget.

In 1993, the Space Station was projected to cost about $17.7 billion. The estimate has risen to exceed more than $26 billion. The price of this program continues to rise, while the target completion date gets pushed later and later.

The fact is, the space station is stripping scarce funds from other valuable NASA programs.

I am excited about our recent successes in exploring Mars through the Pathfinder and its rover, Sojourner. It seems to me, we get much more value for our dollar through ventures such as this one, than we do from the space station, given its excessive price tag.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Roemer/Sanford amendment. I do not believe that we should be sending billions of dollars into space when we have so many more urgent problems here on Earth. On top of that, our Country is over $5.6 trillion in debt.

When NASA proposed the space station back in 1984, the project was to cost a total of $8 billion. Since 1984, the space station has been redesigned many times and the cost estimates have skyrocketed.

Mr. Chairman, what does this mean for the taxpayers? Well, it means they will be sinking billions and billions more of their hard earned money into this space station rat hole. We have all heard many times that space is the final frontier. I believe the space station is a frivolous frontier. It is yet another example of how the federal government cannot do anything in an economical or efficient manner. Instead, many fat-cat government contractorsare getting rich at the expense of the taxpayers.

I recently spoke on this floor about another failed space venture, the Air Force's Titan IV program. There have been three failures in a row for this program at a cost of over $3 billion. If we took all of this wasted money and put it towards some of our ailing programs such as Social Security, I believe our Country would be much better off.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, this Country has paid Russia, our partner, hundreds of millions of dollars to participate. What have we gotten from Russia in return? Well, we've got increased costs because of Russian schedule delays. Mr. Chairman, the United States has enough of its own delays. We don't need Russia's help with that.

When this project was being debated in the early 1990's, a coalition of 14 leading scientific groups came out against the space station saying that they were especially disturbed that the escalating costs in subsequent years would drain money from other important scientific projects.

According to the Congressional Research Service, in 1993, NASA said the International Space Station would cost $17.4 billion in research and development through the end of construction and it would spend no more than $2.1 billion a year on the program. Today, NASA's estimate for research and development is between $23 and $26 billion, depending on whether construction is completed in 2004 or October 2005.

Mr. Chairman, this is pitiful. I know of no business that could stay in operation with these types of overruns.

We have far too many more important programs here on Earth to justify sending all of these billions into space. I would urge a yes vote on the Roemer/Sanford amendment.

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.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 5 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 No. 5 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 221. CANCELLATION OF RUSSIAN PARTNERSHIP.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall terminate all contracts and other agreements with the Russian Government necessary to remove the Russian Government as a partner in the International Space Station program. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall not enter into a new partnership with the Russian Government relating to the International Space Station. Nothing in this section shall prevent the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from accepting participation by the Russian Government or Russian entities on a commercial basis. Nothing in this section shall prevent the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from purchasing elements of the International Space Station directly from Russian contractors.

In the table of contents, after the item relating to section 220, insert the following:

Sec. 221. Cancellation of Russian partnership.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to start with a quote from Winston Churchill. He said, and I quote, ''I cannot forecast to you the action of Russia. It is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma, but perhaps there is a key.''

The key, Mr. Chairman, is to engage the Russians, to exchange with the Russians, to treat the Russians as an equal partner and a friend, but not to relegate our science programs to foreign policy welfare.

What we need to make sure we do, Mr. Chairman, is work carefully with the Russians, make sure we do educational exchanges and scientific exchanges, and make sure we continue to work carefully and diplomatically with the Russians on trying to craft the right kind of peace agreement in Kosovo for our troops, for NATO, for the world, for the refugees. However, we should not devise international science programs that continually, year after year, program after program, fail, and result in increased costs, increased burdens, increased problems for NASA in trying to build this International Space Station; increased problems for the American taxpayer when they have to foot the bill of the cost overruns and the delays coming from Russia.

□ 1400

This is not a partnership. It is a foreign policy pork barrel project.

One of my colleagues said, the partnership between the United States and the Russians deserves every chance to succeed. But after 6 years, after we were told by the administrator at NASA that their partnership would save the taxpayer $2 billion, we now find ourselves 6 years later with a $4 billion price tag that the American taxpayer has to foot.

It did not save us money, it is costing us money, and it is delaying when we wanted to launch the International Space Station. Instead of launching it in 2002 or 2003, it is now looking at 2004, 2005, 2006.

Each time we see a delay from one of our partners, in this case, the Russians, that adds to the costs for the United States. That adds to the burden of the NASA engineers, the NASA personnel, trying to do their job on the Space Station which they were contracted to do, and now they are doing the Russian jobs. It is not fair. It is not right.

Now, this amendment is not an anti-Russian amendment, it is not a severing of ties with Russia amendment. We have given this partnership in science 6 years and several billions of dollars to succeed.

I strongly advocate continued partnership with Russia in a host of areas. Russia and China continue to be the United States' two key bilateral relationships in foreign policy.

This is not an amendment to bash the Russians. This is an amendment on an international science program to make sure that when we do a memorandum of understanding with another country, that they can continue to contribute science, they continue to contribute their expertise, they continue to contribute money and pay for their fair share, and not allow the United States to take up the full burden.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also is reasonable. It reads, and I encourage

my colleagues to read the amendment, it does terminate all contracts and other agreements with the Russian government necessary to remove the Russian government as a partner in the International Space Station, but it goes on to say, ''Nothing in this section shall prevent NASA from accepting participation by the Russian government or Russian entities on a commercial basis. Nothing in this section shall prevent NASA from purchasing elements of the International Space Station directly from Russian contractors.''

So my reading of that would be that if the service module is ready to go, that the United States could directly purchase that from contractors, but the relationship needs to be redefined. I would hope that my distinguished chairman in the majority would agree with this amendment and we could move on to the next amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, for once, to support, in the spirit of bipartisanship, a Roemer amendment on the Space Station. What this amendment does is that it kicks the Russian government out of the partnership, but it allows NASA to make contracts with Russian aerospace contractors or the Russian space agency, which is a government entity, and thus makes Russia and its aerospace firms a subcontractor rather than a partner.

Mr. Chairman, I supported bringing Russia into the partnership when it occurred 6 years ago because I thought it would save money, it would bring the Space Station on line earlier, and allow the United States and the other partners to take advantage of Russia's tremendous expertise in constructing spacecraft as well as in long-term human space flight.

Unfortunately, this arrangement has not worked out as everyone had hoped. The time has come for a redefinition of the arrangement. Six years ago the administration promised that Russia would not be in the critical path. It said that Russia would be in an enhancing and not an enabling role.

Unfortunately, Russia is in the critical path. Whose fault it is, I do not know, and it is not relevant at this time. But every funding and every construction deadline that Russia has set for itself and agreed to its other partners with since 1996 has been missed by the Russians. They are 100 percent in not living up to their agreements, and that has cost the American taxpayers a lot of money.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has said it costs the American taxpayers $4 billion. I would say it cost $5 billion. The time to prevent further hemorrhaging because of Russia's repeated defaults is at hand, and the Roemer amendment proposes to do so.

The last promise that Russia broke was at the end of last month. It broke its promise to decide by April to deorbit the Mir Space Station if it did not come up with outside funding to support Mir by April 30. Russia did not come up with the funding, and it has not decided to deorbit Mir.

It is obvious that Russia cannot afford two space stations. If Mir stays up, it will not have the money to fulfill its further agreements for the International Space Station. The Russians made that decision, and it is time for the American Congress to respond in kind. By removing Russia as a partner but not as a contractor, we can still get the benefits of the international cooperation that the administration seeks.

Russia has played the role of contractor successfully. It has been a miserable failure in being a partner with the United States, Canada, Japan, and the European space agency.

Two years ago when the NASA authorization bill was on the floor of the House, the House approved a bill that contained the Sensenbrenner-Brown amendment, which required NASA to develop a plan to remove Russia from the critical path. The CAV task force appointed by the NASA administrator recommended eliminating long-term dependence on Russia in its April, 1998, report by developing an independent U.S. propulsion capability. NASA echoed those recommendations in a July, 1998, briefing to the White House.

At that time, the White House rejected the task force and NASA recommendations, but later reversed itself. NASA has initiated long-lead procurements for an independent propulsion capability in fiscal 1999. Their fiscal 2000 request does include funding for an independent U.S. propulsion capability, but NASA has not signed a contract to develop this capability, which is still in its study phase.

I would just like to point out that the American people are also fed up with Russia's defaults. Florida Today took an online poll. Only 22 percent of those surveyed wanted to keep Russia as a partner. Thirty-two percent wanted to end Russia's partnership, and 46 percent wanted to reduce Russia's role but not kick it out of the program completely.

The Roemer amendment does what the 32 percent and the 46 percent of the people in the Space Coast and Florida want to see done, and I would urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment, this amendment that has had no hearings within our committee. This amendment would force NASA to kick the Russians out of the Space Station program with no consideration of the potential cost or schedule consequences for the United States that will result from such action, and with no consultation or negotiation with our 16 international partners in this multilateral cooperative program, each of whom have their own financial stake in the Space Station program.

Instead, this amendment would have the United States take unilateral action that could damage our relations with our existing international partners and do real damage to the Space Station program itself.

Once again, let me remind this body that two segments, the first two segments of the Space Station have been launched and are now in orbit. I think this amendment has a real risk of both wasting that particular investment and doing away with the potential benefits in the future. So for those reasons, I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I suspect that alarms are going off all over down at Foggy Bottom right now, but I rise in support of this amendment. My colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) who just spoke said that this amendment has had no hearings in the Committee on Science. That is technically correct, but the whole issue of the number of times that the Russians have let us down has been debated, discussed, and talked about in the Committee on Science again and again and again.

There is an old German expression that says, fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. The expression does not even go on beyond that, but the truth of the matter is we have been fooled again and again and again by the Russians. It is time for this Congress to send a clear statement that we are tired of this gamesmanship that is being played by the Russians and by NASA.

I think this is a good amendment. I hope that colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in support of this, because this is the only way we are once and for all going to say to our Russian partners that either they play by the agreement that they made, or they do not play at all. And the Roemer amendment is even better than that because it allows us to continue to contract with those contractors who are willing to live up to their end of the bargain.

This is a good amendment, it is a timely amendment. It may not have been formally discussed in our committee, but the whole issue of Russian participation has been debated, discussed, ad nauseum in the Committee on Science. It is a good amendment. I am happy to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) as well, when I was on the Committee on Science for almost 8 years we struggled through NASA's issues and other Committee on Science issues together. I have enjoyed the give and take and opportunities to work with the Members, but I have to say with this Roemer

amendment, I have to oppose the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) as well.

The spring is here. The Space Station issue is here. We have the Roemer amendments. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) wants to kill the Space Station program. He wants to cap it, he wants to wound it, he wants to damage it any way he can.

We have been through this process year after year after year in the committee, on the floor of the House. We have had a fair fight. The issues have been presented. Why do we not say, enough is enough? Why do we not get off the NASA employees' backs?

Mr. Chairman, I urge especially the freshmen who have not been through this process before to listen to the debate today and look at the history of this House's involvement in this debate, and to recognize that the responsible thing to do is to get on with the enormous investment that we have made.

Speaking to the Russian issue, and that issue is a troublesome issue, and I know many Members here have struggled with that issue, but the International Space Station is a multinational project. It was intended when it was first proposed in 1984 by President Reagan to involve the International community.

We have legal agreements that we have to be concerned about that the Russians were involved in. If we today say that the House is going to decide that we do not want the Russians involved, then we are interfering with those legal agreements, as well.

Again, make no mistake about it, if this amendment passes or is accepted this will damage or kill the Space Station program. So I feel like I have to rise today in strong opposition to this, one of three Roemer amendments, and especially to remind my colleagues that what we are talking about today is a responsible investment in NASA, a responsible investment in the International Space Station program. There is a way to end the Russian involvement and end it responsibly, but this is not the way to do it today. Do not fall for this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). I just would advise those people reading the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this procedure to note that I have used the words, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), which is just another miracle, as has happened here today.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has been very persistent over the years, but on this particular amendment we should not ignore the fact that we may disagree with him on some things, but that he in this amendment is offering us a position that the Committee on Science and certainly the Subcommittee on Space has approved of for a long time.

This message by the Roemer amendment is not aimed at the Russians. We are not sending the Russians a message here. The Russians were sent that message by us a long time ago. This is a message to our own State Department and this administration to start paying attention to what this Congress is doing and what we are saying about how this project and other projects should be approached.

□ 1415

This administration has ignored us time and time again on the issue of how to deal with the Russians in connection with the Space Station program. The Committee on Science, although not having specific hearings on this issue, has addressed this issue on numerous occasions, and we have expressed our strong desire that the Russians, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) stated, be treated, not as partners, but instead as subcontractors.

The concept of the Russians as partners in Space Station, which made sense in the beginning, before we knew what chaos that the Russians were going to have to go through in the aftermath of the Cold War, makes no sense now that we know the limitations, the severe economic limitations of the current Russian government.

The Russians cannot afford to be partners in the Space Station program. I remember saying that probably 3 or 4 years ago. Yet, the administration proceeded without any regard to what Congress was saying and what we were trying to insist upon and continued with this idea with the Russians as partners. If we would have proceeded instead with Russians as subcontractors, we could, as the Roemer amendment is suggesting now, simply pay those subcontractors for what they have produced and get on with the program.

So, that is number one. This mistake was made, and it has turned out to be a costly mistake by the administration but it is based on the idea, on foreign policy considerations, not on NASA and Space Station considerations.

Secondly, let me suggest this. We have said over and over again that the Russians should not be in the critical path. I can remember many statements by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) admonishing the administration, whatever you do, do not put us in the path where the Russians can prevent the success of the Space Station.

It is time we get them out of the critical path. It is time we make sure that we are defining this in a very responsible way. But NASA has ignored this committee. Again, it is not NASA that is ignoring the committee, it goes straight up to the very top of the administration, which has been making irresponsible decisions in terms of our relationship with Russia. This is probably paramount in that decision-making process, which is a flawed decision-making process.

With that said, let me admit that this Congressman in the very beginning supported the idea of having a cooperative relationship with Russia. I certainly do not fault the administration with, number one, good intentions and a defensible strategy in the beginning. But in order to protect the taxpayers when a strategy has gone wrong and when it seems that there are intervening circumstances that prevent that strategy from being successful, the administration, like everybody else, especially in the private sector but also people in government, have to admit the strategy can no longer succeed, and change the strategy.

Unfortunately, those of us again who supported the idea of cooperation in the beginning have found that, while we recognize the strategy had to change or it was going to cost the taxpayer tens of billions of dollars, the administration refused to change. We refused to change because of perhaps some face-saving concept, if we are going to save face for our Russian friends, and certainly the Russian government needs that type of moral support, but we should not be trying to give the Russian government moral support at the cost of tens of billions of dollars. That is what has happened here.

So while I believe the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) probably is motivated on his other two amendments to just try to kill the Space Station, I think that his amendment at this point is justified. I support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, Deputy Secretary of State Talbott, not the NASA administrator, signed a multinational agreement for the United States, establishing a framework, the legal framework for the national Space Station in 1998. This multilateral agreement involves major commitments by 15 countries and represents more than a space facility, but a political commitment by these countries to work together on a major civilian project.

To terminate Russia's participation in the International Space Station would jeopardize the United States' ability in the future to work toward a common end with the same set of countries, friends and allies on large scale projects.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Texas, what is the penalty of that multilateral agreement if any of the partners does not fulfill its agreed-upon obligations?

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would assume that we would be out of the Space Station. I think that we would probably be made to take our tools and go home, and we would lose the billions of dollars that we have spent.

This does not make sense to me as an amendment for what we are trying to do in building a relationship with other nations and at the same time accomplish science that we believe in.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, how many defaults of the Russians is the gentleman from Texas willing to accept? They have already cost us $5 billion. How many more and how much money is the gentleman willing to agree for cost overruns caused by the Russians not fulfilling their obligations?

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I fully understand that we have difficulties. We expected to have a challenge when we started building this Space Station. It is unfortunate that we have problems with the Russian government. But if we take action that jeopardizes our own ability to participate in this project, not only do we do harm to our other friends while we are trying to do harm to the Russians, we take ourselves out of it and we lose a significant commitment, a significant investment that we have made.

I want to point out another thing in the bill. In the very first few sentences of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), it says that the administrator shall terminate all contracts. Then a little bit further down the page, it says ''Nothing in this section shall prevent the National Aeronautics and Space Administration accepting participation by the Russian government or Russian entities on a commercial basis.'' That conflicts within itself.

This is not a good amendment. It is not one we should be considering here today because it has the potential of defeating the International Space Station, dissolving our partnership, costing us the billions of dollars that we have invested and that we have a hope that will give us something in our future.

Termination of the International Space Station multinational agreement will impose termination costs on all our partners. Termination would be programmatically expensive to the United States. It would result in major objections from our international partners, given their independent agreements with the government of Russia.

The Russian Space Station has an inextricable involvement in the Space Station program as a representative of the Russian government. It would be difficult to exclude their space agency from negotiations, should NASA be required to contract with Russian industry. I do not know how the commercial wording within the language of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) would work.

The participation of the Russian government in the Space Station has never been more important, not only to contribute money to the project, but also to ensure the political stability in a troubled country. As long as the United States can keep some kind of good working relationship with the Russian government, we can rest a little easier during this political turmoil that is going on there.

Our Russian partners have difficulty feeding its people. I admire their commitment to try to complete this long-term space project. From what my Russian friends and colleagues tell me, contributing capital and human resources to the Space Station is a tremendous source of pride among the Russian people. It is one reason why the government continues its commitment.

So as a representative of the United States Government and industry, I believe we have to do all that we can to encourage the Russians to maintain their involvement with the Space Station, and I would ask that my colleagues not support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I, too, like the chairmen of the full committee and the subcommittee, have expressed some very, very serious concerns regarding the management on the part of the Clinton administration and the NASA administrator regarding these continuing ongoing delays with the Russians. Nonetheless, I do not feel that this amendment, as it is currently crafted, is the proper way for us to address this problem.

I have several concerns. As I understand my reading of this amendment, should this be enacted into law, there would be nothing that would prevent the Russians from essentially charging us $200 million, for example, to deliver the service module on orbit, or substantially more sums of money. As I understand it, that is the cost of the service module. If we add on the cost of launching it, I think the way this thing is crafted, it could not only put the Space Station program but, as well, the American taxpayers in a very, very precarious position.

Additionally, I would like to also comment on the fact that as I understand the legal language of the international agreement, that we as the United States do not have the authority to discharge one particular partner from the international agreement. Essentially the only options that are available to us under the existing law would be for us to remove ourselves from the International Space Station, and therefore we would thus no longer be in partnership with some of our more reliable partners, such as the Japanese, the Canadians, and the Europeans.

So in summary, though I think the intent of this amendment is a good one and that I share the concerns of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and as well I share the concerns of my very esteemed colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the committee chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the subcommittee chairman, I feel that this amendment, the way that it is crafted, it is a bad amendment. It is impossible to implement and as well could ultimately, the end result, lead to significantly increased costs to the American taxpayers.

Then for that reason I would highly encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, not only those who support our manned space flight program and the Space Station program but as well those who support fiscal responsibility, to reject this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise against this amendment. For many years we have been cooperating with Russia. There is perhaps nothing more important in our space program than the symbol that it has for all of man and womankind, the chance to show two former adversaries working together.

Now, as we have a conflict in the Balkans, would be the worst possible time to slap the Russians. More importantly, this would be the worst possible time to have thousands of Russian scientists capable of building ballistic missiles suddenly unemployed as a result of a deliberately political and deliberately hostile action of this House against Russia, motivated, some would say, by a hostility toward the Vice President who played such a creative and important role in negotiating with Russia.

Clearly, the most cost effective way for us to explore space is to do it together, not in a race against Russia but in a race against the hostilities that can build up between countries, in a race to achieve peace and a race to achieve a working together with the only other nation to send men and women into space.

So I speak not only for an efficient space program but also for a lessening of international tensions when I rise against this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to rise to suggest that the level of debate was just brought down, and I resent it. I just want to put

this on the record. We need not to discuss these issues and every time we have a disagreement, relate political motives to each other. I for one am a little bit disgusted that every time I have a disagreement, not every time but often enough on this floor, that we end up saying, if we disagree with somebody over there, all of a sudden we are being political because we are opposing something the administration wants to do.

I would inform my colleague that this amendment was presented by a Democrat. This is a Democrat amendment. This is by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), who has strong support, I imagine strong close ties to the Vice President. In fact, before the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) brought up the issue, I do not recall the Vice President's name being brought into this debate. In fact, I remember specifically stating that I personally supported this tactic and this strategy of working with the Russians in the beginning, but that the administration had not then shifted with the times and adjusted its strategy according to the current situation in Russia.

□ 1430

So I would suggest to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), that instead of trying to belittle other people or call into question our motives that he quit saying that we are being political and stick to the issues. And I just personally resent the fact there were implications in his words that we were over here trying to make political hay out of this.

I was interested in this Russian issue long before this administration became this administration.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in my remarks I simply stated that it would be unfortunate if that were to be the motivation of anyone in this House. I believe that my colleague is referring to only a single phrase in a speech that was not as brief as I wish it was. And I think that my colleague can join with me in believing that all of us should cast a vote for what is in the best interests of the space program and what is in the best interests of our relations with Moscow without being colored by any concerns about any political matter.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

Amend section 101 to read as follows:

SEC. 101. INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the International Space Station, for expenses necessary to terminate the program, for fiscal year 2000, $500,000,000.

In section 106(1), strike ''$13,625,600,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$11,642,900,000''.

In section 106(2), strike ''$13,747,100,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$11,919,100,000''.

In section 106(3), strike ''$13,839,400,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$12,248,490,100''.

In section 121(a), strike ''sections 101,'' and insert in lieu thereof ''sections''.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief since we have been talking about the Space Station now for several hours.

This amendment is cosponsored by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY). It is a bipartisan amendment.

It is also supported by the National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens Against Waste, the Taxpayers for Common Sense, the Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the Concord Coalition.

Mr. Chairman, there have been times when I brought this amendment to the floor in the past couple of years when we have had four or five cosponsors on the bill and, quite frankly, I was not sure we would get more votes than those four or five cosponsors, having come within one vote of defeating the Space Station back in 1993 on a 215–214 vote.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the facts and the overruns and the inefficiencies continue to build up in our favor, yet the votes continue to go in the other direction for canceling the Space Station.

I want to remind my colleagues that this Space Station was first designed back in 1984 and the projected cost, Mr. Chairman, was $8 billion. And my colleagues might say, for $8 billion and eight scientific missions, including platforms to help us understand the environment of the Earth that would be put on the Space Station, a repair weigh station on the Space Station to help us with satellites, the Space Station would be used as a stepping stone to help us go and explore other planets.

We had eight scientific missions for this grandiose Space Station. That was 1984. Today is 1999. We are down to one mission. We do not have any of those platforms left. We do not have any of those scientific missions left except, basically, studying the effects of gravitation on men and women in space.

Now, maybe the symbol of some international cooperation and science, maybe the symbol of a Space Station up in orbit above the Earth is something important for $8 billion. But that cost, Mr. Chairman, has gone from $8 billion to now the General Accounting Office estimates in their reports $98 billion to launch it, to assemble it, to control it once it is up in space. $98 billion.

Now, I guess, Mr. Chairman, that if this were a welfare program, this would have been canceled a long time ago, or if this was a food stamp program that had gone up $90 billion over what it cost, it would have been canceled. But it is a jobs program and it has been put together with Machiavellian type political science in a lot of districts, although three States get about 80 percent of the contracts.

So I do not think, Mr. Chairman, this is a good deal for science. This is not fair to the rest of the great things that NASA does in its budget. This does not live up to the hopes and the dreams and the glory of the wonderful things that NASA has accomplished in the past, whether it was putting a man on the Moon, whether it was putting together the Hubble telescope, whether it was designing Pathfinder and putting it on Mars for $263 million on budget, on time, on schedule. And the American people got excited about it. They could not wait to ask, ''What did we find today on Mars?'' Budget efficient, fair to the rest of the budget. And NASA still allowed us to invest in aeronautics.

So I think, hopefully, we will vote for the Roemer amendment to fence the money, to be accountable for $38 billion of Space Station. If my colleagues cannot vote for that, the second amendment is to remove the Russians from the critical path and still allow commercial enterprise and exchange between the two countries.

And thirdly, my preference would be to cancel the Space Station, to move on, to not let our dreams be suspended 100 miles above Earth in technology that was designed 15 years ago. Let us dream about Mars. Let us dream about going back to the Moon. Let us dream big dreams like we are capable of, NASA.

I hope to get support on my amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to this bold attempt to ground the International Space Station. Now, this program, in my opinion, is vital to developing new technology and new medicines for the next century.

This great land was discovered because of the courage of explorers who refused to let obstacles get in the way of their vision. Today, 500 years later, we talk of cutting exploration to the last frontier at a critical time when our budgets and our vision are already shrinking. Such a miscalculation not only cuts away at the future, it is a direct attack on the American spirit.

At its very core, the American spirit is based on adventure and fighting adversity despite the odds. We should thank God that Christopher Columbus was not tied to the short-sighted constraints of a U.S. Congress afraid of risks and shy of discovery.

Discovery of new cures for disease is only one field of many fields where space exploration has paid off. Medical innovation and further experimentation in space cannot be allowed to wither away. Instead of allowing our imagination to fade, we should raise our sights to the expectation of new strides in science and new leaps in technology.

We have come so far, there is absolutely no excuse to turn around now. With over $20 billion already invested, there is simply no justification for wasting funds that have been spent developing this Space Station to this date.

Despite what the adversaries of this program contend, this Space Station is actually on schedule and within its budget.

Now, not so long ago, a president of the United States challenged Americans to test their dreams and wagered that America could reach the Moon by the end of the decade. Well, Mr. Chairman, almost 40 years later the same country is trying to cut its losses in space because it is afraid of failure. Well, we cannot be afraid to fail. We cannot be afraid to experiment, and we must be determined to stick with this program.

So I just urge my colleagues to continue to support the International Space Station and vote against cutting and killing the Space Station.

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

I also rise to shock the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) because I rise to echo the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TOM DELAY).

Mr. Chairman, when Columbus set sail, about two-thirds of the way into his journey a group of the sailors rose and urged that the project be defunded and that they return to Spain. We would not be standing here today if that amendment had not been defeated, just as we must defeat the amendment before us now.

The Space Station gives us a chance to build bridges to other countries, one in particular of which was our former adversary. It helps us build our own aerospace industry, which is the leading source of American exports.

In my own district, we are developing batteries for the Space Station in a way that may well lead to breakthroughs for an electric automobile so critical to the air quality of the most air-quality challenged city in America. Just as important is the research that can be done only in space on so many diseases, such as cancer, diabetes, AIDS, and influenza.

This Space Station, of course, is a cooperative project, including some 16 nations. Those other nations have contributed already $5 billion to this effort. Today, 250 miles above the Earth, already circle the first elements of the Space Station, *Zarya* and *Unity*, one from Russia, one from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, America belongs in space. Humankind belongs in space. And I can think of nothing worse that we can do at the beginning of a new millennium than defund the Space Station. That is why I urge all of our colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California, with one exception. I doubt that those sailors on Columbus' boats would have advocated defunding that mission because that meant they would not have been paid when they got back to Spain.

But other than that, I think the argument of the gentleman had a lot of merit, and I would hope that the committee and the House would not be fooled by the opponent's scare tactics.

The ground-based flight hardware is 82 percent complete. If we adopt this amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, that hardware will not go to orbit but will end up in museums around the country as an exhibit of Congress' foolishness in defunding the program when it was close to completion.

The flight hardware for the next six flights is already at the Kennedy Space Center being ready for launch. We American taxpayers have invested $20 billion so far in this project. If the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana were adopted, that money would go right down the drain. And that is a pretty tough sell to tell our taxpayers that we made a $20 billion mistake.

□ 1445

I would hope that this amendment would be rejected and rejected by the same overwhelming margins that have occurred in the last several votes on this topic.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). I believe the Space Station offers numerous benefits, spin-off technologies in medicine, in engineering, in transportation, in energy, in environment. Every year this Congress goes through this debate, it gives us an opportunity to affirm the benefits that station has.

The station also has another benefit. That is the intangible but real benefit of international cooperation. It has given us an opportunity to create a platform for participation and cooperation with the Russians. At this very moment, while the entire world teeters at the edge of a larger war in the Balkans, we are reaching out to the Russians to ask them for help. Let it not be forgotten that this very moment, when the Russian leadership has changed, at this very moment Russia is looking for the hand of cooperation to bring about peace.

This is not the time to kill this project which serves as a basis for cooperation with the Russians and other countries. This is a time to say that we need more projects which enable international cooperation and we need more projects that can put us in a peaceful, productive, cooperative relationship with Russia. We need Russia's help in building peace in this world. We do not need to slap Russia's hand on the Space Station. We need Russia to work with us in making this project work. We also need to work with them in making this project work and in building a framework for peace around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my strong support for the Space Station and my strong support for the benefits of the Space Station, and my strong support for continuing the relationship with Russia on this project and continuing this project as a basis for pursuing peace throughout the world.

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

Today I hope that as we are discussing the Space Station and we get into this last area of debate, that we take note that there is one person who is usually with us, who has been with us over the years and been an integral part of this debate, who is not with us today, whom we miss and we hope he is watching over C-SPAN. If he is not, we hope he is reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but we would all like to send our very best wishes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the former chairman.

The gentleman from California has been a great boon to all of us in the Committee on Science. He has provided us an institutional memory over his many long years of service. During those many years, the gentleman from California has been a strong supporter of the International Space Station. In debates like this, he quite often has gotten up and reminded us of the long-term perspective and where we have been and where we are going, and has certainly done a great service to his country in that he has provided us the type of wisdom that is necessary for us to not only start projects like this but to complete projects like this.

We hope that the gentleman from California is watching after he has gone through, I understand, a heart operation. All of us send our very, very warm regards to him. I think that as we vote now on the Space Station, on these amendments, and I hope the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will not take this badly, but I hope that we keep the gentleman from California in mind because he has been such a strong supporter.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. I appreciate my friend from California yielding. I just want to join him in his heartfelt remarks to my good friend and my colleague and my former chairman and my ranking member, the gentleman from California. I understand he is doing well. He had a new valve put in his heart. He is recovering quickly and fully, I understand.

We not only miss his great expertise in these areas, we miss his wonderful and glowing sense of humor. We wish him Godspeed to get back here quickly and help us through some of these difficult dilemmas, even though he and I disagree on this issue.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman from California was the head of the committee for many years as I was a member of the minority at that time. If there is anything that has inspired me to try my very best not to be partisan, but to try to reach out and find areas of compromise and try to be nice and kind and fair to Members who are now no longer in the majority, it is the way he treated us during that entire time.

There was no one who treated people more fairly and honestly in any committee than the gentleman from California did. We remember that now. It gives us a standard by which to judge our own behavior, a man who kept a very good spirit, even when there were spirited debates. We had honest disagreements under his leadership. Certainly we have a lot of honest disagreements because we come from minor political differences. By the way, our differences, even in the most adversarial parts of the discussion of any issue in this Congress, our differences are so minuscule compared to those things that separate other people in other countries who are killing themselves and such.

Here we have certain programs like the space program that binds us together as Democrats and Republicans and helps ensure that we all understand that there is a big picture, that this is not the administration's space program or a Republican or a Democrat space program, this is America's space program, and that we have honestly tried, and I know that there has been some friction here, to ensure that all sides feel that they are part of the decision-making process even when there is a disagreement. Let us keep that in mind, especially, and keep the gentleman from California in mind, because when he was chairman we certainly operated in that spirit.

As we go to this vote on the Space Station, I would hope that we do so, and there are some votes, I am siding with the gentleman from Indiana on one and opposing him on several, that we do so in this bipartisan spirit. I apologize if I got a little testy earlier when I thought the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) was suggesting that we had other motives.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to wholeheartedly concur with the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from California's kind remarks concerning the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN). He will always be known for his humor and his expertise and his fairness. But let me again point out, he is doing very well. He is up and about, active, and will be back here soon to bring all those same skills to us.

If I could shift gears just a moment and go back to the amendment at hand, which is to kill the Space Station, I think we are all aware of the expression, ''same song, second verse.'' This is the same second, 22nd verse, or more.

Let me just quickly again remind the Members that two sections of this Space Station have already been put in orbit. Most all the hardware is on the ground ready to go into orbit. If this amendment passes, those billions of dollars of investment will be wasted, as well as wasting the potential of the good work of the Space Station.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, because it seems to me that what this amendment is about is the very simple theme of putting good money after bad. The reason I say that is that if you were $2,000 into a hypothetical $10,000 investment and then all of a sudden that $10,000 investment began to look very iffy, would you invest the other $8,000 if it was your own money? I think most of us would not.

That is exactly where we are with this Space Station. We are $20 billion in, but we still have another $80 billion to go. Would you really go that distance if it begins to look iffy, which is what basically the scientific community has said? Put another way, if you were $200 toward fixing your car in a, quote, $1,000 repair job but then it turned out the $1,000 repair job would not get you there, would you put in the other $800? I do not think most of us would.

That fundamentally is what this amendment is all about. There is a big hole down in south Texas where there was going to be a supercolliding super conductor, yet in the end that project was found wanting and people said, ''Let's not continue to fund it.'' This is something that is done all day long in people's homes. It is something that is done all day long in businesses. Businesses have start-ups, they venture out, check it out, see if it is going to work and then if it does not look good, they retreat. We can do that in government, too. So, one, fundamentally, this is what that amendment is about.

Two, why is it putting good money after bad? It is putting good money after bad because first of all there is a tremendous amount of uncertainty in this project. As has already been mentioned, this is not the American Space Station, this is the International Space Station.

As we all know, there is a lot of uncertainty in Russia right now. Yeltsin seems to be running through prime ministers on a fairly regular basis. There are a whole host of other problems within this country. Is this the kind of subcontractor you want in a business deal? I know of no contractor, whether in Charleston, whether in Houston, whether in Los Angeles, who would go out and depend on a subcontractor that was iffy. That is exactly what we have in this project.

Therefore, would you risk $100 billion—or $100—of your own money if it was that kind of setup? In fact, it was the independent Chabrow report that last year said it is costing us between $100 and $250 million for each month that the assembly is delayed. That is what this subcontractor is costing us. I think it points to the uncertainty of this overall project.

Two, the reason I think it is putting good money after bad is that the scientific value so far has proved to be very, very limited. Because it is limited, we have to set priorities. Nobody wants to set priorities, but that is fundamentally what our role is about here in government. Indeed, we have got a lot of priorities in government. You could buy 40 B–2s, you could buy a bay full of aircraft carriers, you could buy a whole lot of books or computers for education. You could do a lot of other things with this money.

That is why the National Taxpayers Union supports this amendment. That is why Citizens Against Government Waste supports this amendment. In fact, I have here a stack of different articles that point to again the questionable nature of, quote, the scientific value of what is being talked about with Space Station, which is the reason it would be up there in the first place.

Indeed, the American Society for Cell Biology declared that crystallography experiments in microgravity have made no serious contribution to analysis of protein structures or the development of new pharmaceuticals.

I have here another article that points to scientific publication is the hallmark of a good laboratory, and yet there is not scientific finding or publication out of Space Station. In fact, it points to the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, which is by all models a model for scientific organizations. It has a budget of about $500 million and has numerous findings in all sorts of different scientific journals. Therefore, we could fund several fold, in other words, a multiple of Howard Hughes type organizations with this money as opposed to sending it off into space.

I have another article here that talks about how the Space Station is vulnerable to debris and how NASA is leaving off shields to fast track the project. In fact, according to the ISS partners, there is a 24 percent chance, a 1 in 4

chance that it could be hit by debris. Is that the kind of project you want to put $100 billion into?

I have another article here from the Sunday Times of London talking about how NASA jeopardizes Space Station research to help the Russians.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise again in strong opposition to this amendment by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). This is the third Space Station either wounding or killing amendment that the gentleman from Indiana will offer. My colleagues should oppose every one of those.

This is the annual cancellation amendment that the gentleman from Indiana has offered. We came into Congress together, so he has offered it, I know, since 1991, both in the committee and on the floor at least once a year and sometimes twice a year as well. So to say the least, we have had a fair fight over this issue.

But let us talk about how far we have come. My colleagues have said we are throwing good money after bad. Not so. We have invested $20 billion in this program. We have evaluated this program, we have redesigned this program, we have micromanaged the program almost to death, but we have come too far to turn our back on this very important program.

Let us talk about the science that it will produce, the microgravity, scientific opportunities that are available there. There has been hearing after hearing in the Committee on Science over the opportunities that our scientists have for breakthroughs with diet research, with cancer research as well. So to say that the science is strictly testing the effects of gravity on human beings is to certainly oversimplify what we know many of those scientists and medical practitioners around the world are looking forward to pulling off on this experiment called Space Station.

□ 1500

If we do not fund the space station, we might as well disassemble NASA, because the space station program is the heart of NASA's research and development program and the heart of NASA's science program. This is not a project that is supposed to be flown in space for a few weeks. Space station will reside continuously in space for more than a decade. So for years our scientists will have opportunities to carry out these important scientific experiments there in microgravity under circumstances that we do not have here on Earth.

Five hundred thousand pounds of station components, half a million pounds of station components will have been built at factories around the world by the end of this year. Over 82 percent of the prime contractor's development work has been completed. And U.S. flight hardware sits at the launch site for the next six flights.

So this amendment would waste all the hard work that the NASA employees have put in, this amendment would waste the billion dollars of investment that we have made, and also this amendment and other amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) would cause us to turn our back on the resources and commitment of the 16 nations that are participating in this International Space Station, 11 of those nations and the European Space Agency community as well. So we have got international legal agreements that depend on the continuation of this funding, and I say let us do it, let us do it decisively, let us oppose this amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and all other Roemer amendments that attempt to mortally wound or kill this important space station program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in strong opposition to the amendment by Mr. ROEMER and Mr. SANFORD to cancel the International Space Station.

This is a debate that we have had every year, and every year the House has reaffirmed its support for the Space Station program. While much has already been said in our previous annual debates, let me touch on a few brief points for our Freshman Members who may be hearing this debate for the first time.

First, let's look at where we've been. Services and products ranging from satellite communications to internal pacemakers and cardiac defibrillators were either developed or significantly improved because of our past investments in space.

Even until today, Microgravity research has been limited by scarce flight opportunities and sporadic access to space. Unlike the Shuttle experiments which are limited to about 2 weeks in space, the Space Station will reside continuously in space for more than a decade. The Space Station will give scientists, engineers, and businessmen an unprecedented opportunity to perform complex, long-duration experiments that will benefit the world for years to come.

Next, let's look at how far we've come. At the end of last year, we took a significant step towards our ultimate destiny of establishing a permanent presence in space with the launch of the first International Space Station elements Zarya and Unity, which are now operating 250 miles above the Earth.

Led by the United States, the Space Station draws upon the expertise and resources of 16 nations, including Canada, Japan, Russia, Brazil, and 11 nations of the European Space Agency. In addition to the $20 billion that we have invested in the Space Station, our international partners have contributed $5 billion to date. By the end of this year, 500,000 pounds of station components will have been built at factories around the world. Over 82 percent of the Prime Contractor's development work has been completed, with U.S. flight hardware for the next six flights at the launch site.

This amendment would waste all the hard work and all the taxpayer dollars that have been spent to date on the program. We've come too far for Congress to turn its back on the American people now.

Now, let's look at where we're going. Microgravity capabilities will be available in the spring of 2000, with the outfitting of the U.S. laboratory, Destiny.

The Space Station will be good for science and good for America. Space Station research will complement ground-based research to generate tangible returns, improving the quality of life here on Earth as well as in space.

Space is the ideal environment in which to study processes in fields such as combustion science, fluid physics, and materials science, which are normally masked by gravity-driven forces here on Earth. This research could help us decrease pollution, save billions of dollars in energy costs, construct buildings that are better prepared for earthquakes, and improve the structure and performance of materials used in everything from contact lenses to car engines.

Space Station will enable the medical community to understand bone and muscle loss, and possibly lead to the design of countermeasures. NASA-developed telemedicine systems will be used to provide high-quality medical advice, instruction, and education to underserved parts of our Nation and our World. Growing and analyzing protein crystals in space will play a pivotal role in structure-based drug design.

Mr. Chairman, we are discussing this bad amendment at a time when we should be thinking about the best ways to utilize this opportunity to enter into a new era in life and microgravity sciences research which will revolutionize the quality of life on Earth. R&D onboard Space Station will improve our knowledge of industrial processes, help us take substantial strides towards remarkable medical advances, and enable that pioneering spirit in all of us to take the next steps in the human exploration of the solar system.

Our continued funding should be looked at as an investment in America's future, bringing us new and exciting discoveries that we haven't even yet imagined. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment, and I urge the Members to defeat it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will be postponed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of discussion here today about international cooperation, and I would just ask my colleagues to consider that we make as much effort to have some across the aisle bipartisan cooperation here in the House and in the Senate as we talk about between countries.

One issue that I would ask my colleague to consider as this bill goes into conference with the Senate is the issue of the Triana project. Now I know that there are those that want to push the Triana project because they perceive it as a Democrat issue, and there are those that want to oppose it because they perceive it as a Democrat issue. But I think that there is some issues

here that need to be discussed, and I would just ask the conferees as this bill moves forward to give at least the strong science part of Triana a benefit of the doubt. We have the capability with this project, if it is executed appropriately and the partisan politics is kept out of it as much as possible, to finally settle the issue of global warming and finally be able to say is the billions of dollars that we are considering spending on global warming, is it appropriate and is it needed?

So I would stand here today and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let us not use Triana for political advantage, let us not try to formulate a presidential campaign around a scientific research study, and I say sincerely I think both sides bear a degree of responsibility here. There are parts of Triana that I would ask the chairman and the conference committee to take a look at that is based on strong science coming from Scripps Institution of Oceanography and see if that portion of Triana can be preserved and enhanced so that those of us in the policymaking decision can get good, unfiltered information that is not tainted by political agendas to be able to make an informed decision about global warming.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SWEENEY:

In section 127(a)—

(1) insert ''(1)'' after ''LIMITATION.—''; and

(2) add at the end the following new paragraphs:

(2) The Administrator shall certify to the Congress at least 15 days in advance of any cooperative agreement with the People's Republic of China, or any company incorporated under the laws of the People's Republic of China, involving spacecraft, spacecraft systems, launch systems, or scientific or technical information that—

(A) the agreement is not detrimental to the United States space launch industry; and

(B) the agreement, including any indirect technical benefit that could be derived from the agreement, will not measurably improve the missile or space launch capabilities of the People's Republic of China.

(3) The Inspector General of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall conduct an annual audit of the policies and procedures of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with respect to the export of technologies and the transfer of scientific and technical information, to assess the extent to which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is carrying out its activities in compliance with Federal export control laws and with paragraph (2).

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, let me first congratulate my colleagues, specifically the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) from the subcommittee and the ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) for their fine work on the NASA reauthorization bill.

There have been two major occurrences within the past 10 years that have proven to be a striking blow to the national security interests of our great Nation.

First, China used information it obtained as a result of our cooperation on satellite technology to upgrade its ballistic missile force, improving range and accuracy of its booster systems.

Secondly, the Chinese are also using information they obtained as a result of deliberate and, mind you, successful espionage efforts at our nuclear laboratories at the Department of Energy in order to improve their nuclear warhead arsenal. Mr. Chairman, the combination of these two events means that the Communist Chinese government, which currently has at least 40 ICBMs, will soon have the capability to launch multiple warheads, MIRV missiles, in just 3 to 5 years instead of the 20 years it would have taken without these two pieces of American technology.

Mr. Chairman, we should be outraged as Americans that these two events were allowed to occur, seemingly without a hint that the national security breaches were occurring at all. With these grave events as a backdrop, I offer my amendment today as an attempt to reestablish that it is the policy of the United States to ensure that our good faith efforts to share our technological advances with world partners are not turned against us in the form of military threat.

The amendment addresses two areas of concern to NASA. First, the Chinese espionage experience at the Department of Energy labs is not repeated within our space program. The amendment requires the Inspector General of NASA to assess on an annual basis in consultation with our intelligence community NASA's compliance with export control laws and the exchange of technology and information that can be used to enhance the military capabilities of foreign entities.

Secondly, my amendment requires that NASA, before it enters into an agreement to exchange technology and information with the People's Republic of China to certify with Congress that the exchange of technology and information cannot be used to enhance China's ballistic missile capacities. This policy is consistent with our export controls regarding trade and satellite technology and actually mirrors language in the 1999 defense authorization which requires the President to certify approved satellite technology exports to China. It is entirely appropriate that we hold that same standard to the potential technological exchanges between our space program and the PRC.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the serious transfers of military technology have occurred at NASA, and I stress this, that has not happened at NASA yet, yet we need to recognize that there is a potential danger that must be addressed. A few years ago we were pretty certain that top secret scientific information at our nuclear labs was secure. We now know that that was not the case. This amendment insures that the appropriate steps are taken to prevent the repeat of the breach of our Department of Energy labs and strengthens existing controls on the flow of military critical technology being diverted to China.

This amendment also responds to another provision in the 1999 defense authorization and approved by a vote of 417 to 4 by this House which states that the United States should not enter into agreements with China involving space. This amendment does not go as far as to prohibit space cooperation with China, but it does raise the bar with respect to the types of sensitive technological information that we can exchange through NASA.

Mr. Chairman, NASA is one of the most respected government institutions in the world, and its contributions to technology development in the United States are enormous. This amendment insures that that reputation so painstakingly earned is never tarnished.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the amendment of the gentleman from New York. It requires a certification in advance that the cooperative agreement with the People's Republic of China does not harm the U.S. space launch industry or improve the missile launch capabilities of China and also directs the NASA Inspector General to conduct an annual audit to make sure that these certifications are being complied with.

It is a constructive amendment, and I hope it is adopted.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 203, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

AYES—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Shays
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—203

Aderholt
Archer
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Wicker
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Brown (CA)
Cox
McDermott
Napolitano
Serrano

□ 1534

Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. WATKINS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. CARSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 134, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to House Resolution 174, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) 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 pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 315, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

AYES—114

Abercrombie
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bereuter
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cubin
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeMint
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan
Evans
Fattah
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Ganske
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gutierrez
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
LaFalce
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McHugh
McInnis
Meehan
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Myrick
Nadler
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Pallone
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Portman
Ramstad
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Sanders
Sanford
Schaffer
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tancredo
Tierney
Toomey
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey

NOES—315

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner

Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stump
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (CA)
McDermott
Napolitano
Serrano

□ 1544

Ms. SLAUGHTER changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. TOOMEY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 135, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 117, noes 313, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

AYES—117

Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Blagojevich
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonilla
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Costello
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
Delahunt
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Fattah
Fossella
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kind (WI)
Kingston
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
McInnis
McIntosh
Meehan
Mica
Mink
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Paul
Petri
Pickering
Pombo
Portman
Ramstad
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tierney
Upton
Visclosky
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Whitfield

NOES—313

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sessions
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Brown (CA) Napolitano Serrano

□ 1554

Mr. ROYCE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) 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 pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 92, noes 337, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

AYES—92

Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bereuter
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cubin
Danner
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeMint
Dingell
Duncan
Evans
Fattah
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Goode
Goodlatte
Gutierrez
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Manzullo
McHugh
McInnis
Meehan
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Myrick
Nadler
Nussle
Oberstar
Pallone
Paul
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Ramstad
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Sanders
Sanford
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Stark
Strickland
Tancredo
Tierney
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Woolsey

NOES—337

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (CA) Napolitano
Cox Serrano

□ 1602

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. MINGE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BATEMAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATEMAN:

In section 101(1), strike ''$2,482,700,000'' and insert ''$2,382,700,000''.

In section 101(2), strike ''$2,328,000,000'' and insert ''$2,228,000,000''.

In section 101(3), strike ''$2,091,000,000'' and insert ''$1,991,000,000''.

In section 103(4)—

(1) in subparagraph (A), strike ''$999,300,000'' and insert ''$1,099,300,000'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)(i), strike ''$532,800,000'' and insert ''$632,800,000'';

(3) in subparagraph (A)(i), strike ''$412,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base'' and insert ''$512,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including—

''(I) $20,000,000 for the Innovative Aviation Technologies Research program;

''(II) $30,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Sustainment program;

''(III) $10,000,000 for the Aircraft Development Support program;

''(IV) $20,000,000 for the Unmanned Air Vehicles program; and

''(V) $20,000,000 for the Long-Range Hypersonic Research program'';

(4) in subparagraph (B), strike ''$908,400,000'' and insert ''$1,008,400,000'';

(5) in subparagraph (B)(i), strike ''$524,000,000'' and insert ''$624,000,000'';

(6) in subparagraph (B)(i), strike ''$399,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $54,200,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity'' and insert ''$54,200,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity, and with $499,800,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including—

''(I) $20,000,000 for the Innovative Aviation Technologies Research program;

''(II) $30,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Sustainment program;

''(III) $10,000,000 for the Aircraft Development Support program;

''(IV) $20,000,000 for the Unmanned Air Vehicles program; and

''(V) $20,000,000 for the Long-Range Hypersonic Research program'';

(7) in subparagraph (C), strike ''$994,800,000'' and insert ''$1,094,800,000'';

(8) in subparagraph (C)(i), strike ''$519,200,000'' and insert ''$619,200,000''; and

(9) in subparagraph (C)(i), strike ''$381,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, and with $67,600,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity'' and insert ''$67,600,000 to be for Aviation System Capacity, and with $481,600,000 to be for the Research and Technology Base, including—

''(I) $20,000,000 for the Innovative Aviation Technologies Research program;

''(II) $30,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Sustainment program;

''(III) $10,000,000 for the Aircraft Development Support program;

''(IV) $20,000,000 for the Unmanned Air Vehicles program; and

''(V) $20,000,000 for the Long-Range Hypersonic Research program''.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment and to express my displeasure with the drastic reductions in the NASA budget over the past several years. I am particularly concerned about the reduction in funding for aeronautics research. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) shares my concerns and joins in this amendment.

NASA is not simply a space exploration agency; it has also played a vital role in the creation of important technology used in civilian and military air transport. These contributions are among the brightest jewels in NASA's crown, but the last several years have seen the aeronautics budget dwindle precipitously.

The Clinton administration is rarely so zealous in its attempt to reduce nondefense discretionary spending. It is, therefore, ironic and unfortunate that it is so determined to scale back aeronautics research.

Today I have presented or am presenting an amendment to transfer $100 million from the International Space Station account to the Aeronautical Research and Technology account for each of the 3 fiscal years covered by the authorization bill before us. I have long been a supporter of the Space Station and remain so, but I feel that it has received more than generous funding while aeronautics research has suffered disproportionately.

I expect that it may be said that this $100 million reduction in the funding for the Space Station is a killer amendment. This is not the case, in my view, unless those who direct the Space Station program choose to make it so, and to me it is inconceivable that they would to this. No one, on the other hand, can do the vital aeronautics research identified in my amendment unless it is adopted.

Nearly $5 billion has been spent on the Space Station in the last 2 fiscal years, and another $2.4 billion is included in the President's budget for fiscal year 2000. Meanwhile, aeronautics research will have been reduced by $400 million over the same period.

The reduction in budget authority for aeronautics would bring the reduction in that program to 50 percent of what it was 10 years ago. Clearly aeronautics research has suffered disproportionately.

The Bateman-Scott amendment will transfer $100 million from the Space Station account to the aeronautics account for each of the 3 fiscal years covered by this bill. Failure to increase our commitment to aeronautics research will have grievous economic and national security consequences to the United States. The Bateman-Scott amendment will help guarantee that American aviation will preserve its traditional dominance.

My colleagues' support and vote for the Bateman-Scott amendment is solicited and will be appreciated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bateman-Scott amendment. The amendment will transfer $100 million from the International Space Station for each of the next 3 fiscal years to the Aeronautics Research and Technology account.

This amendment is necessary to restore deep cuts in aeronautics research and development programs as proposed by the bill. It is especially important when we know that several aeronautics R&D programs were cut, in large part in order to fund continued cost overruns for the Space Station.

We know that the Nation's aeronautics research program are in serious decline. The proposed FY 2000 NASA budget decreases an already underfunded aeronautics research effort by an additional 33 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we know that dollar-for-dollar investments in aeronautics research pay off. This is because aeronautics is the second largest industry in terms of positive balance of trade, second only to agriculture, and that goes back and forth every year. That is directly attributable to our past investments in aeronautics research.

Every aircraft worldwide uses NASA technology. For example, engineering principles developed from this research have contributed to overall aircraft safety and efficiency, including things like wing design, noise abatement, structural integrity and fuel efficiency. Such improvements are part of every aircraft in use today and are a direct result of our investment in aeronautics research.

Contrary to being corporate welfare, Federal investment in aeronautics research and development is vital because private companies are reluctant to fund this type of research when future applications of that research are unknown or will not pay dividends for 20 years. So our past and current funding of aeronautics research represents an appropriate and responsible Federal role.

The steady decline in aeronautics has already had an impact on United States competitiveness. Less than 10 years ago, United States firms held more than 70 percent of the world market share of civilian aircraft sales. But today, Europe's AirBus has more than 50 percent of that market share.

So while the U.S. has continued to severely cut research in this area, other countries have aggressively increased their investment. Japan, for example, will put $20 million more towards high speed transport research, while this budget ends our investment in high speed transport research.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support our continued investment in aeronautics research and development.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a letter from Virginia Governor Jim Gilmore expressing his opposition to the bill and a January 18, 1999 article entitled the ''Cost of Station Cuts Into Funds For Supersonic Airplane Effort'' in ''Space News'', as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
May 18, 1999.

Hon. ROBERT C. SCOTT,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCOTT; I write to you on behalf of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency Langley Research Center (NASA–LARC) and request your assistance during this year's appropriations process in the 106th Congress. Specifically, I request you cast your vote against H.R. 1654. President Clinton's budget proposal, submitted to Congress earlier this year, drastically reduces, for the second straight year, funding for the NASA–LARC to a level that threatens its critical research initiatives. NASA Langley is a national resource that is based in Virginia. I believe, therefore, that it is incumbent on all of us in elective office to represent its national mission. I respectfully request you halt this proposed budget cut and increase funding for this facility that is vital to the economy of the Tidewater region, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and our national competitiveness.

Over the last 2 years the NASA–LARC has been cut 24% comprehensively and the aeronautics portion has been reduced by 33%. This year, the President's budget proposes a cut of over $110 million and the reduction or abolition of numerous programs, including the elimination of two major programs—High Speed Commercial Transport (HSCT) and Advanced Subsonic Technology (AST). If this proposal is not overturned, Virginia will experience a direct loss of over 500 aeronautical engineering jobs through the end of 2000. Collateral effects include a total loss of approximately $275 million to the Virginia economy and 1,900 jobs lost. Moreover, these effects will not be contained strictly to the Tidewater region, but will also be realized in Blacksburg, Charlottesville and Northern Virginia as well.

The United States has drastically reduced federal aeronautics funding from $1.3 billion per year to $640 million per year—a 51% reduction—over the last ten years. In 1997, ''aeronautics products'' was the second largest U.S. export category ($69 billion) in our balance of trade, second only to agricultural products. While the United States continues to reduce its ability to compete in this market, other nations, such as Great Britain, South Korea, France, Taiwan and China, are increasing the amount of their investment in aeronautical R&D and are strong partners with their private sector companies. For example, Boeing has seen its share of the global commercial aircraft market go from 90% to less than 50% over the last 15 years. Airbus, based in France, has seen its share increase from 0% to approximately 50%. This comes as no surprise since the best aeronautic R&D facilities are now located in Europe.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that in a dangerous world in which this administration has deployed our military personnel to a multitude of locations around the globe, the most important thing necessary to insure their safety is complete domination of the skies over their heads. The current situation in the Balkans is a clear-cut example of why it is important to maintain a position for the United States at the forefront of aeronautics research and development.

Once again, I ask you to join me and fight to preserve NASA–LARC and see that it continues to play the integral role it has play in the economy of Virginia, in defense of this

notion and the promotion our commercial interests in global economy.

Very truly yours,

JAMES S. GILMORE, III,
Governor of Virginia.

[From the Space News, Jan. 18, 1999]

COST OF STATION CUTS INTO FUNDS FOR SUPERSONIC AIRPLANE EFFORT

(By Brian Berger)

WASHINGTON.—Funding for NASA's effort to develop technology for the next generation of supersonic passenger airplanes will be slashed and possibly eliminated to help NASA pay for cost overruns on the international space station program, according to government sources.

When U.S. President Bill Clinton presents his 2000 budget request to Congress in early February, sources said funding for NASA's High-Speed Research program—a nine-year-old effort to develop a concept for an environmentally friendly supersonic passenger jet—will be significantly reduced or cut from the space agency's budget altogether.

Last year, Congress appropriated $190 million for High-Speed Research in 1999, according to the NASA Comptroller's Office.

Although some sources say NASA could be in line for a small budget increase for 2000, congressional sources said its unlikely the White House will add enough money to pay for space station overruns without making cuts elsewhere.

A congressional source said some combination of new funds and program budget cuts are to be expected in a year when the White House is under political pressure to find as much as $1 billion extra for the international space station.

''This is the first year there hasn't been tremendous support for High-Speed Research,'' a senior NASA official said.

The NASA official declined to offer details of the cut pending the president's release of his spending plan. But a congressional source said the president's budget will reflect a deliberate decision to phase out the High-Speed Research program.

''I think it's dead,'' the source said, ''and I wouldn't be surprised if it goes away for a while.''

The NASA program began in 1990 to help U.S. aerospace companies develop the technologies needed to build a supersonic passenger plane capable of meeting the more stringent environmental regulations predicted for 2010.

But when industry-partner Boeing Co., Seattle, announced last fall that it would delay for 15 years its plans to build a supersonic passenger plane—also known as a high-speed civilian transport—until 2025, both the environmental and economic goals of the NASA program changed to reflect the new time frame.

Boeing spokeswoman Mary Jean Olsen said the company will not invest tens of billions of dollars in building a supersonic passenger jet until the technology and market demand for the product presents itself.

Alan Wilhite, deputy director of the Office of High-Speed Research at NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va., said the program was on track to meet all the economic and environmental goals Boeing set for the program in 1990.

He said the program is now undergoing a year-long feasibility study to determine what must be done to meet more stringent environmental and economic goals forecasted for 2020–2025. Word of the budget cut comes as program officials at Langley are preparing to begin the next phase of the program, an eight-year, $700 million effort that includes the test and assembly of a full-scale supersonic engine.

But a Boeing program official said it is too soon to build an engine for an airplane that is still 20–25 years from reality.

''We really should not proceed with manufacturing technology,'' said Boeing's Robert Cuthbertson, program manager for the High-Speed Civilian Transport program.

During a NASA hearing before the House Science Committee in February 1998, Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R–Calif.) questioned NASA Administrator Daniel Goldin about the advisability of building a full-scale engine for an airplane that may not be built.

''The whole program is being looked at very closely in terms of what level of investment the government should put in this area,'' the senior NASA official said.

Cuthbertson said Boeing is cutting back its investment in high-speed research substantially, estimating a 75–80 percent reduction over the next seven years.

John Logsdon, director of the Space Policy Institute at the George Washington University here, said aeronautics research is the subject of a long-standing debate between the White House and NASA.

''The argument is that aeronautics is a mature industry and ought to be paying for its own [research and development]'' Logsdon said. ''Some say it's inappropriate for the government to be paying for [a research and development] program that is essentially for Boeing.''

Boeing is the only U.S. company currently building large commercial airframes.

Robert Walker, former chairman of the House Science Committee, said the debate goes back decades, but that the High-Speed Research program was usually seen as the kind of pure technology development effort NASA should be supporting.

Driving the budget cut, a NASA and congressional source said, is a White House in search of money to pay for cost overruns in the international space station program without raiding NASA science accounts.

''One way or another, you have to fix the space station overrun problem,'' a senior NASA official said.

With NASA program officials calling for more than $700 million for High-Speed Research through 2007, the program presents a tempting target for the White House budget ax.

''There aren't a lot of cookie jars for NASA to go after,'' the congressional source said.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am in support of the bill and the piece of legislation and opposed to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in direct contradiction to the President's and Administrator Goldin's priorities for the space program for NASA.

I understand the concern of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) about the continuing reductions over time that we have seen in NASA's aeronautics budget. But cutting the Space Station to fund aeronautics is not the appropriate answer.

However, at this point, let me point out that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), again, the truth of his arguments is that we have to prioritize. If we are going to be spending huge chunks of money on the Space Station, that is exactly right. It is a very painful process. This is what part of that painful process is. Once again we are faced with something that comes from our decision, the decision of the whole body, to move forward with the Space Station.

Administrator Goldin in this environment says his top three priorities are, number one, safety; number two, finishing the Space Station and getting it over with; and advanced space transportation technology. Everything else comes after that as far as the administration and Mr. Goldin and his priorities go.

That means that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) is proposing cutting the administrator's number two priority, which will in fact increase total Space Station costs because it will cause delays just to fund the station at a different level of priority.

So let us not think that this is just an easy answer that takes somebody through Space Station. When we are here in the very last few moments of getting the Space Station up, any delay in this system will be very expensive, and there will be delays if we start cutting precipitously like this.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) may or may not know that this bill does not cut research at NASA's Aeronautics Center one bit. In fact, this bill directs NASA to bring the resources and talents of the excellent scientists and engineers at the Aeronautic Center to bear on a higher priority. It is a priority, as I just mentioned, of Mr. Goldin's; it is one of his top three priorities. It is a much more difficult challenge than just trying to improve aeronautics, and that is to improve and to meet the challenge of advanced space transportation technology.

□ 1615

Simply keeping the aeronautics centers working on aeronautics only is a very bad strategy. Now, yes, we realize that that is valuable work. But there are many challenges that we face and contributions that they could make outside the area of aeronautics. And limiting these centers to aeronautics, basically it is a very bad strategy and it is based on a going-out-of-business strategy.

I, therefore, respectfully oppose the well-intentioned but I say counterproductive amendment of the gentleman. Because in the end, by delaying the Space Station and by taking money precipitously from it, it will cause disruptions in the Space Station program and the plan that we are moving forward on and we will not be getting done with the project and it will end up costing us more money and putting even more pressure on aeronautics and other aspects of NASA's budget.

So while I understand the pressures we are under, I can sympathize with the idea that certain areas are not being funded like we would like to see them be if we had unlimited funding, but just cutting the Space Station precipitously is not the answer. Perhaps the answer should be, as I say, looking

at the aeronautic centers and trying to broaden their area of research rather than keeping them just on aeronautics.

So I reluctantly and respectfully oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the Bateman-Scott amendment. They have both been good friends of NASA and tireless champions of aeronautic research. I believe this amendment is well-intentioned.

Nevertheless, I think taking money from NASA's Space Station will simply destabilize that program and that will result in more station cost growth, more pressure on the NASA budget that will not benefit anyone in the long-run.

So although I think we need to take a long hard look at what needs to be done to keep NASA's aeronautics program world class, I oppose taking money from the Space Station. And I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 286, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

AYES—140

Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Chabot
Chenoweth
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Danner
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dickey
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan
Evans
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kucinich
LaFalce
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Manzullo
Markey
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
Meehan
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moore
Myrick
Nadler
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rivers
Roemer
Ryan (WI)
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Sisisky
Skelton
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Traficant
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey

NOES—286

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Ortiz
Ose
Packard
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Velazquez
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Abercrombie
Brown (CA)
Cox
Ganske
Lipinski
Napolitano
Serrano

□ 1636

Messrs. TAYLOR of Mississippi, SMITH of Michigan and FROST changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. SPRATT, Mr. OLVER and Ms. DELAURO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Are there any other amendments?

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

Let me quickly thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and their staff for their efforts to try to bring about a good bill here, but I have to say I am disappointed that we were not able to get that done.

Let me point out very quickly that Dan Goldin, the NASA administrator, has strongly suggested that Members oppose this bill; that the OMB has recommended this bill be opposed, for a variety of reasons:

Quickly, because it would delete all funding for NASA's information technology initiatives, it would hold NASA's earth science research program hostage to an unworkable data buy earmark, it would cancel the peer reviewed Triana scientific and educational mission and waste the $35 million already appropriated, and it would prohibit any research on innovative inflatable technologies that have great potential to lower the costs of future human space operations.

You can be pro NASA and against this bill. I recommend, as the ranking member on this committee, a ''no'' vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 174, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment 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 to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was 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, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 259, noes 168, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

AYES—259

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—168

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Duncan
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Gephardt
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
John
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
LaFalce
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Shuster
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stabenow
Stark
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Brown (CA)
Hooley
Napolitano
Pastor
Serrano
Shimkus
Terry

□ 1658

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

□ 1700

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1654, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 1654) to reflect the actions of the House, and that the Clerk be directed to make the following specific changes:

In the instruction to strike in the amendment by Mr. TRAFICANT to section 103(4)(A)(i) the phrase ''focused program, and'', and to apply the same instruction to strike to section 103(4)(B)(i) and section 103(4)(C)(i) with respect to fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to place extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1654, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), and unless there is an amendment that we do not know about, we will probably not have votes on the next bill that is coming up. I cannot give a complete assurance that there will be no rollcall votes, but my guess is that all of the amendments and the bill will be disposed of by voice vote and the Members can take that into account when making their plans.

NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 175 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1553.

□ 1702

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 1553) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHIMKUS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1553, the National Weather Service and Related Agencies Authorization Act of 1999 authorizes a total of $1.391 billion for fiscal year 2000 and $1.468 billion for fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, the NOAA office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research Programs, the National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service and related facilities. The NWS, supported by the Atmospheric Research and NESDIS programs, provides around-the-clock weather and flood warning and forecast services to the general public for the protection of life and property. The NWS data is used by private sector, commercial and weather service firms which provide specialized forecasts for a variety of business uses.

The additional funds authorized by this bill will, first, provide an increase of nearly 10 percent in the lead time for tornado warnings, particularly to those areas of the Nation such as Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, the Midwest and the Southeast that are subject to devastating tornadoes; second, also provide an increase of 10 percent in forecast accuracy of the onset of freezing temperatures, particularly important for agricultural regions; third, provide an increase of nearly 5 percent in the forecast accuracy of heavy snowfall and severe storm warnings; and last, maintain current capabilities and hurricane forecasts and flood warnings. I commend the bill to the House for its adoption.

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

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

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for bringing this bill to the floor today.

The Committee on Science has worked quickly this year to bring to the floor several authorization bills to give guidance to the Committee on Appropriations. One of the most significant of these bills is H.R. 1553, which will authorize the operations of the National Weather Service for the next 2 years. The National Weather Service provides critical information and early warning detection of disasters to communities throughout the United States. Timely, accurate weather forecasts save lives and provide us with time to prevent or at least minimize damage to property that results from tornadoes, hurricanes, blizzards and other severe weather.

New technologies pioneered by NOAA research enabled the National Weather Service to issue tornado warnings 30 minutes before they struck communities in Oklahoma. Those tornadoes caused over $1 billion in damage to Oklahoma City and surrounding communities. The loss of life could have been much worse without early warning provided by the National Weather Service. The development and deployment of Doppler radar and the Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System, AWIPS, extended the lead time for storm warnings by 20 minutes or more. More time means more lives can be saved. Emergency services can be deployed and people can take action to protect themselves.

The National Weather Service and its related research programs provide tangible benefits to our citizens every day at the cost of a few dollars per person annually. This bill replaces the Organic Act of 1890, which currently provides the definition of the National Weather Service's mission, with new language defining the duties of the Weather Service. The language was improved through the adoption of an amendment that I offered in committee which clarified the role of the National Weather Service in providing marine and aviation forecasts, and it will be further improved by the manager's amendment that will be offered by the chairman of the committee, the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

I believe the changes we have made in this section have addressed many of the concerns raised by the administration and the aviation industry. I am confident that we have a sound basis for continued work on this issue as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Although we would have preferred to see the authorization for the High Performance Computing and Communications Initiative, the HPCC, in this bill, we are satisfied that its exclusion is not done with prejudice on the part of the chairman of the committee, or the committee. Funding for the HPCC initiative supports advancements will enable NOAA to improve both short and long range forecasting.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) indicated the committee will move separate legislation within the coming few weeks to authorize appropriations for the HPCC program in its entirety, including the authorization of NOAA's portion of the program. We understand that this bill will provide authorizations of appropriations for all departments and agencies which participate in the government-wide HPCC program, as well as in the proposed information technology for the 21st century initiative. We look forward to working with our colleagues to advance the HPCC authorization bill, given its importance to the Nation and future technology.

H.R. 1553 reflects the President's request for FY 2000 for both the program accounts and to the procurement and construction accounts of NOAA. I am pleased by the authorization levels for next year. However, I am concerned that the FY 2001 numbers, kept at the same level as FY 2000 for all program accounts, would lead to a real decline in real support for the work of the National Weather Service and related research programs.

Later, I will offer an amendment to increase the FY 2001 authorization by a modest 3 percent. I hope my colleagues will support my amendment and ensure that NOAA has the stable funding required to continue to provide the vital weather forecasting services we rely on every day.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as the subcommittee Chair and author of this legislation, I am proud to speak in support of H.R. 1553. H.R. 1553 authorizes funding for the National Weather Service's atmospheric research, NOAA's environmental satellite data information service.

I am pleased to say that the Committee on Science reported this bill by voice vote. It was a tremendous display of how much can be accomplished when we work together in a bipartisan fashion.

Before I go on, I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for his hard work and leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I would also like to thank the ranking minority member

of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment and my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), for his leadership on his side of the aisle. While we do not always see eye to eye, I would think it is safe to say we do agree on the importance of passing H.R. 1553.

The National Weather Service plays an important part in protecting the public. The recent violent tornadoes in Oklahoma and Texas demonstrated how important advanced warning can be. Lives were tragically lost. I am afraid that the toll would have been much, much higher if there had not been advance warning given by the National Weather Service. This is just one of many examples of the important, sometimes lifesaving, services provided in the funding of this bill.

The bill funds NOAA's satellite programs at a level consistent with the administration's request. Satellites play a critical role in weather forecasting, as well as providing important environmental data. NOAA plans an ambitious launch schedule over the next decade or so which will not only improve coverage but will also improve satellite data acquisition capabilities.

H.R. 1553 also authorizes funding for NOAA's Office of Atmospheric Research. It is important that we have a clear understanding of how the atmosphere works so that we can better understand the weather and determine if global climate change is in fact occurring. H.R. 1553 continues the committee's tradition of strong support for atmospheric sciences.

Just a quick aside: I woke up this past Saturday morning to read a front page story detailing a crucial court decision overturning EPA's thoughts on P/M and ozone standards. The Court's decision noted that the agency had far exceeded its legal authority and based the regulation on science that was proven to be potentially unsound.

The reason I bring this matter up today in the context of H.R. 1553 is that I have always been a strong proponent of moving the EPA science mission to a nonregulatory governmental body. In my mind, NOAA would be a natural choice. In the light of the court decision, I plan to hold a hearing on the subject of P/M and ozone regulations. This will build on the bipartisan series of three hearings held by the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment last year.

I would like to conclude by saying H.R. 1553 will protect public safety, maintain state-of-the-art scientific research and facilities without busting the budget or raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. This is good legislation. I encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I do stand in support of the passage of H.R. 1553 to provide the National Weather Service with the resources to warn our citizens of impending natural disasters.

My constituents, the people of Guam, are probably the most familiar with the destruction that accompanies storms, and though we are thousands of miles away from Washington, D.C., we nonetheless share our prayers and support for stricken communities around the country.

The work of the National Weather Service, along with other Federal agencies like FEMA and the Small Business Administration, is important for communities to prepare for potential natural disasters. There is no question that with the technological advances and improved methods of research, the National Weather Service has been able to relay timely information via TV, radio, computers and other media to communities in the direct path of destruction.

Guam is located in an area of the Pacific known as typhoon alley, which was once the home of a weather reconnaissance squadron employing WC–130 aircraft. Their mission consisted of gathering advanced storm information by flying directly into a typhoon. Today, Guam remains the only part of the United States that is not covered by some kind of hurricane or typhoon aircraft.

□ 1715

I know that this is not directly related to the National Weather Service, but I did want to thank the chairman for accepting in the manager's amendment to make sure that both States and territories are equitably treated in terms of protection of property and life.

Guam is now no longer covered by the Joint Typhoon Warning Center, a casualty of the BRAC process. So it is vitally important that we continue to support the National Weather Service, particularly as they develop new ways of doing weather forecasting and providing information to communities such as Guam. It is important that as they perfect their satellite technology and as they experiment with the possibility of using fixed-wing aircraft, that they consider all parts of the United States in their service.

We in Guam would like to see perhaps the introduction of typhoon chasers once again, but it is very important that the National Weather Service and any kind of typhoon warning for a place like Guam is vitally important. Some years we face as many as 70 storm warnings in one year, and almost every typhoon that one hears about that hits the Asian mainland passes by or near or through Guam; hopefully most by or near.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

I would like to discuss two aspects of the science that is covered under this bill. The first my colleagues have already heard discussed by other speakers and that involves the National Weather Service and its importance. I certainly share that view, particularly since I live in a part of the country that frequently has tornadoes and have personally been in the basement a few times as tornadoes have passed overhead.

A little sideline on that, I depend heavily on the Weather Channel for my weather information, particularly when I travel, and I was struck recently by someone who commented that he did not really see the need for the National Weather Service because he got all of his weather from the TV. I enlightened him about the fact that although I love the Weather Channel and other TV that reports the weather, all that information comes from the National Weather Service, and the other services that are provided by the Weather Channel and so forth are simply massaging, computing and varying the data received from the National Weather Service. Indeed, the Weather Service performs a valuable service for our country in many, many ways.

The main point I would like to make this afternoon is the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is doing a great deal of good science, often in somewhat obscure areas. All of us know how important it was 150 years ago to explore this Nation so that we could learn the details of its geography and, above all, the amount of its national resources. As we have explored our entire earth surface in terms of lands and found all the natural resources or nearly all the natural resources of the various landed areas of our planet, we realize that in another century we are going to have to get many of our natural resources from the oceans.

I wanted to point out and bring to light an important service performed by NOAA last year, and this was published in Science Magazine on September 26 of last year by Dr. Smith of NOAA, Dr. Walter H.F. Smith, and Dr. David Sandwell of the Scripps Institute.

Before their work was done, we only had rough ideas of the topography underneath the oceans, and that was obtained by echo sounding data from ships. But there are many areas that were unexplored, areas as large as the State of Oklahoma which had never been explored. The two scientists I mentioned developed a method by watching the motion of the satellites and measuring their positions very carefully and calculating the gravitational attraction of the various parts of the Earth upon the satellites and calculating backwards, finding the topographic structure underneath the oceans. It is not extremely accurate,

but when we have areas the size of Oklahoma with no data, then any data is worthwhile, and they have done a remarkable job. They found an entire mountain range underneath the ocean which was not known about before.

Now, why is this important? First of all, as my colleagues can see, there are many rifts in the ocean bed. Most of those areas provide a lot of warm water which, in turn, provides for a great deal of activity by various organisms which forms the bottom of the food chain for the fishing industry. By plotting this more carefully, we have been able to aid the fishing industry throughout the world. But even more importantly, those rifts produce tremendous amounts of natural resources of metals which we are running out of on our landed areas and, in the future, we are likely to be mining ocean module and picking up these nodules of material which are quite abundant on the ocean floor. It will be very difficult to operate in that situation, but certainly this is something that has been pursued to a certain extent already, and once the prices of minerals rise this will provide a major source of resources for the next century and beyond.

I personally thank these scientists and others who have worked on this issue and the many other issues they deal with, and I think it is very important for the Congress and for the people of this Nation to realize that this important work is being done and is being done so well by the scientific community of our Nation.

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

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

I understand that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) wants to engage in a colloquy, and this seems to be about the last chance to do that before general debate is over with.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and he is correct, I do wish to engage in a colloquy. It happens to be about Weather Service modernization issues and the process that we have been going through for years, those of us from vulnerable communities and those of us who have expressed concerns. I know the chairman has been aware of that for some time.

NOAA, through the Modernization Transition Committee, is engaged in this process of independently reviewing the necessity of maintaining those Weather Service offices throughout the country, and in fact they have already rubber-stamped the closure of maybe more than 100 of those. Some of those closings, in my opinion, could result in the degradation of service, and that is of particular concern to me and why regularly I have monitored this bill and wanted to make sure that some of our more vulnerable communities had that review process in place.

I wanted to inquire if the chairman would care to comment about where we are currently with that and with regard to those circumstances, whether the Weather Services Modernization Committee is trying to close some of those offices.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to tell my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), as well as the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), who has a similar concern, that the Committee on Science is aware of the NOAA Modernization Transition Committee process and commends NOAA for its efforts in this regard.

The committee is also aware of the efforts of various communities that maintain local weather coverage and shares the gentlemen's view and their concern about the degradation of service that may result from closing Weather Service offices. Consequently, the Committee on Science strongly urges NOAA to continue to aggressively work with local communities in developing comprehensive strategies that will allow high-risk communities to effectively respond to occurrences of severe weather.

I can add that the Committee on Science is known as doing tough-love oversight, and this is one of the areas where the committee will be doing some pretty tough oversight because we do not want NOAA modernization to result in a huge degradation of service, particularly in the high-risk areas. I know the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) represents one of those areas, as does the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to add that I appreciate that attitude, and I am aware that the Modernization Transition Committee has its work cut out for it and that NOAA has had to look after closing a number of these offices. But I was also aware that a few of us were in perhaps an extraordinarily exceptional category. So I appreciate the committee's attitude in expressing this tough-love oversight, because I think NOAA needs that, and I think our citizens deserve that.

So I thank the gentleman for that attitude.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1553

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Weather Service and Related Agencies Authorization Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the term—

(1) ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(2) ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Operations, Research, and Facilities activities of the National Weather Service $617,897,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $617,897,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available until expended. Of such amounts—

(1) $449,441,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $450,411,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Local Warnings and Forecasts;

(2) $2,200,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,200,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Advanced Hydrological Prediction System;

(3) $619,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $619,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Susquehanna River Basin Flood Systems;

(4) $35,596,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $35,596,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Aviation Forecasts;

(5) $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Weather Forecast Offices (WFO) Facilities Maintenance;

(6) $37,081,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $37,081,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Central Forecast Guidance;

(7) $3,090,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $3,090,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Atmospheric and Hydrological Research;

(8) $39,325,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $39,325,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Next Generation Weather Radar (NEXRAD);

(9) $7,573,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $7,573,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS);

(10) $38,002,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $38,002,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System (AWIPS); and

(11) $970,000 for fiscal year 2000 shall be for two 1,000-watt National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio transmitters, to be located in Jasper and Marion Counties, Illinois, and nine 300-watt National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio transmitters, to be installed in appropriate locations throughout the State of Illinois, and for maintenance costs related thereto.

(b) PROCUREMENT, ACQUISITION, AND CONSTRUCTION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Procurement, Acquisition, and Construction activities of the National Weather Service $69,632,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $70,120,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available until expended. Of such amounts—

(1) $9,560,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $9,060,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Next Generation Weather Radar (NEXRAD);

(2) $4,180,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $6,125,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS);

(3) $22,575,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $21,525,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System (AWIPS);

(4) $11,100,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $12,835,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Computer Facilities Upgrades;

(5) $8,350,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $8,350,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Radiosonde Replacement;

(6) $500,000 for fiscal year 2000 shall be for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Operations Center Rehabilitation; and

(7) $13,367,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $12,225,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Weather Forecast Office (WFO) Construction.

(c) DUTIES OF THE NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To protect life and property, the Secretary, through the National Weather Service, except as provided in paragraph (2), shall be responsible for—

(A) forecasts and shall serve as the sole official source of weather and flood warnings;

(B) the issuance of storm warnings;

(C) the collection, exchange, and distribution of meteorological, hydrological, climatic, and oceanographic data and information;

(D) the preparation of hydrometeorological guidance and core forecast information; and

(E) the issuance of marine and aviation forecasts and warnings.

(2) COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.—The National Weather Service shall not provide, or assist other entities to provide, a service (other than a service described in paragraph (1)(A) or (B)) if that service is currently provided or can be provided by commercial enterprise, unless—

(A) the Secretary finds that the private sector is unwilling or unable to provide the service; or

(B) the service provides vital weather warnings and forecasts for the protection of lives and property of the general public.

(3) AMENDMENTS.—The Act of October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 653) is amended—

(A) by striking section 3 (15 U.S.C. 313); and

(B) in section 9 (15 U.S.C. 317), by striking '', and it shall be'' and all that follows, and inserting a period.

(4) 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 subsection and outlining a timetable for their termination.

SEC. 4. ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH.

(a) OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Atmospheric Research Operations, Research, and Facilities environmental research and development activities of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research $173,250,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $173,250,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available until expended.

(2) CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY RESEARCH.—Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), $126,200,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $126,200,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Climate and Air Quality Research, of which—

(A) $16,900,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $16,900,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Interannual and Seasonal Climate Research;

(B) $34,600,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $34,600,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Long-Term Climate and Air Quality Research;

(C) $69,700,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $69,700,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Climate and Global Change; and

(D) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE).

(3) ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS.—Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), $47,050,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $47,050,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Atmospheric Programs, of which—

(A) $36,600,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $36,600,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Weather Research;

(B) $4,350,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $4,350,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Wind Profiler; and

(C) $6,100,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $6,100,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Solar-Terrestrial Services and Research.

(b) PROCUREMENT, ACQUISITION, AND CONSTRUCTION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Atmospheric Research Procurement, Acquisition, and Construction environmental research and development activities of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research $10,040,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $14,160,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available until expended. Of such amounts—

(1) $5,700,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory Supercomputer; and

(2) $4,340,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $6,160,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for the Advanced Composition Explorer (ACE) Follow-On Satellite/GEOSTORM.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE, DATA AND INFORMATION SERVICE.

(a) OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Operations, Research, and Facilities environmental research and development and related activities of the National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service $103,092,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $103,092,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available until expended.

(2) SATELLITE OBSERVING SYSTEMS.—Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), $59,236,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $59,236,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Satellite Observing Systems, of which—

(A) $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Global Disaster Information Network (GDIN);

(B) $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Ocean Remote Sensing; and

(C) $53,236,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $53,236,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Environmental Observing Services.

(3) ENVIRONMENTAL DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.—Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), $43,856,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $43,856,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Environmental Data Management Systems, of which—

(A) $31,521,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $31,521,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Data and Information Services; and

(B) $12,335,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $12,335,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Environmental Data Systems Modernization.

(b) PROCUREMENT, ACQUISITION, AND CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Procurement, Acquisition, and Construction environmental research and development and related activities of the National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service $413,657,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $476,183,000 for fiscal year 2001, to remain available until expended.

(2) SYSTEMS ACQUISITION.—Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), $410,612,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $473,803,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for Systems Acquisition, of which—

(A) $140,979,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $114,594,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for the procurement and launch of, and supporting ground systems for, Polar Orbiting Environmental Satellites (POES), K, L, M, N, and N′;

(B) $80,100,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $113,600,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for the procurement and launch of, and supporting ground systems for, the National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS); and

(C) $189,533,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $245,609,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for the procurement and launch of, and supporting ground systems for, Geostationary Operational Environmental NEXT follow-on Satellites (GOES N–Q).

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), $3,045,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $2,380,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Operations Center Rehabilitation Construction.

SEC. 6. FACILITIES.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to enable the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to carry out the Operations, Research, and Facilities environmental research and development and related activities required to meet recurring facilities operations costs associated with the David Skaggs Research Center in Boulder, Colorado, $3,850,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $3,850,000 for fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 7. ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall exclude from consideration for grant agreements made after fiscal year 1999 by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, under the activities for which funds are authorized under this Act, any person who received funds, other than those described in subsection (b), appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1999, under a grant agreement from any Federal funding source for a project that was not subjected to a competitive, merit-based award process, except as specifically authorized by this Act. 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 the receipt of Federal funds by a person due to the membership of that person in a class specified by law for which assistance is awarded to members of the class according to a formula provided by law.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''grant agreement'' means a legal instrument whose principal purpose is to transfer a thing of value to the recipient to carry out a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by a law of the United States, and does not include the acquisition (by purchase, lease, or barter) of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the United States Government. Such term does not include a cooperative agreement (as such term is used in section 6305 of title 31, United States Code) or a cooperative research and development agreement (as such term is defined in section 12(d)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a(d)(1))).

SEC. 8. INTERNET AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.

The Administrator shall make available through the Internet home page of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration the abstracts relating to all research grants and awards made with funds authorized by this Act. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or permit the release of any information prohibited by law or regulation from being released to the public.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes

the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALVERT:

In section 3(c)(1), insert ''(in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories)'' after ''life and property''.

In section 3(c)(2)—

(1) strike ''(other than a service described in paragraph (1)(A) or (B))'';

(2) strike subparagraph (A);

(3) redesignate subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (A);

(4) in subparagraph (A), as so redesignated by paragraph (3) of this amendment, strike ''lives'' and insert ''life'';

(5) at the end of subparagraph (A), as so redesignated by paragraph (3) of this amendment, strike the period and insert ''; or''; and

(6) add at the end the following new subparagraph:

(B) the United States Government is obligated to provide such service under international aviation agreements to provide meteorological services and exchange meteorological information.

Mr. CALVERT (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. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 1553. This amendment was crafted in a bipartisan manner with my colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD). It contains carefully thought out language which will ensure that we maintain a proper balance between the protection of life and property while promoting a private sector weather forecasting industry.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

As the subcommittee chairman indicated, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), we did discuss this amendment. I am in total support of the manager's amendment.

The amendment addresses the major concerns our constituents in the aviation industry had on the section of the bill dealing with the duties of the Weather Service by making clear that the National Weather Service will continue to be responsible for providing weather information that is vital to protect life and property. Access to reliable high-quality weather information is essential to maintain the excellent safety record that our aviation industry has achieved and that the public expects. The National Weather Service's role in providing this information in support of our aviation industry will continue.

The amendment also clarifies that the U.S. Government, through the National Weather Service, will continue to provide the weather services under our international aviation agreements. I know the administration also had concerns about the language included in the bill as reported to the House by the full committee. I believe this amendment will address those concerns on the part of the administration and the aviation industry.

Again, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the subcommittee, for offering this manager's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

SEC. 9. COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds authorized pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS: REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 11. PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is a buy-American amendment that has been added to these bills.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very good buy-American amendment, and we accept it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUTCHINSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUTCHINSON:

In section 3, insert at the end the following new subsection:

(d) CLOSING OF LOCAL WEATHER SERVICE OFFICES.—It is the sense of the Congress that the National Weather Service must fully take into account the dangerous and life threatening nature of weather patterns in Wind Zone IV, otherwise known as tornado alley, before making any determination on the closure of any of its local weather service offices.

Mr. HUTCHINSON (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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this amendment is something that I have worked with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) in regard to, and I want to thank them for their understanding of this important issue.

The amendment is very simple. It expresses the sense of Congress that the National Weather Service must fully take into account the dangerous and life-threatening nature of weather patterns in wind zone number four, otherwise known as Tornado Alley, before making any determination on its closure of any of its local Weather Service offices.

□ 1730

This sense of the Congress resolution is very important because, as we know, in Oklahoma they have had severe impact, loss of life, because of tornadoes of devastating impact.

In my State of Arkansas we have had similar circumstances, and they are considering and debating whether to close the local Weather Service office in Fort Smith. Only a few years ago, in 1996, there was a devastating tornado that came into Fort Smith and the Van Buren area which caused a loss of life. There was inadequate warning that still embarrasses the Weather Service because of that.

In fact, on that occasion there was a local spotter that called the Tulsa office, which is what we would be under if we totally closed the Fort Smith office, and they were told that there was

a tornado that was spotted in Pocola, only a few miles from Fort Smith, and the response from Tulsa was, where is Pocola? Pocola, of course, is again within the Fort Smith area. It is difficult to give an adequate warning when there is not a grasp of what is happening on the ground.

So this is a great concern, and this I believe expresses the sense of Congress that they have to take into consideration the extraordinarily dangerous weather patterns in tornado alley, and the many States that are affected by the weather patterns in wind zone number 4.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding to me.

While I commend the modernization transition committee for their work, and especially their work regarding the closure of the Evansville, Indiana office, I think it is necessary to chronicle the actual life lost and the loss of property as a result of the inadequate service provided there.

On April 14 of 1996 an F–2 tornado struck Warrick County, Indiana, without warning, toppling two rail cars and tossing a trash dumpster into an electrical transformer at Alcoa's Warrick operations.

Subsequently, a Reed, Kentucky woman was killed by a tornado of which she had no warning to the locale. Neither did the tornado in Warrick County. Likewise, no warning was given prior to a tornado hitting the north side of Evansville, Indiana, the third largest city in the State of Indiana, and damaged two places of business.

Then, most recently, an F–2 tornado touched down in Pike County, Indiana, with no warning, destroying three homes.

So I commend the gentleman from Arkansas for his bringing up this very important issue, and I ask for his sense of Congress amendment to be adopted by the committee and the House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. Chairman, with regret, I must oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON). While not binding, the gentleman's sense of Congress amendment telling the National Weather Service that it should not close any local Weather Service office for any reason whatsoever is in direct contradiction to the provisions of existing law. It will have a chilling effect that could well bring the service's modernization efforts to a halt, with potentially disastrous consequences for public health and safety.

I would remind the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Indiana that this bill improves forecast accuracy for tornadoes by 10 percent. The reason we are able to do that without busting the budget is by making the Weather Service more efficient.

The Weather Service plan for its modernization and associated restructuring was approved overwhelmingly by Congress and signed into law by President Bush in 1992. Already this multibillion dollar effort has resulted in dramatic gains in the service's capability to predict severe weather events such as tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, severe thunderstorms, damaging hail, and high winds, and in dramatic gains in its ability to further ensure the public health and safety.

The only way this multibillion dollar modernization effort was and is affordable is because Congress also directed the Weather Service to consolidate its sprawling network of local Weather Service offices. The savings from this consolidation effort allows the modernization effort to proceed.

Congress also established an elaborate procedure to ensure that local Weather Service offices were not closed in a willy-nilly fashion and were not subject to partisan politics.

For example, the Secretary of Commerce may not close, consolidate, automate, or relocate any field office "* * * unless the Secretary has certified", "certified that such action will not result in any degradation of service."

In addition, a public review process was also established, and, as an additional protection, Congress created a 12-member modernization transition committee comprised of five members representing the National Weather Service, the Department of Defense, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency and several members from civil defense, public safety and labor organizations, news media, pilots, and farmers. This committee may review any certification proposed by the Secretary of Commerce to determine if a degradation of service might result.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would have the implied effect of overriding this elaborate and fair public process. In addition, as I said earlier, it would have a chilling effect that could well bring the service's modernization efforts to a halt with potentially disastrous consequences to public health and safety.

We simply cannot afford to complete the National Weather Service's modernization effort and to operate the new system without the parallel restructuring of Weather Service field offices.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to support the committee's effort to complete the modernization.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to thank the gentleman for his comments, and I wanted to remind the gentleman that a substitute amendment has been offered, and that I think it clarifies the objections that have been expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

So I hope that with the amended amendment, the substitute amendment that has been offered, that the gentleman will be able to support it, because I believe it is consistent with the goals of the National Weather Service, but also expresses a sense of Congress that they have to take into account the dangerous and life-threatening nature of the weather patterns in wind zone number 4, and these States that are impacted by this are Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Missouri, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Arkansas, Michigan, Tennessee, and Georgia.

So Members can see the States impacted by wind zone number 4 are significant, and we ask the House or would ask the chairman hopefully to be able to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 175, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) will be postponed.

Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COSTELLO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION INCREASE.

Each of the amounts authorized for fiscal year 2001 by this Act, except for the amounts authorized by sections 3(b), 4(b), and 5(b), shall be increased by 3 percent.

Mr. COSTELLO (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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents a cut in services performed by the National Weather Service in FY 2001. The bill before us today leaves funding for NOAA programs flat from FY 2000 to FY 2001. My amendment would increase the authorized levels for FY 2001 by a modest 3 percent.

Construction and procurement accounts are excluded from this increase

because in those areas authorization levels are consistent with real projected outyear numbers. My amendment would increase the bill's total authorization level by just under $27 million. If we are able to avoid major damage from just one major weather event in fiscal year 2001, this investment will have paid off many times over.

There are few programs that match the success of the National Weather Service. The recent tragedy in Oklahoma, where deadly tornadoes leveled residential communities, is our most recent example of the importance that timely and accurate weather forecasting plays in our lives. The extra 15 to 20 minutes of warning that our investments in forecasting and prediction research and in technology improvements at NOAA saved lives.

The May 6 issue of USA Today contained an editorial which provided the statistics on storm-related deaths from the 1950s until today. The number of storm-related deaths has decreased by two-thirds over the past 40 years. Weather Service programs cost each taxpayer a few dollars per year. This is a modest price to pay for the protection of life and property.

The level of increased funding provided in my amendment is consistent with the committee's past views and estimates, which called for a 3 percent increase for FY 1998, a 4 percent increase in FY 1999, and a 3 percent increase for FY 2000. Almost all of the members of the Committee on Science supported these increases. I have purposely stayed within the Chairman's preferred range of increases.

The increased funding is also consistent with the increases the committee is providing in the authorization bills for other agencies and departments under our jurisdiction.

The committee has made a commitment, through the Science Policy Report conducted by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), to ''stable and sustainable Federal R&D funding'' over the next 5 years. Sustainability is not achieved if we let inflation erode the funding levels.

This amendment meets the stability and sustainability tests set out by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) has rightfully, in my opinion, criticized the administration on several occasions for failing to provide adequate outyear funding in its budget request leading to net declines in inflation-adjusted funding. Flat funding means that all the increased inflationary costs for doing work will be absorbed by Weather Service programs leading to an effective cut in funding.

Finally, by providing a modest increase of 3 percent, consistent with the policy of the committee, in FY 2001 authorized levels for Weather Service programs, we send a strong signal to the administration and the Committee on Appropriations that we value NOAA's Weather Service programs, and that we want to continue to provide stable funding to support these programs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), which would add nearly $27 million to the bill's already generous fiscal year 2001 authorization level.

This bill recommends an increase of $61.1 million, or 4.6 percent, above the fiscal 1999 appropriated level for fiscal year 2000, then an additional increase of $67.1 million, or 4.8 percent, above the fiscal 2000 recommended level for fiscal year 2001.

It is consistent with the administration's request, and also consistent with my pledge to provide stable and sustainable R&D funding over the next 5 years for programs under the Committee on Science's jurisdiction.

I would just point out that I have been talking about 3 percent increases overall for science. This bill has 4.6 percent in the first year and 4.8 percent in the second year, which is over that recommended amount.

While I understand the gentleman's amendment is well-intentioned, I also believe it is unwise, while we are trying to sustain the balanced budget caps in order to preserve and protect social security. I simply cannot be a party to an amendment that threatens the well-being of our senior citizens, and consequently, I urge rejection of the Costello amendment.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO). It would increase authorization levels for the National Weather Service and the atmospheric research functions of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration by 3 percent in fiscal year 2001.

As it stands, this bill includes no increases in program accounts from fiscal year 2000 to 2001. I believe that will be insufficient to provide for the real needs of our Nation.

With no allowance for inflation, this flat funding authorization will produce a decline in the real work being done by NOAA. The nominal dollars from fiscal year 2000 to 2001 appear to be the same, but the level of service it supported will decline, in real terms.

With a major NOAA facility in my district in Boulder, Colorado, I want to avoid this real decline in the level of funding and services.

The Space Environment Center that detects solar storms which can interfere with the operations of our utility companies and cell phones is based also in Boulder. The Forecast Systems Lab, which worked with the Weather Service to develop the advanced weather interactive processing system, or the radar system that is now used across our country, is also based in Boulder.

□ 1745

But this decline in funding and services will affect other Members' districts as well, and the impact of reduced funds on NOAA's Weather Service and its studies on atmospheric and environmental change will be felt nationwide.

The Costello amendment will result in an increase in program authorizations of less than $27 million. The level of increase is consistent with the committee's past reviews and estimates, and those are produced by the majority. The majority endorsed a 3 percent increase in fiscal 1998 and fiscal 2000 and a 4 percent increase in fiscal year 1999. Furthermore, in a February report the majority criticized as too low the out-year numbers and the President's request for programs under the Committee on Science's jurisdiction.

I would add that the Costello amendment is consistent with the findings in the report on Federal Science policy of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). That report called for stable and substantial funding for science programs. But it is hard to see how funding can be stable and substantial if we routinely let inflation eat away at our programs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment. As it stands, the bill does not enable NOAA and the National Weather Service to do their jobs. We must not marginalize these important programs.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to the increase in FY 2000 and FY 2001 of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER). The increases, in fact the percentages that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) gave are in fact accurate.

But the point that needs to be made here is that the increases are for construction and procurement. There are no increases for programs. So the point is that the increases are going to construction and procurement. There are no increases in FY 2001 for programs. In effect, the inflation factor will require a cut in program funding for that fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUTCHINSON

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my demand for a recorded vote, and I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUTCHINSON) there were—ayes 5, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of the substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COX) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1553) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 175, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment 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 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Costello amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

If not, the Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION INCREASE.

Each of the amounts authorized for fiscal year 2001 by this Act, except for the amounts authorized by sections 3(b), 4(b), and 5(b), shall be increased by 3 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CALVERT) there were—ayes 3, noes 5.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute as amended, was 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, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1553, NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of the bill to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1553.

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

There was no objection.

PUT SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST AND POLITICS SECOND

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday in my Social Security Task Force meeting that I was going to do some yelling and screaming about encouraging the American people and this Congress to move ahead with Social Security reform. If the American people decide that there should be Social Security reform, then we will do it.

That is what happens in Washington. We have made a tremendous stride forward in saying we are not going to spend the Social Security surpluses for other government expenditures. But if nobody cares, this body and the President are going to spend that money.

I think it is so important that every community, every senior citizen, every young person that is going to end up paying this bill start being active, start writing their legislators, start writing the President, because we have got to put Social Security first and put politics second.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN MEMORY OF CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER THREE DAVID ALLAN GIBBS

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today, Chief Warrant Officer Three David Allan Gibbs was laid to rest in Arlington Cemetery in a very moving ceremony. He was fondly remembered by family, friends, and colleagues for his bravery and selfless dedication to his country.

David Gibbs entered the United States Marine Corps in 1980 after graduating from Washington High School in Massillon, Ohio. He served in a number of posts both at home and overseas before transferring to the United States Army in 1985.

It was in the Army that David was able to pursue his dream of flying, and he soon became a helicopter pilot of the AH–1 Cobra and later the Apache. As a pilot, he served in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm where he earned the Bronze Star Metal.

David Gibbs died in Albania on May 5, 1999, serving on Task Force Hawk as part of the NATO mission in the Balkans. He is survived by his wife Jean, daughters Allison and Megan, son David, mother Dorothy, brother Chuck, and sister Pam.

David Gibbs represents what is best about this country, that young people follow their dreams, stand up for the ideals in which they believe, and in doing so make us all proud and humble.

□ 1800

TRIBUTE TO U.S. ARMY CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER KEVIN REICHERT

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an American hero, U.S. Army Chief Warrant Officer Kevin Reichert.

Last week I attended Officer Reichert's funeral in his hometown of Chetek, Wisconsin, a small town of 2,000 people in the northern part of my congressional district.

Chetek is like any small town in rural America. When a member of the community is recognized for outstanding deeds, everyone shares in the pride and joy; and when tragedy strikes, the community shares in the grief. It is unfortunate that last week the people of Chetek came together to bury a hometown hero.

Kevin Reichert lost his life, along with his copilot Chief Warrant Officer David Gibbs, during an Apache flight-training mission in Albania while in support of Operation Allied Force. These two men were stationed in Illesheim, Germany, with their families and were the first American casualties of Operation Allied Force in Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Reichert began his military career in the United States Air Force, where he served with great pride and honor. He later transferred to the U.S. Army in order to realize his lifelong dream of flying. Kevin was accepted to an Army aviation flight program. He later distinguished himself as an outstanding and decorated officer. His commitment to his country was an inspiration to those who served with him.

When I attended Kevin's funeral, I had the opportunity to speak with Chief Warrant Officer Paul Clark, who lived with Kevin in Illesheim and served with him in Albania. In his eulogy, Officer Clark honored his fallen fellow soldier by saying, ''Kevin always answered the call. He always cared about everyone. He was proud of what he did and his unit was proud of him.''

Other pilots in Kevin's squadron said that he took great pride in every task that he was given. One pilot even said that Kevin was considered peacemaker of the troop.

Kevin was a devoted husband to his wife Ridgeley and a loving father of their three children, daughter Carrisa, and sons Christopher and Colten. In Chetek, family, friends and teachers remember him as a young man who always contributed to his community and was never shaken by adversity.

While growing up in Chetek, Kevin displayed early signs of his desire to serve his country and fly. One of his biggest hobbies in high school was flying model airplanes. Kevin was so committed to realizing his dream of flying that he enlisted in the Air Force just one year before graduating from high school. Shortly after basic training, Kevin returned to Chetek in his uniform to thank those who had helped him along his way.

The teachers at Chetek High School remembered him as a young man with an incredible desire to learn and a willingness to contribute to the world in which he lived. He touched many lives, and those who had contact with him were proud to call him their friend.

This young man from western Wisconsin wanted nothing more than to provide for his family, to serve his country, and to fly helicopters. He was the son every mother wants, the student every teacher dreams of, the husband and father every family needs, and the soldier every Nation must have.

Mr. Speaker, this tragic accident reminds us that all men and women in our Armed Forces operate in dangerous conditions every day to carry out their mission. It reinforces our respect for the sacrifices that they and their families make in order to serve our country and protect our Nation's interests across the globe.

Kevin Reichert's death is a great loss to our Nation and to our community in western Wisconsin. Our Nation owes Officer Reichert and his family a debt of gratitude that can never be repaid. His service to our country and his ultimate sacrifice will not be forgotten.

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they are called the sons of God. And God bless Kevin Reichert, Officer David Gibb, and their families. And God bless all our young men and women in our Armed Forces throughout the globe who are serving our Nation and protecting our freedom.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, DECLARATION OF POLICY OF UNITED STATES CONCERNING NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–150) on the resolution (H. Res. 179) providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 883, AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–151) on the resolution (H. Res. 180) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 883) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TRIBUTE TO CALVIN EDWIN RIPKEN, SR.

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for a fine job there on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Calvin Edwin Ripken, Sr., born on December 17, 1935, in Harford County, Maryland, at a place designated on Harford County maps circa 1940 as ''Ripken's Corner.''

At the age of nine, young Cal was left fatherless due to an accident that took the life of his father, Arend, at the intersection of U.S. 40 and Maryland Route 7 in Harford County. Fostered by two older brothers, Ollie, 18 years his senior, and Bill, some 10 years older, Cal followed his brothers to every sand lot game they played in the old Susquehanna League.

At the age of 12, Cal became the batboy of the Aberdeen Canners, a semi-pro baseball club playing in that same Susquehanna League. One day when his signs were being stolen by an opposing team, Manager Fred Baldwin asked young Ripken, ''Boy, do you know how to give signs?'' Calvin said, ''yes.'' So for the next 2 years, young Cal gave the signs sitting on top of the bats. No one ever figured out where the signs were coming from.

In 1953, Cal Sr. graduated from Aberdeen High School and was offered a soccer scholarship to Washington College in Chestertown, Maryland.

Cal Sr.'s baseball team began when he played for those same Canners in 1955 and 1956. He was a catcher, the same position his older brother, Ollie, had held years before. In 1957, Cal accepted a minor league contract with the Baltimore Orioles and was sent to play in Phoenix, Arizona.

On November 30, 1957, Cal married Violet Gross, a marriage that produced four children in Elly, Cal Jr., Fred, and Bill. Cal Sr. subsequently progressed through the Orioles' minor league system until spring training of 1961. During a game as a member of the Rochester Red Wings, Cal was struck by foul tips twice in succession on the right shoulder, causing a disabling injury. Following a short rehabilitation stay in Little Rock, Arkansas, Cal was given the opportunity to turn his talents to managing and became, at 25 years old, the youngest manager in the Orioles' system. From there he rose through that system to become the Orioles' third base coach. And then, in

1987, he became manager of the Baltimore Orioles, the team he so dearly loved.

Cal Ripken, Sr., and Cal Ripken, Jr., represent the first ever father-son teammates to win a World Series, in 1983. In addition, Cal Sr. is the first manager to ever manage two sons, Cal Jr. and Billy, on the same major league baseball team at the same time.

On March 25, 1999, at the age of 63, Cal Sr. succumbed to lung cancer. Cal Sr. never moved away from his hometown. There he was not known as the father of Cal Jr. but as a neighbor who would help anyone who was in need. After his retirement from baseball, Cal remained involved in the community by lending his support to many causes. Specifically, Cal and Vi dedicated their time and money to many charities, including the Maryland Special Olympics and the Boys and Girls Clubs of Harford County.

Cal also hosted an annual instructional baseball camp for youngsters who wanted to learn how to play the game of baseball. Cal Sr. loved to teach and would spend countless hours helping those who wanted to learn from this man, who had spent his entire life in the game of baseball.

Cal Sr. and Vi were the driving force behind the Boys and Girls Clubs of Harford County in Maryland. Recently, the Justice Department granted the Boys and Girls Clubs $77,777.77 in memory of Cal Sr. The sevens symbolize the number worn by Cal Sr. on the baseball field. The number 7 is now etched inside the third base coach's box at Camden Yards.

I offer my sincerest sympathies to Cal's wife Vi, his children, Cal Jr., Billy, Fred, and Ellen. The loss of Cal Sr. is felt by all who admired this great man who gave back so much to his community.

PILT PAYMENTS

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague knows, I have the great honor and great privilege of representing the State of Montana here in the House of Representatives.

Montana is one of the largest districts, both in population and area, in the Congress. I represent an area of 148,000 square miles and approximately 900,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, about 30 percent of Montana is owned by the Federal Government; and that is about 42½ thousand square miles, or 27.2 million square acres. To put that into perspective, Mr. Speaker, the Federal lands in Montana is about equivalent to the size of the entire State of Kentucky or the entire State of Louisiana, or Mississippi, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia.

As you colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, State and local governments are prohibited from taxing Federal lands. But State and local governments are obligated to provide services: law enforcement services, fire protection, search and rescue, schools, hospitals, and other emergency services.

The Federal Government compensates local governments really in two ways. One, it makes payments to State and local governments in lieu of taxes. We call this PILT payments. In addition to that, the Federal Government provides for revenue sharing. The receipts and certain income from the development of resources go to State and local governments. Certain minerals, timber harvest, oil and gas leases, even a portion of outfitter fees, 25 percent, go to State and local governments.

But, Mr. Speaker, the PILT payments, the payment in lieu of taxes payments, in Montana is about 17 cents per acre of Federal land. Private land in Montana, on average, produces revenues to State and local governments of about $1.48. So the PILT payments are not much more than 10 percent of what private taxes would produce.

In 1995, the Congress authorized the first increase in PILT payments in over 20 years. However, Congress has failed to appropriate the full level of PILT payments authorized and the Clinton administration has never requested the full level of funding.

But even more troubling is the Clinton administration has been locking up the public lands by dramatic reductions in timber harvest, withdraw of mineral districts, the shutting down of oil and gas expiration, and the closing of public lands for recreation and for tourism, and that has further reduced the revenues and income to State and local government.

More troubling than that even, the Clinton administration recently proposed the ending of revenue sharing arrangements altogether. Mr. Speaker, this proposal has been opposed by local governments and it has been opposed by the Montana legislature.

Mr. Speaker, what this resolution says is that Montana local governments, Montana State government opposes the Clinton administration's policies of closing down the public lands and failure to fulfill its obligations under PILT payments. We have to restore resource development, Mr. Speaker, and we have to fully fund the PILT payments.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the resolution passed with 119 votes in the Montana 1998 legislature.

MONTANA STATE CAPITOL,
Helena, MT, March 31, 1999.

Hon. RICK HILL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HILL: On behalf of the State of Montana it is my honor and duty to send you the attached copy of House Joint Resolution 19 for your information.

House Joint Resolution 19 is urging the full funding of payments in lieu of taxes on federal land in Montana, the proper harvest of the allowable sale quota for timber, and a renewal of the federal governments' compact with state and local governments to contribute a fair share of taxes on federal land in Montana.

On behalf of the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate and all of the members of these esteemed bodies, I thank you for your consideration of this resolution.

Sincerely,

MIKE COONEY,
Secretary of State.

Enclosure.

A JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF MONTANA URGING THE FULL FUNDING OF PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES ON FEDERAL LAND IN MONTANA, THE PROPER HARVEST OF THE ALLOWABLE SALE QUOTA FOR TIMBER, AND A RENEWAL OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S COMPACT WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO CONTRIBUTE A FAIR SHARE OF TAXES ON FEDERAL LAND IN MONTANA

Whereas, the ability of Montana's economy has historically been dependent on use of our abundant natural resources; and

Whereas, the natural resource harvest has contributed billions of dollars to Montana's economy by providing employment opportunities to members of our communities and by supporting our business communities; and

Whereas, revenue from industries related to natural resource harvest has produced taxes for the support of local and state governments; and

Whereas, the federal government has long recognized the importance of supporting local governments in counties where the United States controls management of public lands by reimbursing state and local governments by payments in lieu of taxes (PILT); and

Whereas, a variety of federal legislation, such as the Forest Reserve Act of 1890 sought to make equitable distribution to counties and to the education system of 25% of net proceeds derived by the sale of resources harvested on federal land; and

Whereas, the federal government is now reducing the volume of timber cut in relation to the allowable sale quotas (ASQ), redistributing funds historically contained in the 25% fund (outfitter fees), reducing its commitment to full funding of PILT, which was reduced from 100% in 1994 to 53% in 1998, and redefining its commitment to states and counties (a decoupling effort to overturn the 1890 Forest Reserve Act); and

Whereas, this effort has and will cause irreparable financial harm to state and local governments, our natural resource industries, and employment opportunities for Montanans.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the Legislature of the State of Montana petition the U.S. Congress to ensure a full commitment by the federal government to full funding of PILT, a commitment toward the proper harvest of the natural resource base by way of already adopted ASQ, and a renewal of its compact with states and local governments to contribute to the federal government's fair share in taxes on land present in Montana but retained by the federal government.

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Western Governors' Association, and the Montana Congressional Delegation.

ENACT THE DIABETES RESEARCH WORKING GROUP REPORT

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago the Diabetes Research Working Group released its report entitled ''Conquering Diabetes: A Strategic Plan for the 21st Century.'' This document was a result of over a year of effort on the part of 12 scientific experts and four representatives from the lay diabetes community. Support was provided by dozens of other individuals both from within the National Institutes of Health and from outside the NIH.

The Working Group was established by Congress as part of the Fiscal Year 1998 Appropriations Act and based on legislation I introduced in the last session of Congress. It requested that NIH establish the Group to develop a comprehensive plan for NIH-funded diabetes research.

Dr. Ronald Kahn is an outstanding physician and scientist. He was selected the chairman of the group. He has spent literally thousands of hours meeting and talking with countless individuals to establish a consensus on the direction of diabetes research. The report has exceeded all expectations. It clearly details the magnitude of the disease both on the individual and on our society.

On an individual level, diabetes affects virtually every tissue of the body with severe damage. Since 1980, the age-adjusted death rate due to diabetes has increased by 30 percent, while the death rate has fallen for other common diseases, such as cardiovascular disease and stroke.

□ 1815

Diabetes affects about 16 million Americans, with 800,000 new cases diagnosed each year. The societal impact is likewise staggering. One in four Medicare dollars are spent to treat people with diabetes. And over one in 10 health care dollars spent are spent for diabetes. In economic terms, the cost to society is over $105 billion each year.

The report identifies five areas of extraordinary research opportunities for making progress in understanding and treating and ultimately preventing and curing diabetes. These five areas are the genetics of diabetes and its complications; autoimmunity and the beta cell; cell signaling and cell regulation; obesity; and clinical trials and research. Within each area, specific research recommendations are made, and in all areas rapid advancements are anticipated.

Finally, ''Conquering Diabetes,'' the name of this report, presents an analysis of current spending and estimates, program-by-program, of the cost of implementing each opportunity. Current spending, the group reports, is far short of what is required to make progress on this complex and difficult problem. They calculate that an increase of $384 million in fiscal year 2000, rising to $1.166 billion in fiscal year 2004 is, quote, required to have a robust and effective diabetes research effort, one which will reduce the rising burden created by this debilitating disease.

The release of the report has generated extraordinary interest among the scientific community, Mr. Speaker. Some argue that advances in research must be present to generate an increased NIH portfolio, while others argue that the presence of research dollars will generate advances as in the case of AIDS. By either standard, the time to establish a national commitment to diabetes research is now.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must seize upon the momentum in diabetes research and fully enact the Diabetes Research Working Group Report recommendations. It will take a commitment of $827 million in the next fiscal year. The scientific community has united to develop a concrete plan and now it is up to the Congress to unite to make this plan a reality.

I must conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that this is a very important initiative for our country. I know it is going to be a difficult year economically for the appropriations subcommittee that has to deal with this issue, but I must say it is in the Nation's best interest, it is in the interest of scientific research and the diabetic and all the complications that come from diabetes that the Congress step up and say $827 million is the number. I urge my colleagues to support this initiative in the House.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION SEEKS TO DEAL WITH HIGH COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS TO NATION'S SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk tonight about prescription drugs, about the high cost they represent to many seniors across this country, and about legislation that I have introduced in the House that will solve a good part, or allow substantial discounts on the cost of prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries.

But first a little history. Last June I asked for a report to be done by the minority staff, the Democratic staff, of the Committee on Government Reform on which I sit. I asked for that study to be done on prescription drugs, for one reason. Every time I spoke to seniors in my district back in Maine, I always heard the same questions: What can we do about the high cost of prescription drugs?

I remember distinctly one gentleman down in Sanford who stood up and said, ''You know, I'm spending $200 a month now on my prescription medication. My doctor just told me that I have to take another pill. The cost is $100 a month, and I'm not going to take it, because I simply can't afford to spend that additional $100.''

I heard that over and over again from seniors who simply could not afford to take the medication that their doctors told them they had to take. It is a serious problem across this country. Let us look at some of the numbers.

Many seniors, as this chart shows, simply cannot afford to take the medication their doctors prescribe. Seniors are 12 percent of the population in this country, but they use 33 percent of all prescription drugs. Approximately 37 percent of all seniors have no coverage at all for prescription drugs.

In fact, there are many seniors who do have some coverage, perhaps under a MediGap policy, but that coverage really does not do them very much good. For example, they may have a deductible of $250, a co-pay of 50 percent, and a cap of $1,200 or $1,500 per year. That does not do people who are paying $5,000 a year for their prescription drugs much good at all.

The average drug expenditure for Medicare beneficiaries is $942 per year. But in listening to seniors in my district in Maine, many are spending much more than that. In fact, many cannot afford to take the drugs that their doctor prescribes. So what do they do? One thing they do is they take one pill out of three, they mix and match, they cut a pill in half, they try to get by by taking some of their drugs but not all of their drugs.

It is a serious health care problem. We have reason to believe that it is sending people to the hospital, where expenses are high, who really do not need to go there if they could afford to take their medications. Thirteen percent of older Americans, that is almost 5 million people, report that they were forced to choose between buying food and buying medicine.

Let me give my colleagues a couple of stories. I hear from women in my district, they send me letters that say, ''I don't want my husband to know, but I am not taking my prescription medication, because my husband's sicker than I am and we can't afford both his medication and my medication. So I'm not taking mine.''

Back in July of 1998 when I did the first report on the study I will describe in a moment, I got a letter from a woman who sent me a letter saying, ''I'm writing to you because I don't know where else to turn. Here is a list of the prescription medications that my husband and I are supposed to take every month.'' The bottom line in prices was $650 per month. ''And here,'' she said, ''are our two monthly Social Security statements that represent all of our monthly income.'' The bottom line was $1,350. You cannot spend $650 of a $1,300 a month income on prescription drugs. You simply cannot do it. People cannot live like that. So they

are making choices that represent serious health risks to them.

Now, let me look at the study. I want to talk about a report that the Committee on Government Reform Democratic staff did. We went into the First District in Maine and asked questions. We wanted to compare the price that the manufacturers, the prescription drug manufacturers, give to their best customers, compared to the price that seniors pay in my district at the retail pharmacy level.

Here is how we did it. We looked at the price that the VA gets for its medications, the price that Medicaid gets for its medications, we looked at the price that large drug wholesalers get. Then we tried to figure out as best we could what hospitals and big HMOs get for a discount. Then we went and looked up the prices at the local retail level.

Here is what we found. The average retail drug prices for older Americans are almost twice as high as the prices that drug companies charge their most favored customers. We did not pick the drugs to investigate arbitrarily. We simply picked the five most commonly prescribed prescription drugs for seniors. These are branded prescription drugs.

You can see that there is Zocor, manufactured by Merck; Norvasc, manufactured by Pfizer; Prilosec, manufactured by Astra and Merck; Procardia XL, a Pfizer drug; and Zoloft, another Pfizer drug. The prices for favored customers, the best prices at which these pharmaceutical drugs are sold, for Zocor was $34.80. This is now a nationwide study, not just the First District of Maine. The retail price nationwide for seniors is $107.07. The price differential is 208 percent. Look at Norvasc. The price for favored customers, $59.71; the retail price for seniors $116.64, 95 percent higher than the price for favored customers. Prilosec, the price for favored customers is $59.10; the retail price for seniors, $114.56, a 94 percent increase. Procardia, $68.35 to favored customers; $130.33 at the retail price for seniors across this country, a 91 percent price differential. Zoloft, $115.70 for favored customers; and retail prices for seniors, $220.45, a 91 percent differential.

In short, for the five most commonly prescribed prescription drugs for seniors, seniors when they walk into a pharmacy, when they walk in without prescription drug coverage, they are paying 116 percent of the price that the favored customers of the drug companies are getting. Now, those favored customers are hospitals, big HMOs, and the Federal Government through the VA and through Medicaid.

That study, which was done first in Maine, has now been replicated in over 40 districts around this country, all of them at the request of Democratic Members of the House of Representatives who asked for the study. The results are the same. That differential means that seniors on average are paying more than twice as much as the drug companies' best customers.

Now, there are some prices that are even higher than that. Here is a price, a chart showing that the price for Ticlid for favored customers is a little bit over $30, but it is $105 for older Americans. Synthroid, a prescription drug that costs about $2 to favored customers, is around $30 for seniors, a huge differential, almost 1,500 percent. Micronase has a differential, its cost according to this chart, $7 or $8 as best we can tell, about $40 for older Americans.

That is happening all across this country. Older Americans are paying inflated prices for their prescription medication. What did our study show about who is getting all the money? The study showed that the pharmacies are not the problem.

The pharmacies in all of these studies are making a markup, to be sure, but a markup that ranges between 3 percent and 22 percent on their prescription medications. They are getting, in other words, an ordinary markup, and they are getting that markup because at the retail pharmacy level we are dealing with a competitive market. People can choose to go to a number of different pharmacies in their area.

When we talk to seniors, we find that they are in fact price shopping. Their price shopping has become more desperate, more anxious now than it was in the past because, frankly, they are having a harder and harder time paying their bills. The bottom line is, of that 116 percent price differential, maybe 25 percent maximum is going to the pharmacies. That means somewhere around 90 percent or so is going straight to the manufacturers.

Now, is the pharmaceutical industry an industry about which we need to have grave concerns? I suggest not. Why do I say that? Fortune magazine reports that the most profitable industry in the country by any measure is the pharmaceutical industry. This chart is hard to read, but if we look at profitability as return on revenues, the number one industry is pharmaceuticals, with an 18.5 percent return in 1998. The next most profitable industry on that is commercial banks at something like 13 percent.

If you look at return on assets, another way of measuring profitability, the pharmaceuticals are at 16.6 percent. Soaps and cosmetics are the second most profitable industry at 11 percent. If we look at return on equity, the number one again is pharmaceuticals at 39.4 percent. Soaps and cosmetics are at 35 percent.

□ 1830

No matter how we look at this subject, we are talking about the most profitable industry in the country charging the highest prices in the country to seniors who do not have prescription drug coverage.

If we look out beyond this country, we will find, as we have done studies comparing prices here versus prices in Canada and prices in Mexico, that the highest prices for prescription drugs in the world are charged in the United States, and within the United States the highest prices in the country are charged to those seniors who do not have any insurance for their prescription drugs.

Now what is one possible way to deal with this problem?

In developing this legislation we worked with the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), a Democrat, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), a Democrat, to put together legislation. I have sponsored the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act. It is H.R. 664, and here are the basic provisions:

H.R. 664 would allow pharmacies to buy drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the best price given to the Federal Government, and the best price is usually a price that is charged to the Veterans Administration or Medicaid or some other program. What the bill does is it gives senior citizens the benefit of the same discount received by hospitals, big HMOs and the Federal Government. What is unique about this legislation is that it does not cost the Federal Government any significant amount of money. We can achieve a 30 to 40 percent discount in prescription drug prices at no significant cost to the Federal Government, and how does that happen? Because it happens this way:

All we are saying is that the Federal Government should be the negotiating agent, the buying agent, for people who are already participants in a Federal health care plan: Medicare. The Federal Government already provides for hospital care and doctors care and other benefits, but Medicare does not provide any funds at all for outpatient prescription drug coverage.

Why is that? Well, back in 1965 when Medicare was created, prescription drugs did not cost anything. There were not, frankly, that many drugs with the potency and effectiveness of drugs that are available today, and the pharmaceutical industry gets a great deal of credit for developing many new drugs that have improved the quality of life for people. But if someone cannot afford to buy the drugs, they do not do them any good.

H.R. 664 does not establish a new Federal bureaucracy, it does not cost any significant amount of money, but it would reduce prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries by 30 or even 40 percent.

This is a bill that has broad support in the Democratic Caucus. There are 111 cosponsors to this bill, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), our Independent, and Democrats all across this country have lined up to say we want to reduce the cost of prescription drugs for seniors. To date, not one single Republican has cosponsored this legislation.

The bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senators TED KENNEDY and TIM JOHNSON, but again not one single Republican has stood up for senior citizens against the pharmaceutical industry. It is not happening, and people need to ask why. Because a bill that provides a benefit of that magnitude, a 30 percent discount, and yet costs the Federal Government no significant amount of money is not objectionable.

Now, one of the things that I found is that, and it has been interesting, is that as the prescription drug studies have been replicated around the country, people begin to understand that there is a solution out there. This is part of the solution. A Medicare prescription drug benefit of some kind is another part of the prescription. But the fact is that here is something that can be done right now. We do not need comprehensive Medicare reform in order to give seniors a discount that other people in the society already get.

I am pleased to see so many of my colleagues here tonight. I promised the first person here that she would be able to stand up first, our new member from Cleveland, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the discussion of the high price of prescription drugs for the elderly and in support of H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness Act for seniors, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for organizing this special order about this very important issue.

This is a matter that will affect us all at some point in our lives. In my district, greater Cleveland, Ohio, I am currently conducting a study of the cost of prescription drugs for seniors. We are all aware that seniors need more money for prescription drugs. Many seniors cannot afford the medication their doctors prescribe to maintain their health. We shudder when we learn that they must choose between buying food and buying medication. As Congresspersons, we have an opportunity to do something to ease that burden by supporting H.R. 664.

The need is obvious. As we age, our health gets worse. Medical technology has afforded us longer, healthier lives. Our collective longevity places a strain on Medicare, Social Security, health plans and insurance. We know these things. What perhaps we do not know is that seniors are being charged higher prices for medication than are the so-called preferred customers. One would think seniors, consumers of such a high volume of prescriptions, would be preferred customers. This is not the case.

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) was the first Member to request that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight conduct a study on the price of prescription drugs to seniors in June of 1998. What the study found is alarming, to say the least. My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) subsequently did a study in the State of Ohio. Let me go just give a couple of examples. Let us take for instance Micronase, a diabetes medication by Upjohn. Micronase for a preferred customer is $10.05, but to a senior the vital medication costs $44.28. That is right, a difference of 341 percent. That is just an example of a laundry list of differing prices.

I believe we need to step in to protect taxpayers from being gouged by drug manufacturers. We must protect our elderly from corporations seeking to profit from their illness. This issue is of particular importance to me because my parents are seniors. In fact, my father, Andrew Tubbs, will be 79 years old tomorrow, 63 years older than my son, Mervin, who turned 16 today.

When I ran for Congress last year, throughout my district I received numerous complaints from seniors on this very issue. I promised to work on this issue, and I always try to keep my promise. That is why I rise in support of H.R. 664 and thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and my Democratic colleagues for bringing this issue to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to support the Prescription Drug Fairness For Seniors Act.

Mr. ALLEN. I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) we appreciate her support and hard work on this issue.

I yield now to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. I want to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) very much for yielding to me to discuss this very important issue and also commend him for his leadership on it. I think all the Members of this House who are concerned about health care and particularly the health care of older Americans, and in fact every American who is concerned about this for themselves and for their parents owes him a debt of gratitude for the leadership that he has shown on this critically important issue.

Prescription drugs, as we know, are an essential part of health care in America, and they are particularly essential for those who need it the most, and that inevitably is people as they age. As we age, we call upon the health care delivery system much more frequently. The elderly, in fact, spend three times as much of their income on health care as compared to that is which is spent by the average American. Our Nation's largest health care program, Medicare, currently does not provide even a minimal prescription drug benefit. Senior citizens use one-third of all prescriptions that are issued in our country, and yet nearly 40 percent of our seniors have no prescription drug coverage. They, therefore, must incur drug expenditures out of their pocket. Seniors on fixed incomes are the people who can least afford to shell out thousands of dollars a year for drugs on which their health and often their very lives depend.

In short, we are asking them to choose often between the necessities of life, often between the basic essentials of life, choices between buying food or buying the medication they need to sustain their health. The irony in all of this is that in many cases the drug manufacturers are charging senior citizens double what they charge their most favored customers, as our colleague pointed out in those charts he showed us a few moments ago. Their favorite customers, of course, are large HMOs, or Federal Government or other large purchasers.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight minority staff under the gentleman's leadership conducted a study on drug prices in the district that I represent as they did in districts across the country. The study surveyed prices at pharmaceuticals for 10 prescription drugs that are most commonly used by elderly Americans. The average price differential between what the drug companies' most favored customers pay and what a senior citizen in my congressional district in New York that stretches from the Finger Lakes across the Catskill Mountains to the Hudson Valley, the difference between what is paid by HMOs and senior citizens averaged 106 percent. So that is an extraordinary differential.

For one drug, Ticlid, the price differential was in fact 270 percent difference. In other words, the senior citizens were paying 270 times what the price was for a person with a member of a large HMO, for example, or someone else who could purchase in bulk.

The difference between what seniors pay and what large HMOs pay is not merely result of volume discounts, however. There are other factors that intervene. Compared to the markup on other consumer products, which average around 22 percent, the markup on prescription drugs was much higher, the average markup there being 116 percent. This price markup is coming directly as a result of the markup from the manufacturers. As my colleague pointed out, it is not the corner drug store that is scalping these prices. It is the drug manufacturers themselves that are causing these enormously high prices, and therefore they are the ones who are getting the huge profits.

Our Nation's seniors deserve fair treatment. The Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act, which we have introduced under the leadership here of the gentleman from Maine, would help ensure more equal treatment, fairer treatment, and better treatment and healthier treatment for our senior citizens. It would do so by allowing pharmacies to purchase drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the best price charged by the Federal Government.

This bill is estimated to have a benefit to senior citizens in that it will reduce the prices they pay for prescription drugs, as the gentleman has indicated to us in his charts by about 40 percent on average across the board. Each senior citizen will realize a 40 percent saving in the prescription drug

prices they require to maintain their health and in some cases their lives. Making prescription drugs more affordable for seniors is a strong first step as we work toward expanding the Medicare program to include a prescription drug benefit.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for the leadership that he has shown. The passage of this bill, which he has indicated, is unfortunately at this moment sponsored only by Democrats. If we manage to pass this bill, it is going to mean an enormous saving for every elderly American across the country.

So I praise the gentleman for his leadership in this very, very important issue, and I am very pleased to join with him in cosponsoring this bill, and he and I and all the others of us that are working so hard to get it passed will succeed, this bill will succeed, and the beneficiaries will be elderly Americans all across our country.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, and I want to thank him for all his work on this legislation here within the House and also for conducting that study back in his district, which shows basically the same kind of pattern that we have seen across the country.

I would like now to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in today's special order to highlight the high cost of prescription drugs for seniors in America, and I wish to compliment the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for first organizing this special order and, secondly, for introducing the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act, H.R. 664.

Sooner or later every American will be affected by Medicare. Like death and taxes, the coming of old age is inevitable for the living. The need for affordable and quality health care for seniors, therefore, is in everyone's best interest. When one's resources are limited like many of our constituents, we know we need to give this attention.

Mr. Speaker, Texas is no different from anyone else.

□ 1845

Its health care, the need for health care, becomes even more acute. Currently, Medicare offers health care insurance protection for 39 million seniors and disabled Americans. The program provides broad coverage for the cost of many primarily acute health services. However, there are many gaps in program coverage. The most glaring shortcoming is the fact that Medicare has a very limited prescription drug benefit.

Most beneficiaries have some form of private or public health care insurance to cover expenses not met by Medicare. The reality is that many of these plans do not offer coverage or offer very limited protection for drug expenses. The result is that Medicare beneficiaries pay approximately half of their total drug expenses out-of-pocket.

For many seniors, the existing system imposes quite a financial burden, and for many it means choosing between medication or food or utilities or other essentials. The average drug expenditure for Medicare enrollees living in the community was $600 in 1995. Total spending for persons with some drug coverage was $691 compared to $432 for those with no coverage, according to data compiled by the Congressional Research Service.

The average expenditure per person varied widely depending upon the type of insurance coverage. In every category, spending was significantly higher for those who had supplementary drug coverage than those who did not. Higher spending reflects higher use rates. In 1995, persons with coverage used 20.3 prescriptions per year compared to 15.3 prescriptions for those with no supplementary drug coverage.

One inference that the Congress and the President should take to heart from these figures is obvious. Based on their limited income, some seniors are foregoing the purchase of needed prescription drugs so that they can eat, pay bills or submit their rent checks on time.

It is absolutely amazing to me that the U.S. Government would foster a Medicare policy that directs seniors to choose whether they have prescription drugs or whether their electric bill is paid on time. That is a choice without a favorable outcome.

Based on this problem, the Congress and the President should be spurred into action to approve the legislation of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) or some legislation that brings additional prescription coverage for Medicare beneficiaries. Obviously, this benefit will be expensive, but I am confident that the Congress and the President, working with the drug manufacturers and health care community, can achieve this goal.

A second concern that exists in the current Medicare system, that does not feature a drug benefit, is the difference between what seniors pay versus what other purchasers of health insurance paid. It affects them as their limited income begins.

Studies by the staff of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), who is on the Committee on Government Reform, have revealed that pharmaceutical companies are taking advantage of older Americans through price discrimination. These studies show that in Texas and other States seniors pay for prescription drugs, on average, nearly twice as much as the drug companies' favored customers, such as the Federal Government and large health maintenance organizations.

This price difference is approximately 5 times greater than the average price difference in other consumer goods. I intend to work with the Committee on Government Reform to determine the extent of this problem as we complete the study in my district.

In the meantime, the Congress and the President need to address the lack of Medicare prescription drug benefits. As a cosponsor of the bill offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), I would urge all Members to cosponsor it. This is not a partisan piece of legislation. This is for all seniors.

This legislation allows pharmacies to purchase drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the best price charged to the Federal Government through programs such as the Veterans Administration or Medicaid. The legislation has been estimated to reduce prescription costs for seniors by more than 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate this evening.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks. She has done great work on this issue. We appreciate her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY). We have talked about this issue on numerous occasions and he has told me a good many stories about how the high cost of prescription drugs affects people in his district.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) for allowing me to step up before him for a second because I do have to leave.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I wanted to come here this evening and talk with all the others that think this is an important issue. I want to take a little leave from the prepared remarks that I had to compliment the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for the leadership that he has shown on this.

To let people know it goes beyond just filing the bill, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and I shared time on the Committee on Government Reform, which unfortunately under its current leadership has been wasting a lot of time on issues that apparently are not getting that committee too far into anything concrete.

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has understood that that committee has great progress in line, it has great potential, and he has taken on an issue here that is important to the American people and is what that committee ought to be doing on a regular basis. So I commend the gentleman from Maine for stepping forward on that.

Shortly after the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) did his study, he was kind enough to share it. I did another study after the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) did his, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) did his. It was one of those succeeding studies that sort of went domino effect right across the country, as we have heard mentioned here.

The results in my district were no different than they were in others. Seniors that are not covered in a large

plan are paying an extraordinary high amount for prescription drugs.

This whole health care system that we have is imploding at the current time. We said this in 1993 and 1994. We told people then that if we did not do something about the systemic problems that we had in our health care delivery system, we were going to find that managed care companies would take every ounce of profit that they had out of it, squeeze it out and hand back to the American people a problem.

Essentially, that is happening in large part, and aggravating that situation is the huge cost of prescription drugs; the cost to managed care systems themselves, the cost to hospitals, and the cost to individuals that are not covered on a plan large enough to drive a lower price.

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and I have both heard the prescription drug manufacturing companies come out and tell us that this is cost fixing, price fixing. We both smiled at that because we know it is the exact opposite of that. They do not have a free market system. In fact, the prescription drug companies are running monopolies. They have patents on those drugs and they are determining the prices on them.

They are discriminating in two different ways that we found out through our reports. Overseas, where people have universal or single payer health care or they have some system to buy en gros for people, they are driving the prices down and then that cost is being made up, that profit for the company made up by shifting the higher costs to people that are not covered in this country. Then within this country, people that are covered in plans get a lower price because the plan is large enough to bargain, and that cost is then shifted onto those that are not in that position.

We need to have the majority understand that this is not a partisan issue. They have made it a partisan issue. The fact that we can have 111 or 112 sponsors to a bill and none of them be from the majority party, when it is a bill that talks to an issue that the American people speak about every day, and there is not one person that is going to speak here this evening that is not going to say that they took the studies and reports in their district and went to seniors and went to others in their district and talked about it, received a tremendous response from people who have said, ''That has been an issue for years. We are glad that Congress is listening. Something has to be done.''

Now, obviously, what has to be done is Medicare has to include prescription drugs in that program in long range, and that, I hope, will come to fruition at some point this time. In the interim, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has had the foresight to put this bill together, and I have been fortunate enough to cosponsor it and move it forward to allow people to have the benefit of the Federal supply system.

Strangely enough, well, it is not really strange, it is no coincidence at all that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is a cosponsor of significant campaign finance reform, as am I and most of the other people that will speak here this evening.

Amazingly, in the early 1990s when many products were lifted and allowed States to buy under the Federal supply system, originally prescription drugs were on that list. Consequently, by the end of that fall when the appropriations bill was done, there was a single sentence in there that took prescription drugs out. So now prescription drug companies make 28 percent profit in some instances. Other companies in the Fortune 500 would be happy to have 10 percent profits.

Nobody is saying we do not want them to have profits. They have been the top 20 profitable companies across the world in the last years. We want them to make a profit. We do not want them to shift the responsibility to the most vulnerable part of this population. We need to improve our health care system. We need to make sure that people can do it.

And when we get through with this bill, when it passes, I am hoping we move on and allow legislation to pass to take away any impediments, anything that would stand in the way of States or entire regions of this country joining together to get their prescription drugs at even lower prices. We can put in protections for the manufacturers to make sure that their prices are not driven down worldwide, but we have to make sure that we move in that direction.

Let me leave the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) with one story that we have shared and that I think drives it home. There is a woman in my district who lives in Newburyport, Massachusetts, who wrote a letter and then she shared it later with the newspaper, and the letter begins, ''I am sitting at my desk with an involuntary flow of tears streaming down my cheeks. My husband sits close by silently eating his heart out. I am angry. I am distraught. I am feeling extremely defenseless.''

She goes on to say, ''My husband just returned from the drugstore. When I read the receipt, I felt a sense of panic and my eyes welled up. $250? This has to be a mistake. No, it is $250. But how can that be? We just paid $400 two weeks ago. We cannot keep on doing this. Our income tax return bailed us out last time. Now what? I took a quick mental inventory of our financial status. Our one credit card is maxed. Our bankruptcy prevents us from obtaining a loan. We are living paycheck to paycheck. We have overdraft but when that is exhausted, what will we do? I have no aces in the hole. All I have left is hope and prayer.''

What people like her are hoping and praying is that Congress will not make this a partisan issue; Congress will understand that we are here not to waste time, as the Committee on Government Reform does all too often. It is here to act on legislation that is important to the American people, legislation like H.R. 664.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress and helping us getting it passed.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for his good work. He is working hard on this, and the story that he told about his constituent is repeated in stories from others all across this country, because everywhere across this country there are people who are unable to pay for all their prescription drugs and their food and their electricity and their other living expenses that they have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), who as a registered pharmacist took the lead in setting up the prescription drug task force. I can say honestly no one has worked harder on this legislation than the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), for yielding, and I want to thank him for this outstanding bill and for this idea that has helped create this bill. He has provided the leadership that has gotten us where we are with this effort, and I appreciate very much what he has done.

I also want to thank our colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), and all of the others that have joined us here this evening and that are cosponsors of this bill.

I think this is something that for most of us it is just a simple matter of fairness. It is unbelievable that we would allow a situation to develop in this country because of our laws and our regulations that we have put in place, that would create a system where our senior citizens could be so grossly abused as they are right now by the prescription drug manufacturers in this country. It is a very distressing thing.

We are the greatest Nation that has ever been in the history of the world. No other country has ever had our economic or our military or political power, and yet we allow a situation like this to become dominant and to take advantage of our senior citizens.

When I first began the campaign in 1996, one of the first experiences I had was encountering a senior citizen that came to me and he said, ''Medicare does not pay for my medicine. I have a $500-a-month Social Security check. My medicine is $600 a month. What do I do?'' I didn't have an answer for him. I thought I knew a lot about this business at that time, but that man has plagued me ever since. I think about him every day.

It seems so unfair that we would let the manufacturers, the pharmaceutical manufacturers in this country, create a situation where that man who had worked hard, played by the rules, tried to do everything that he thought he was supposed to do to be prepared for his old age, get taken advantage of in that way.

□ 1900

If we had someone out here going door to door, taking the food out of our senior citizens' mouths, we would have them arrested, and yet that is exactly what is happening here with our senior citizens in this country. We all pay too much for prescription medication. The gentleman has done an outstanding job this evening of explaining that these are the most profitable companies anyplace. They are the most profitable legal businesses that exist. And yet, we allow them to take advantage of our senior citizens like this. We all encourage making a profit. We want these companies to be profitable, but when they make a profit at the expense of taking advantage and abusing senior citizens who cannot protect themselves, it becomes a moral issue, and that is the reason we have to do something about it.

As the United States Congress, we should pass H.R. 664 and do everything that we can to at least give our seniors an even break. It is almost unbelievable to me that we have not done this a long time ago. This does not cost the government anything. All it does is make our seniors part of a very large purchasing pool and give them a good deal. For once in their lives, they get an even break.

As we see the way the system is structured, it is unbelievable to me that the Federal Government has allowed it to go on and on and on. Every time that we have held the prescription drug manufacturers responsible, when we created generic drugs basically in this country, the prescription drug manufacturers came to us and they said, oh, this will be a terrible thing. We will not get any new products. The fact is, the investment they made in creating new products has more than quadrupled. It just simply does not hold water that they are not going to continue to invest in creating new products. We all know what an essential thing that this is. As I have said, it is a matter of basic fairness.

I appreciate again the gentleman's efforts this evening to bring this to the public's attention, to bring it to our attention. I thank all of my colleagues for being here to support this effort and I look forward to the day when we can stand here and say, this is law. We have done the right thing, we have done the fair thing, and America is going to be a better place for it. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As I said before, no one has worked harder on this legislation than the gentleman has, and I agree with the gentleman, we will pass this legislation before we are done.

I would now like to recognize one of our new Members, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue. I think the gentleman has been out there on the front and he has really demonstrated why we need to do something about this cause.

I rise today to talk about the problem of prescription drug costs. I have held a series of town hall meetings around my district in New Mexico and I ask senior citizens in these town hall meetings about health care and what their problems are. It became apparent to me very early on that one of the most frequently mentioned problems was how to deal with rising prescription drug costs.

As one woman put it, she said, on a fixed income, I have to make a tough choice between my prescriptions and food and other essentials. So imagine having to make a choice between food and one's prescription drugs. There could not be a tougher choice.

Well, basically we have heard some discussion here about what the problem is, and I would like to identify a little bit further where I think it is coming from. First of all, I think it is absolutely clear that we have an increasing drug cost situation going on. Clearly, Medicare does not cover the cost of prescription drugs. When I ask in my district, people said they got insurance, supplemental insurance, but found out that it did not even cover most of the cost of prescription drugs. The HMOs, although many of them say they cover the cost of prescription drugs, there are problems getting drugs there. So we have seniors paying out of their own pocket in order to cover those prescription drug costs, and we have big drug companies who are making record profits, and yet they discriminate between preferred customers and senior citizens.

So this is an issue that Congress can really do something about. First, we can attack it with the gentleman's piece of legislation, which I think goes a long way toward trying to sort out this discrimination issue. We can require that the large, big drug companies sell at that preferred customer cost to the small pharmacies who, in my district, have said they would just pass that on to senior citizens, pass on that savings.

Second, we can pass a real tough patient Bill of Rights. That patient Bill of Rights would say that if a doctor prescribes a drug, then it is going to be required that it be paid for, and we have such a proposal, a Democratic proposal that is circulating that I have signed on to and I am sure many others have signed on to here.

Third, when we get into the whole issue of Medicare and making sure that Medicare is solvent, we can at least say that part or all of prescription drugs should be covered under that program which has helped so many since it was put in place in the 1960's.

So let me just finish by saying, it is time we do something now; it is time that we move forward. I appreciate so much having the opportunity to speak and to have all of my other colleagues here that are working on this issue. I want to once again thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I read some of the material that came out when the gentleman did his report in New Mexico and it was compelling information. I am so glad to have the gentleman working with us on this issue.

I would like now to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the distinguished and more-senior-than-many-of-us-Member from Ohio who has shown great enthusiasm and leadership on this issue since we started. I really appreciate all of the gentleman's help. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine and I want to also thank and laud the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for all of the good work that he has done, and all the others here this evening who have shown leadership on perhaps the most important issue facing America, America's elderly population.

Last year the CEO of Bristol-Myers Squibb made a $1.2 million salary, a $1.9 million bonus, and $30.4 million in stock options. Last year, drug company profits outpaced those of every other industry by more than 5 percentage points. Millions of dollars for executives, billions of dollars in profits.

Last year, 4.5 million seniors filled their prescriptions OR purchased food. They had to make that choice. They could not afford both. Millions of dollars for executives, billions of dollars in profits, yet senior citizens had to choose between food and medication.

Seniors are paying higher prices for prescription drugs than any other purchaser because drug companies simply know they can get away with it. Medications are not luxury items, seniors have little market clout, and drug companies wield monopoly power. As a result, seniors pay prices set high enough to generate unrivaled profit margins and compensate for the discounts offered to other, more influential purchasers. The highest prices are charged to those least able to afford prescription drugs and most likely to need prescription drugs.

What kind of system is that?

Drug companies tell us it is the right system. They say if the United States no longer permits drug companies to gouge individual senior citizens, or even if we provide a meaningful insurance vehicle that puts seniors on an equal footing with other large purchasing groups, drug industry profits, they tell us, will be so stifled that innovation in medical progress will stop dead. That is what they tell us.

But how much do these companies need to earn over and above their research and development costs to feel sufficiently appreciated? Drug companies earn exorbitant profits by charging seniors double, sometimes triple, even occasionally quadruple, what they charge large purchasers inside the United States and individual purchasers, and large purchasers outside the United States.

Even seniors with prescription drug coverage are often overwhelmed by their prescription expenses. In Medicare supplemental plans, for example, when one gets past the deductible, the modest annual limit and the 50 percent coinsurance, coverage just does not look much like coverage anymore.

In 1999, 5 million seniors, some with and others without drug coverage, will pay more than $1,000 out-of-pocket for prescription drugs. About 1 million will pay $2,000 or more for prescription drugs. These numbers could be significantly lower if seniors were simply treated like other customers.

Prescription drug companies claim that if we take action to protect seniors from price gouging, everyone else's prescription drug prices will go up. Apparently, drug companies cannot tolerate any reduction in their record-breaking profits. They must compensate for charging seniors reasonable prices by upping the prices charged to other payers.

I would like to again thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for the Democratic proposal, the Prescription Drug Fairness For Seniors Act, which prevents drug companies from singling the elderly out, charging them distorted prices relative to other purchasers. This bill makes sense. I hope the Republican leadership will do its jobs and demand that drug companies are held accountable.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership on this. I welcome the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Shows).

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be here. I thank the gentleman. No Americans, especially our senior citizens, should ever be forced to choose between buying food or medicine and they should not have to decide between paying the electric bill and their prescription bill. That is a shame to say, but in America today we allow that to happen.

Early this month I read an article in The Washington Post where a woman with stomach tumors stopped taking her prescription medication because she could not afford to pay for it. She said not taking her medicine caused unbearable pain, but she really had no choice, because she could not afford it. There is just something about that that is not right.

We have millions and millions of Americans suffering from high blood pressure and diabetes and heart disease and medicines that are absolutely necessary for these people to take. These are not luxuries, this is something that we have to have. It is not an option. Yet, prescription drugs costs continue to rise and many seniors just do not have the money to pay for it.

I can give a personal example. My mother-in-law is on a fixed income. If it was not for family, she really would not be able to do it. Something has to do it for them. If a senior citizen has to pay $250 a month for just one prescription drug, that adds up to $1,000 annually. Think about it. Most of them have more than one.

Our seniors spend a lifetime working hard and paying taxes. They help build our roads, educate our children, help provide for the defense of this country, a lot of them are our veterans; and after all of these sacrifices they have made, they deserve the peace of mind knowing that they can get medication that is affordable.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the gentleman's bill, the Prescription Drug Fairness For Seniors Act of 1999. I think it is a fine piece of legislation.

This legislation would substantially lower the cost of what the senior citizen would have to pay. Right now, they pay almost twice as much for prescription drugs as the drug companies. That is what they call favored customers or volume customers such as the Federal Government and large HMOs. This legislation will allow pharmacies to purchase drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the same rate as the so-called preferred customers.

But we can do more to help alleviate the cost of prescription drugs. We should also pass H.R. 805, the legislation of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), to allow seniors to have access to FDA-approved generic medicines. These generic brands can be bought, as we know, 30 to 40 percent cheaper and they provide the same services. If seniors are having to pay more for a name brand when they can get the same effect from a generic brand they should be able to do that at that reduced price.

Our long-term goal should be to figure out how to add prescription drug benefits to Medicare. Seniors ought not have to worry about that. We ought to be doing it for them.

Let us make prescription drugs more accessible and affordable to our seniors. Let us pass H.R. 664 and H.R. 805 and make it so our seniors in America never have to choose in America between buying food and their medicine. Let us make sure our seniors never have to go without their medication because they cannot afford it. Let us add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. We know it is the right thing to do. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for being here tonight and for all of his hard work on this issue.

I yield now to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine for yielding, but I especially thank him for his consistent leadership on this very important issue.

Yesterday, in the District of Columbia, I had my Senior Legislative Day. There I released the study for the District of Columbia entitled, Prescription Drug Pricing in Washington DC: Drug Companies Profit at the Expense of Older Americans. That study was prepared by the minority staff of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on which both the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and I serve.

The gentleman's bill is very important, but it is a very moderate bill.

□ 1915

It would only level the playing field so that seniors can take advantage of bulk pricing the way many Americans, most of them younger than seniors, already do. I do not have any problem with bulk pricing. It is a standard American practice. In fact, it is a standard practice throughout the world.

In the case of the drug companies, the bill of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) would allow them to share some of the profits, they are now hoarding $25 billion a year, by spreading the standard practice of bulk buying more widely to cover those who can least afford to buy their drugs individually.

But I want to say right here and now that while I support the gentleman's bill, I am a cosponsor of the gentleman's bill, I believe that we can afford a prescription drug benefit in Medicare, and I want to say why.

There has been a revolution in American medicine. At the time that Medicare was passed, seniors could go to the drugstore and for a couple of dollars, buy the couple of pills that were available for what ails them. Today there has been a shift from invasive procedures to drug therapy, in effect.

If I could ask the gentleman a question, does the gentleman know whether there has been a study as to how much the use of drugs and medicines is saving the Medicare program?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentlewoman that I am not familiar with the study, but it has to be saving substantial amounts. Spending on prescription drugs is going up 15 percent a year, and we all know that the number of hospital beds in use is going down, at the very time that seniors are living longer. So there have to be substantial savings here, but I am not aware of a study that would quantify that.

Ms. NORTON. I raise the question for the gentleman only because this much seems clear: We are forcing down costs in the Medicare program. Nothing is forcing down the costs of drugs. So I would wager that there are billions of dollars being saved by the Medicare program by not having to pay for drugs.

What I am suggesting is that precisely because they are saving that money, that the Medicare program

ought to allow some of those costs to shift to the program itself.

After all, that program is willing to pay for the most costly procedures if prescribed by a physician, but it is not willing to pay for procedures under the direction of a pharmacist. This is absolutely irrational. The cost is greatly out of proportion and is quite outrageous. We will pay for institutional care by allowing a senior to spend down her resources until she gets nursing home care paid for entirely by Medicaid, but we will not pay for a drug benefit that will keep her out of a nursing home altogether.

Seniors cannot possibly take this much longer. I cannot believe that the seniors who have saved colas and social security will not force prescription drugs into their Medicare. If we are going to change how we treat people from invasive procedures and save the taxpayer money, then it seems to me we have a moral obligation to shift some of that savings to seniors who are on limited incomes and cannot possibly continue to shoulder the burden they are shouldering now.

In the report done for my own district, we found that my seniors were paying 137 percent more than preferred customers. An example, and that is six times, by the way, more than they pay for other consumer goods, an example was Synthroid, a thyroid hormone drug where the drug to the preferred customer is $1.75 a dose, and $31.43 a dose to the senior.

The gentleman's bill, minimally, must be passed, and it must move us on to making prescription drugs a benefit of Medicare.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and I will return again on another occasion to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

I want to thank all Members who have been here tonight.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act. This issue is one of great concern to a number of my constituents who are Medicare beneficiaries who use one third of all prescription drugs in the United States.

On average, seniors pay nearly twice as much as the drug companies' favored customers, such as the federal government and large HMOs and 37% of our nation's seniors do not have prescription drug coverage. In my district in Texas alone, many seniors are forced to pay up to 109% or more for the most commonly used prescription drugs. It is time to show our nation's seniors that their health is more important than drug company profits.

I have had a great number of constituents contact me personally to share their concerns for those seniors that are literally having to choose between buying food and buying their prescriptions. An even greater number of individuals endanger their lives every day by not taking the required dosage or only filling some of their prescription medications since they can not afford to meet all of their medical needs.

It is high time that the U.S. Congress address the issue of a Medicare benefit for prescription drugs. How much longer are we going to allow the pharmaceutical industry, which is currently enjoying record profits, to dictate the health care choices of our senior citizens?

I support H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act because it allows pharmacies to purchase drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the best price charged to the federal government though programs such as the VA or Medicaid. This legislation would reduce prescription drug prices for seniors by more than 40%, and without imposing price controls, but putting an end to price discrimination.

It is time to show our nation's seniors that their health is more important than drug company profits.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LOIS MOORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR H.R. 664, LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR DISCOUNTS ON PRESCRIPTION DRUGS TO SENIOR CITIZENS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for his kindness in reaching out to me for time.

I am going to take just a moment, Mr. Speaker, before I begin a tribute to Dr. Lois Moore, because it is absolutely appropriate to acknowledge my support for H.R. 664, the legislation that deals with a discount of prescription drugs for senior citizens.

It is interesting that we find it difficult to get such legislation to the floor of the House. I am very pleased that I am engaging in a study in my district with pharmacies, and I was very glad to hear the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) say that this is not an issue dealing with pharmacies. In fact, it is with our large pharmaceutical companies.

In fact, there will be processes under H.R. 664 where the burden would not be heavily on the pharmacies, but it is important that just like they give big discounts to hospitals and HMOs, that they give discounts on prescription drugs as well to our senior citizens.

When I traveled in my district and visited five senior citizen sites, every one of them said, I have to choose between eating, paying light bills, heat bills, and getting my prescription drugs, as we well know, hearing from my mother that there is an enormous amount of prescription drugs, because we are living longer, that many seniors have to take.

It keeps them healthy. It keeps them happy. It keeps them able to do the things that they would like to do. Why should we penalize them? I hope that we can move H.R. 664 to the floor very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, let me acknowledge the purpose of my special order this evening is a tribute to Dr. Lois Moore, a selfless leader in our community who has served the Harris County Hospital District, and we will be losing her expertise.

She is known in our community in Harris County, in Houston, Texas, as one of its greatest leaders in the health care community. Her leadership, expertise, commitment, and presence will be truly missed at the hospital district. However, we know that she will continue on to service.

Under her leadership as the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Harris County Hospital District, the hospital district was named among the top 100 hospitals in the United States in 1994 and again in 1995 by Modern Health Care Magazine.

After graduation from Prairie View A&M School of Nursing 35 years ago, Moore began her public health care service in the Jefferson Davis Hospital emergency room. She soon became the emergency center charge nurse.

Through the 1960s and 1970s she moved from evening shift nursing supervisor to assistant director of nursing at Ben Taub hospital. In 1977 she was named administrator at Jefferson Davis Hospital. During this time she earned a Bachelor of Science degree in nursing and a Master of Education degree.

Moore was appointed chief operating officer for the Harris County Hospital District in 1987, and on February 28, 1999, the Board of Managers of the Hospital District appointed her president and CEO. She has, therefore, served us for 10 years in that capacity.

As president and CEO of the Harris County Hospital District, the 6th largest inpatient health care system in the United States, Moore oversaw three hospitals, 11 community health centers, one freestanding HIV-AIDS treatment center, and eight school-based clinics, two very important things.

School-based clinics, they have been proven to be successful in preventative health care, and 11 community health centers, they also have been proven to be successful in preventing disease, in helping people to understand health care.

With the recent statistics that have suggested to us that it has been very difficult for minorities, Hispanics, African Americans, and Asians, as well, to access health care in America, Lois Moore has been a shining star to ensure that her community gets good health care. She has worked with a very good board. We are looking forward to the fact that the board will continue her leadership and her message, and that they will select a person of quality like Lois Moore.

The district has had an annual budget of approximately $528 million with more than 50,000 employees. Ben Taub General Hospital and Lyndon B. Johnson General Hospital treat 77 percent of Houston's serious trauma, and I found it very, very exciting to see Ben Taub on one of our major news network shows, I believe Nightline, citing it as one of the best trauma care hospitals in the Nation, maybe the world.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that Lois Moore has served her community as a stellar leader. I am so proud to call Lois Moore my friend. Ms. Moore has testified before national committees on health care reform, served with Governor Ann Richard's Task Force on Health Care, and is a frequent speaker on public health issues and health care reform.

She has a husband by the name of Hard, a daughter Yolanda, son-in-law Mike Williams, and two granddaughters Kendra and Jasmine.

Let me simply close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that all of the Eighteenth Congressional District and I believe all of the State of Texas salutes Lois Moore, our past president of the Harris County Hospital District, a great humanitarian, a great Houstonian, Texan, and great American.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to speak on behalf of Lois Jean Moore, a person who exemplifies what the true meaning of commitment, dedication, strength, service and selflessness is. Not only has the Harris County Hospital District lost one of its greatest leaders but also our entire health care community. Her leadership, expertise, commitment and presence will truly be missed.

Under her leadership as the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Harris County Hospital District, the Hospital District was named among the Top 100 Hospitals in the United States in 1994 and again in 1995 by Modern Healthcare magazine.

After graduation from Prairie View A&M School of Nursing 35 years ago, Moore began her public health care service in the Jefferson Davis Hospital emergency room; she soon became the emergency center charge nurse. Through the 1960's and 1970's, she moved from evening shift nursing supervisor to assistant director of nursing at Ben Taub Hospital. In 1977, she was named administrator of Jefferson Davis Hospital. During this time, she earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing and a Master of Education degree. Moore was appointed Chief Operating Officer for the Harris County Hospital District in 1987. On February 28, 1989, the Board of Managers of the Hospital District appointed her President and CEO.

As President and CEO of the Harris County Hospital District, the sixth largest inpatient health care system in the U.S., Moore oversaw three hospitals, 11 community health centers, one free-standing HIV/AIDS treatment center, and eight school-based clinics. The District has an annual budget of approximately $528 million with more than 50,000 employees. Ben Taub General Hospital and Lyndon B. Johnson General Hospital treat 77% of Houston's serious trauma. Under Moore's leadership the Hospital District's programs in outpatient care and disease prevention and health promotion have been enhanced and expanded. New outreach programs in the community health centers now provide mammography, diabetes screening, immunizations, early disease detection, and health care for the homeless.

As one of the nation's top public health care administrators, Mrs. Moore never loses sight of the Hospital District's mission-quality health care for the underserved. In a changing health care environment, she has managed, year after year, to balance compassion with fiscal prudence. Under Moore's leadership, the district, which has the lowest per capita tax rate of all Texas hospital districts, has nearly doubled its non-tax revenue.

In addition to her responsibilities at the Hospital District, Lois Moore also serves her community selflessly. She serves on numerous boards including the American Red Cross, March of Dimes, United Way, Texas Association of Public and Non-Profit Hospitals, and the National Association of Public Hospitals. She is a Fellow of the American College of Health Care Executives and is included in Who's Who in America. Mrs. Moore was awarded in 1994 Tree of Life Award from the Jewish National Fund. In February, 1995, she was named co-recipient of the Houston Area Healthcare Coalition's Healthcare Provider Award. In April of 1996 she was awarded an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters degree from Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio, Texas.

Mrs. Moore has testified before national committees on healthcare reform, served on Governor Ann Richard's Task Force on Health Care, and is a frequent speaker on public health issues and health care reform.

With all of this on her plate, Mrs. Moore also found the time to care for her loving family which consists of her husband Hard, daughter Yolonda, son-in-law Mike Williams and two granddaughters, Kendra and Jasmine.

I am stating these things so that they will be inscribed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but her deeds will forever be remembered by those who will try to fill the shoes of this great woman. Congress and the 18th District of Texas is proud to honor Mrs. Lois Moore and we will truly miss her great service.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON THE POLITICS OF THE CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week Democrats were accused of trying to place politics in the 2000 Census. A Dear Colleague letter was sent out which implied that the Democratic Party, organized labor, and the Census Bureau were involved in a conspiracy to somehow undermine Republicans through the partnership programs being organized to support the 2000 Census.

This claim would be laughable if it were not so destructive. The decennial Census is a national civic ritual. In order to be successful, partnerships with literally thousands of organizations must be established. The Census Bureau is working hard to do that, regardless of the political leanings of any group. From Fortune 500 companies to the AARP to the NAACP to the National League of Cities, organizational support for the largest national peacetime mobilization in our Nation's history is essential to the success of the 2000 Census.

The claim that it is Democrats who are politicizing the Census is also ironic, coming as it does almost 2 years to the day after the Republican memo which began the blatant politics in the Census.

So I rise today first to set the record straight and share with the Members some of the history of the Republican attempts to place politics in the Census, but also to commend some recent moves by the Speaker which indicate that a more bipartisan spirit may be prevailing over this issue.

On May 20, 1997, 2 years ago, the GOP sent a memo to Republican State chairs. In it, the Chair of the Republican National Committee said that the 2000 Census was, and I quote, ''an issue of unusual importance to the future of the Republican Party,'' and that at stake is ''our GOP majority in the House.''

In that memo was nothing about the importance of counting all Americans, regardless of race, age, or income; nothing about the impact of the Census on the lives of real people: about how State and local governments use Census information to plan schools and highways, about how the Federal government uses it to distribute funds for health care and other programs; and nothing about how businesses use it in making their economic and marketing plans. Instead, we find only cynical, partisan rhetoric about how to make sure the 2000 Census benefits Republicans.

That was just the beginning. In June of 1997 Republicans tried to ban statistical methods for the Census on the disaster relief bill for the flood victims in the Midwest. Then in September of 1997 the majority put language in the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill to ban the use of statistical methods.

They tried again in 1998 to kill the use of statistical methods and failed. Then they turned to the courts. In January they lost that battle, too, when the Supreme Court ruled that the Census Bureau could not use modern scientific methods for apportionment, but they are required to use it for everything else, if feasible. The majority has done everything it can to prevent the most accurate Census possible in 2000.

□ 1930

They have recently begun throwing up legislative obstacles to an accurate census here in the House and have also begun a campaign at the State level to prevent the use of accurate numbers.

The 1990 census had an error rate of over 10 percent. There were 8.4 million missed and 4.4 million people that were counted twice. The 1990 census missed one in 10 African-American males, one

in 20 Latinos, one in eight American Indians on reservations, and one in 16 rural non-Hispanic whites.

Up until just recently, the sole focus of the majority's agenda has been to make sure that these people are left out of the 2000 census. But there are signs of hope. Call me a starry-eyed optimist, but I think the Republican leadership may be coming to its senses.

They have finally agreed with us on one census problem and will not shut down the government this June 15 as they originally planned. The emergency supplemental appropriation which passed last night contained a provision eliminating that artificial deadline. It also included almost $45 million in additional money the Census Bureau will need to conduct the census using old methods. That, too, is a hopeful sign. I welcome these signals of a new spirit of bipartisanship on census issues.

Let me just add that I hope it continues through the fiscal year 2000 appropriations process, as we are about to begin it.

Mr. Speaker, last week Democrats were accused of trying to politicize the 2000 Census.

A Dear Colleague letter was sent out which implied that the Democratic party, organized labor, and the Census Bureau were involved in a conspiracy to somehow undermine Republicans through the Partnership programs being organized to support the 2000 Census.

This claim would be laughable if it weren't so destructive.

The Decennial Census is a national civic ritual. In order to be successful, partnerships with literally thousands of organizations must be established, and the Census Bureau is working hard to do that—regardless of the political leanings of any group.

The Decennial Census is a national civic ritual. In order to be successful, partnerships with literally thousands of organizations must be established, and the Census Bureau is working hard to do that—regardless of the political leanings of any group.

From Fortune 500 companies, to the AARP, to the NAACP to the National League of Cities—organizational support for the largest national peace time mobilization in our nation's history is essential to the success of the 2000 Census.

The claim that it is Democrats who are politicizing the census is also ironic, coming as it does almost two years to the day after the Republican memo which began the blatant politicization of the Census.

And so I rise today first to set the record straight and share with you some of the history of the Republican attempts to politicize the Census, but also to commend some recent moves by the Speaker which indicate that a more bipartisan spirit may be prevailing over this issue.

On May 20th 1997, two years ago, the GOP began their blatant attempts to politicize the 2000 Census with a memo to Republican State Chairs.

In it, the Chair of the Republican National Committee said that the 2000 Census was ''an issue of unusual importance to the future of the Republican Party,'' and that ''At stake is our GOP majority in the House. . . .''

In that memo was nothing about the importance of counting all Americans, regardless of race, or age, or income.

Nothing about impact of the census on the lives of real people—about how state and local governments use census information to plan schools and highways, about how the federal government uses it to distribute funds for health care and other programs, and nothing about how businesses use it in making their economic and marketing plans.

Instead you find only cynical, partisan rhetoric about how to make sure the 2000 Census benefits Republicans.

That was just the beginning.

In June of 1997, Republicans tried to ban statistical methods for the Census on a disaster relief bill for the flood victims in the Midwest.

Then in September of 1997 the majority put language in the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill to ban the use of statistical methods.

They tried again in 1998 to kill the use of statistical methods and failed.

Then they turned to the courts. In January, they lost that battle too when the Supreme Court ruled that the Census Bureau could not use statistical methods for apportionment, but that they are required to use it for everything else, if feasible.

The majority has done everything it can to prevent the most accurate census possible in 2000.

They have recently begun throwing up legislative obstacles to an accurate census here in the House, and have also begun a campaign at the state level to prevent the use of accurate numbers.

The 1990 census had an error rate of over 10 percent. There were 8.4 million people missed, and 4.4 million people counted twice.

The 1990 census missed 1 in 10 African American males; 1 in 20 Latinos; 1 in 8 American Indians on reservations; and 1 in 16 rural non-Hispanic Whites.

Up until just recently, the sole focus of the majority's agenda has been to make sure that these people are left out of the 2000 Census as well.

But there are signs of hope. Call me a starry-eyed optimist, but I think the Republican leadership may be coming to its senses.

They have finally agreed with us on one census problem and will not shut down the government this June 15th as they originally planned.

The Emergency Supplemental Appropriation which passed last night contained a provision eliminating that artificial deadline.

It also included $45 million in additional money the Census Bureau will need to conduct the census using old methods. That too is a hopeful sign.

I welcome these signals of a new spirit of bipartisanship on Census issues.

Let me just add that I hope it continues through the fiscal year 2000 appropriations process we are about to begin.

We also need to realize that conducting the Census using the old methods that Republicans have insisted upon will cost a lot of money—as much as $2 billion more than originally planned.

I urge Republicans and Democrats alike to support full funding for the 2000 Census.

There is one clear and simple issue here—will the next census count everyone, or will it repeat the mistakes of 1990 leaving millions of people unrepresented and unfairly left out.

I call upon the Republican Party to build upon its recent gestures and allow the Census Bureau to conduct the most accurate census possible.

The first census of the 21st century must be as accurate and complete as we can make it.

The Constitution of the United States and the American people demand no less.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING IN THE 7TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MARYLAND: DRUG COMPANIES PROFIT AT THE EXPENSE OF OLDER AMERICANS

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, food and medicine are very, very important to people. Sadly, in Baltimore City and Baltimore County and all over this Nation, it has become increasingly clear that after a lifetime of service to family and community, too many seniors are faced with the cruel and difficult choice between paying for the miracle drugs which sustain life and buying food.

The findings of the Committee on Government Reform minority staff study of my district, the 7th Congressional District of Maryland, demonstrates that in Baltimore a senior citizen paying for his or her own prescription drugs must pay on the average more than twice as much for the drugs as the drug companies' favored customers.

For the five drugs investigated in this study, the average price differential was 133 percent. The drug with the highest price differential was Synthroid, a commonly used hormone treatment manufactured by Knoll Pharmaceuticals. For this drug, the price differential for senior citizens in Maryland was an incredible 1,641 percent. An equivalent dose of this drug would cost the manufacturers' favored customers $1.75. An uninsured senior citizen in Baltimore must pay over $30.

Now, because large preferred customers of the drug companies typically buy in bulk, some difference between retail prices and favored customer prices would be expected. But the study found there is an unusually large price differential being enforced for prescription drugs, over six times greater than the average price differential for other consumer goods typically purchased by senior citizens.

Moreover, it appears to be pharmaceutical manufacturers, not our local drug stores, which are responsible for the far higher prices. Local pharmacies appear to have relatively small markups between the prices at which they buy prescription drugs and the prices at which they sell them. Retail prices are just 5 percent above manufacturers suggested price to pharmacies.

It appears that the drug companies are engaged in a form of discriminatory pricing that victimizes those who are least able to afford it. Large corporate governmental and institutional

customers with market power are able to buy their drugs at discounted prices. Drug companies then raise prices for sales to seniors and others who pay for drugs themselves to compensate for these discounts to the favored customers.

By engaging in these cost-switching price practices, drug manufacturers are earning enormous profits, while seniors must choose between food and medicine. America's top 10 drug manufacturers are expected to reap approximately $20 billion in profits in 1999 alone.

Reducing the cost of prescription drugs for seniors and other uninsured individuals is a moral imperative. Until we can achieve expanded Medicare coverage, the Federal Government should not be doing business with drug manufacturers which discriminate against uninsured senior citizens and others in their pricing.

That is why I commend and join the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALLEN) and another 100 of the Members in Congress in cosponsoring the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act.

This legislation would not enact price controls, but the government would cease buying drugs from companies which engage in cost-switching. It would require drug manufacturers to sell to pharmacies the drugs needed by Medicare patients at the lowest price paid by any government agency or other preferred customer.

This bill would assert the Federal Government's purchasing power to encourage the compassionate and even-handed pricing of live-saving prescription drugs. The bill would allow pharmacies to benefit from the government's purchasing power, effectively reducing the price that they pay for the drugs they dispense to Medicare beneficiaries. Based upon our analysis of Baltimore's prices and those applicable in other areas, I believe that pharmacies would pass most of these savings on to Medicare patients in the form of lower prices.

Today drug companies are utilizing market forces against the interest of senior citizens in a way which is unfair and contrary to our national interests. We can make the market follow morality. Never again should any senior citizen be forced to choose between food and medicine. I urge my colleagues to support the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act.

LOOKING AT THE RECORD OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, tonight marks the second in a series of special orders that House conservatives hope to hold on the record of Vice President AL GORE.

The Vice President has been particularly aggressive in attacking the work of congressional Republicans. He likes to call us names and say that we are extreme. That is a frequent theme from the Clinton-Gore administration.

Conservatives believe it is important for the American people to understand why AL GORE finds our record of cutting taxes, balancing the budget, eliminating wasteful government and restoring common sense environmental policies so contemptible. To do this, we must look at AL GORE'S record.

At a future time we plan to call attention to the fact that while in Congress, AL GORE voted to raise taxes more than 50 times. He even voted to raise taxes after he left Congress. As Vice President he broke a tie vote in the Senate in favor of the 1993 Clinton-Gore tax increase, the largest tax hike in our Nation's history.

We also will examine his record on spending, which cannot under any definition be seen as moderate. In fact, he was given the dubious title of ''big spender'' 14 of his 16 years in Congress.

Tonight we will continue the examination of AL GORE'S views on the environment. This examination is important because, upon being elected, President Bill Clinton ceded control of his administration's environmental policy to Vice President AL GORE. In fact, Mr. GORE was given the authority to select the EPA administrator and other high-ranking environmental policy positions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have read accounts where people expect us to ridicule Mr. GORE by quoting from some of his writings. The ridicule will have to be done perhaps by the listener. I would just observe that we are not here tonight particularly to focus upon his exaggerated claim to have been, he and his wife, the model on which ''Love Story'' was based, that movie of many years ago, or indeed his claimed fatherhood of the Internet, which frankly is outrageous and laughable, or indeed most recently his claim to being the originator of the idea of a certain web site designed to protect children, to assist parents in protecting children from the dark side of the Internet, the pornography that is available there.

No, tonight I plan to focus on policy. What is the policy of this man who is the Vice President, who has stood largely in the shadow of the President, but who in reality is a key policymaker and whose views are actually set forth by his own hand in his own book, ''Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit,'' a book not actually ghost written but in fact written by the Vice President himself.

So this book is a valuable document because it is in his own hand and reflects his own thinking, thinking which he has repeatedly and very recently backed up and acknowledged that, indeed, this book continues to reflect his views. So I think it is very timely to look into some of these issues.

In the first special order a couple of weeks ago we did this, we looked at one of his writings. I think just by way of review, it would be good to go over this again. Quoting from ''Earth in the Balance,'' he wrote that ''Modern industrial civilization as presently organized is colliding violently with our planet's ecological system. The ferocity of its assault on the Earth is breathtaking, and the horrific consequences are occurring so quickly as to defy our capacity to recognize them, comprehend their global implications, and organize an appropriate and timely response.''

There is a recurring theme throughout his writings of promoting this idea of a crisis and the need for extraordinary measures in responding to this crisis, just as if we are not in a normal situation where we go through normal processes, but because it is a crisis, it justifies extraordinary approaches.

Another quote on the Holocaust and global warming: ''New warnings of a different sort signal an environmental Holocaust without precedent. Today the evidence of an ecological crystalnacht is as clear as the sound of glass shattering in Berlin. It is not merely in the service of analogy that I have referred so often to the struggles against Nazi and Communist totalitarianism, because I believe that the emerging effort to save the environment is a continuation of these struggles.''

Many, I think, Mr. Speaker, would certainly feel this is gross exaggeration at a minimum. Actually, when we think of the very idea of bringing in the Holocaust where people lost all their freedoms, including their lives, lost many of their family members, indeed entire families were wiped out by this horrific, historic event, it seems demeaning to me to be talking in these terms and implying that whatever situation we may face today is in any way related in kind or in degree to what went on during the Holocaust.

Well, here again, we have a very dramatic statement on the coming civil war: ''We now face the prospect of a kind of global civil war between those who refuse to consider the consequences of civilizations' relentless advance and those who refuse to be silent partners in the destruction. More and more people of conscience are joining the effort to resist, but the time has come to make this struggle the central organizing principle of world civilization. God and history will remember our judgment.''

□ 1945

Very, very strong terms that he is using here, implying really that, if we are not on his side, we are not a person of conscience, implying that if we do not refuse to be a silent partner in a destruction, so to speak, that if we are not with them, we are against them, that if we are not part of the solution, we are part of the problem. Very much that kind of dogmatic expression here and really impugning all those who do not join in this particular view of the situation.

And again, whatever we may think of the circumstances we face in the environment, I guess I would just observe we made great strides in the environment by any dispassionate standard.

For example, I grew up in Los Angeles as a young person and I remember my eyes smarting so badly on any number of days and the tremendous air pollution that we had there extending up into the early 1960s. And then we go back today and we do not experience that kind of thing anymore, and on a number of occasions we will find clear days there.

So I mean, I just point out, and the statistics do bear it out beyond my anecdotal experience, but there has been dramatic improvements in the area of for example air pollution, in the area of water pollution, dramatic improvements in the way that we treat the environment.

So I honestly find it difficult to fathom these illustrations of a civil war, of an environmental Holocaust. I mean, it is shameless exploitation. It is a gross exaggeration. It is not indeed the reality.

Well, here is the quote I guess we read last time, AL GORE on the American century:

> The 20th century has not been kind to the constant human striving for a sense of purpose in life. Two world wars, the Holocaust, the invention of nuclear weapons, and now the global environmental crises have led many of us to wonder if survival, much less enlightened, joyous and hopeful living, is possible. We retreat into the seductive tools and technologies of industrial civilization, but that only creates new problems as we become increasingly isolated from one another and disconnected from our roots.

I mean, this is an unbelievable quote. Every time I read it I marvel there is so much to pull out of that. There again we see the Holocaust being pulled into it, two world wars, and then the reference again to what we face as the global environmental crisis, implying that when it is a crisis, it is like a world war, it is like the Holocaust, implying that extraordinary measures are called for and, frankly, implying, when we read the rest of the book, that the compromise of our freedoms is justified in order to meet this crisis, just as in wartime in the United States the Government becomes much more powerful and is able to impose things on the citizenry that it could not do in peacetime because it is involved in a struggle for national survival. And this is the framework that is being set here by the Vice President.

And then this last part I find interesting, paradoxical, frankly, in light of the Vice President's own actions. ''We retreat into the seductive tools and technologies of industrial civilization.''

Well, this is the man who has claimed authorship of the Internet. That is about as high tech as we can get. That is a futurist, if you will. And yet, by his other writings, some of which we have read off these charts tonight, I mean, he is almost anti-technology, almost pre-Colombian, getting back to the time before the European male disturbed everything in the world and caused this environmental crisis, if you will, that we presently suffer from according to him.

I just think these are interesting views for someone holding the second highest office in the United States to have.

Look at the future on cars that he has. Quoting again from the book:

> Within the context of the Strategic Environment Initiative, it ought to be able to establish a coordinate, a global program, to accomplish the strategic goal of completely eliminating the internal combustion engine over, say, a 25-year period.

Well, the internal combustion engine has been a great blessing to modern mankind, perhaps more than anything else we can think of. I do not know about my colleagues, but the thought of having a battery-powered car spewing off horrendous amounts of ozone fumes being highly toxic, we think we have problems with toxic disposal now, what are we going to do when everybody is driving one of these electric cars that has six, seven, or eight huge batteries in it?

By the way, these cars do not have a very long range. I think they are about a hundred miles or so. They are not nearly as fast or as powerful as today's cars. And that is a problem if we are trying to go over the mountains or up a hill or any number of things that sometimes vehicles are called upon to do. We would have to ask ourselves what is really involved.

It says a global coordinated program. A lot of things I read in AL GORE's writings are linked to this globalism. I mean, is the U.N. going to own a department on this too to supervise and wipe out the use of our internal combustion engine? Are we going to have to fill a report as one of the countries giving some U.N. czar an accounting of how we are making progress on this front?

I mean, it is truly alarming the amount of intervention by the United Nations in what has traditionally been regarded as the sovereign affairs of this Nation. So I find that a very bizarre idea as well, talking about getting rid of the internal combustion engine.

By the way, a lot of jobs in this country depend upon the internal combustion engine. And I do not know what would happen to those people, and Mr. GORE does not really offer that in his book.

Former senior ABC news correspondent Bob Zelnick has written a book actually about the Vice President. It is called ''Gore: A Political Life.'' I am sorry I do not have these quotes up on the chart, but I will just share a couple of them with my colleagues, one by Mr. Zelnick, referring to this book ''Earth in the Balance,'' which I encourage everybody to buy a copy of and to read. He says the following:

> The book is pathetically one-dimensional in its view of Western Civilization, shabby in its ignorance of economics, simplistic in its approach to problem solving, and grandly certain of a crisis that has not been proved to exist despite a massive scientific effort funded by the U.S. Government to the tune of more than $2 billion a year.

Then economist Robert W. Hahn said the following, again in comment upon the book. He said, the book contains ''an incredible laundry list which can easily result in central planners selecting environmentally and politically correct products and technologies. It is nothing less than environmental socialism.'' Again, Mr. Hahn's quote on this book written by the Vice President. ''It is nothing less than environmental socialism.'' Very disturbing.

Well, there are some factual contradictions, many, to the assertions made by the Vice President. Let us look into a few of the claims.

AL GORE has claimed that urban sprawl or suburbanization is rapidly reducing the amount of open space, rural areas, and farmland at an alarming pace that strict growth controls are needed to preserve scenic open spaces and protect the Nation's food supply.

So once again, it is a crisis, it is an alarming pace. I left out a word, ''such an alarming pace that strict growth controls are needed to preserve these open spaces.'' So, once again, extraordinary measures to meet extraordinary events. That is the advantage. If they are a demagogue trying to justify intrusions into one's freedom, they have got to set the stage by advancing this crisis, this idea that we are literally under seize, that we are at war, that we need, therefore, to have extraordinary responses. That is why I think Mr. Hahn refers to these writings as ''environmental socialism.''

My colleagues heard the claim, loss of our open space so alarming at its pace that we have got to have strict growth controls. Here is the reality: Only 4.8 percent of the land area of the United States is developed; and in more than three-quarters of the States, over 90 percent of the land is used for rural purposes, such as forestry, pasture, wildlife preservation, and parks.

Indeed, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, each year only .006 percent, that is six ten-thousandths of one percent, of land in the continental United States is developed.

Mr. GORE has made another claim. ''An increase of 1½ degrees Farenheit in global temperatures since 1850 is proof that manmade carbon dioxide emissions are dangerously heating up the planet.'' Have we not heard a lot about that out of the Clinton-Gore administration? And yet here is the fact on that: This claim ignores the fact that the Earth's temperature naturally rises and falls over the course of several centuries.

If we think about it, they cannot even get the weather forecast right for tomorrow let alone deducing that somehow our temperature has risen. Since the last Ice Age ended nearly 11,000 years ago, there have been seven

major warming and cooling trends. Of the six trends preceding the current period of warming, three produced temperatures warmer than today, while three produced temperatures colder than today.

The pattern of the most recent warming, this proves an alleged human contribution. One degree of the warming occurred between 1850 and 1940, when human carbon dioxide emissions were negligible in that 90-year period. Between 1940 and 1979, the temperature increased only one-half a degree Farenheit when rapidly rising amounts of carbon dioxide emissions should have been causing warming to accelerate.

NASA's T–ROSE series of satellites indicate that there has indeed even been a slight cooling trend of .02 degrees Farenheit since 1979, a cooling trend. And yet we heard his assertion that we are dangerously heating up the planet through carbon dioxide emissions.

These results have been collaborated by weather balloons, the results of the T–ROSE satellite that show that, indeed, far from heating up the planet, there is a cooling trend since 1979. The source for this is ''Talking Points in the Economy: Environmental Series'' from the National Center for Public Policy Research.

I have just got three more claims, and then I am going to call on my distinguished colleague from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) to offer his thoughts. By the way, I observe that he has been very involved, through his subcommittee, on analyzing the Kyoto Treaty and measures relating to it dealing with global warming.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for one second before he continues on that?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the gentleman for bringing these issues before the House because they are extremely important in the current business of this Congress. He mentioned how Vice President GORE has advocated and recently said he stood by every word in the book that we should begin a martial plan of sorts to phase out the automobile, or at least the internal combustion engine.

Well, it seems to me a very relevant fact for the oversight hearings that our subcommittee is having on implementing this global warming treaty. It is a policy that it is very clear this administration is implementing even without the Senate approval of that treaty. And tomorrow, in fact, we are having a joint Senate and House hearing where the administration is testifying about what steps they have taken to follow requirements in last year's appropriations bill to justify all of the spending that they are using in the area of climate change and global warming.

So my colleague brings forward to this House information that is critical to our pursuit of that oversight capacity of this administration on current policies. And some of the goofy ideas that the Vice President put forward and says he still believes in are having a direct effect today on policies in the Clinton-Gore administration and something I think, when most Americans realize, the AFL–CIO even said it could cost us a million jobs if we implemented that treaty as part of this martial plan for the environment.

□ 2000

That is 1 million American jobs that will be sent to Mexico because they are not part of the treaty, or China because they are not part of the treaty, or North Korea or Latin America or India because they are not part of the treaty. And so it has a real impact on the daily lives of at least those 1 million American families that would be affected by the loss of their job when these ideas are implemented by Mr. GORE and the administration. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this forward. I look forward to hearing his other examples and then have a couple that I would like to add as well.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman. I thank him as well for doing his excellent work on this subject with his subcommittee in bringing out these important facts.

Here is another claim by the Vice President. He has said, ''Global warming is responsible for 1998 being the hottest year on record.'' Some of these are just so patently false and absurd that it makes you smile when you read them. The hottest year on record. I mean, that is either true or it is not.

The fact is it is not. This last year's hot weather in North America did not even set records. North America's record high was reached on July 10, 1913 when Death Valley in my State of California hit 134 degrees Fahrenheit. That is pretty hot. None of the other seven continents broke records last year, either. Africa hit its record high in 1922, Asia in 1942, Australia in 1889, Europe in 1881, South America in 1905, Oceana in 1912 and Antarctica in 1974.

Here is another claim. AL GORE has maintained that all old growth forests in America will be wiped out within 20 years. Here is the fact on that. There are a lot of people that have, I think, been misinformed on this, precisely because of comments like this by the Vice President.

The fact is as of 1993, there were 13.2 million acres of old growth forests left in America, old growth defined as forests containing trees over 200 years old. Eight million of these acres were totally protected in national parks and wilderness areas and can never be harvested. So 8 million of the 13.2 million acres of old growth can never be harvested in this country. Furthermore, the harvesting rate for the remaining 5.2 million acres of old growth forest is approximately only 1 percent per year.

Here is another statistic that I will throw out. There is more standing timber in the United States of America today than at any time in the 20th century. That is also a fact. In fact, there is so much standing timber, that is why our forests face catastrophic threat of forest fire. If we quadrupled the cutting of the trees right now, we could not catch up with the amount of growth that is occurring each year. That is how serious this threat really is.

Lastly—lastly for the night—of course there are many other absurd claims that we will focus on, but for the night this is the final one I will address. ''The United States is running out of space for landfills.''

Here is an interesting statistic, an interesting fact. All garbage produced in the United States for the next 500 years would fit in a single landfill measuring 20 miles by 20 miles. That is an interesting statistic. So I do not think we are running out of landfills.

With that, I am going to now call upon the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH), who by the way is chairman of the Conservative Action Team, a group of conservatives in the House, organized to try and increase their effectiveness in promoting that philosophy. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for yielding. I should point out to our viewers and our colleagues the gentleman's modesty. He was one of the four founders of the Conservative Action Team and has been a true strength of keeping those principles alive in this Congress and in the previous Congresses. I thank him for that diligent work.

Mr. Speaker, one of the anomalies that some of the research showed was this question of whether or not depleting the ozone layer would in fact cause more cancer. All of us are horrified by the increases in cancer rates, and I think all of us can say we have seen loved ones or friends or family members who have been struck by that terrible disease. And so certainly we would want to do everything possible to try to make sure that that was prevented and every step possible to make sure it was in fact cured and treated.

One of the false claims that I understand has been made is that somehow the depletion of ozone will affect the incidence of melanoma, skin cancer. In fact, the scientific studies show that ultraviolet A rays do affect that. Therefore, we need to be very careful about exposing people to that. But ultraviolet B rays do not. The facts are, the scientific community has confirmed this, ozone has nothing to do with ultraviolet A, which is the cancer-causing rays, but does block ultraviolet B which are not linked to increased incidence of cancer. So the claims that having to worry about the ozone layer could increase the incidence of cancer do not seem to be substantiated by the science.

But even more profound, as I was reading through the Vice President's

book, he talks about one of the promising new treatments for cancer, a drug called Taxol which can be produced from the Pacific yew tree. I want to read to you so you can get an idea where this man is coming from, what he had to say about that.

''The Pacific yew tree can be cut down,'' and, by the way, this is on page 119 of his book, ''Earth in the Balance.'' I do recommend people try to read it and get a better understanding of what philosophy is driving this administration and Vice President GORE's actions in particular. On page 119, he says:

> The Pacific yew can be cut down and processed to produce a potent chemical, Taxol, which offers some promise of curing certain forms of lung, breast and ovarian cancer in patients who would otherwise quickly die. It seems an easy choice. Sacrifice the tree for a human life, until,

and this is the part I would like people to focus on,

> until one learns that three trees must be destroyed for each patient treated. Then it becomes a close question.

Well, quite frankly in my book it is a very easy question. Three trees versus a human life, three trees versus the ability to prolong someone's life who is suffering from cancer. I would pick the individual, the person, the human being who is a cancer patient and suffering from that dreaded disease and say it is clear three trees are worth it. We can sacrifice three trees to save one human life. But the Vice President apparently does not think that is so clear. He goes on to discuss that in his book.

That to me is an indication of the larger differences in philosophy that are approached by this administration and many of us in the Conservative Action Team. We set as our priority having government actions that help people, that maximize freedom of individuals, that allow individuals to pursue their lives, that allow businesses to pursue remedies for cancer, whether it is in yew trees or other research. They feel it is better to regulate that, have the government make that larger question, is it worth three trees to save a human life?

Our philosophy is, let the individual make those choices. For me, the answer is clear. It is worth it. But let individuals make that. If they want to seek that remedy, that aid, that treatment for their cancer, give them the opportunity to do it. Do not interpose AL GORE's government to make that decision for us and say, ''We have to consider the larger social ramifications because we think those trees may be important to save and, yes, we regret that some people may lose their lives to cancer but we have these larger considerations.''

That difference in philosophy is profound. It ends up being part of every decision that we make here in Congress. Do we add more regulations and thereby take away freedom in the name of this cause? Do we increase taxes so that government can decide how we should distribute resources among different individuals? To both of those, the Conservative Action Team says no. And let no more regulations unless you can show there is a definite benefit that outweighs the cost. And no more taxes. In fact, we want to reduce the cost of government so that we can lower taxes to allow people to keep more of their hard-earned income.

It is important that we have those fundamental debates from time to time here on the House floor, because they come up bill after bill after bill. There is something that often we do not focus on. And so one of the things that I think is critical as we continue this effort of bringing forward the record of a very important official in our government, someone whose decisions are making an impact on each of our lives every day, that we know both the record but also those philosophical differences that can be discerned from their writing.

If you had told me that perhaps this was written before Vice President GORE had had a chance to be the number two executive in the government, and that he has learned since then that perhaps some of these ideas were a little far-fetched, a little bit goofy, perhaps a little bit out of context for the modern world and that he had rethought some of them, I would understand that perhaps we should not be bringing them forward today and focusing on them. But I am told that as recently as a couple of months ago when asked about it, Vice President GORE said categorically he stood by every word in this book. And so it is in fact relevant to today's thinking what exactly is written in this book.

I was surprised, as I read through many of the pages there, that it is a completely different description of what our goals and aspirations are and should be. I do not think the modern world is like the Nazi Holocaust. I think the modern world has provided incalculable benefits, that people are better off today than they were 10 years ago or 20 years ago or 50 years ago; that we have miracles of modern science that allow us to treat cancer patients, that allow us to extend life, that allow us to provide a better hope for the future for all people; and that that progress has gone forward in spite of the thinking that we need to restrain it because there might be this almost Nazi-like Holocaust in the world if we do not reverse course and undo much of the modern society, much of modern technology, much of the learning that has accrued to our benefit in the last 50 years.

So I do appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) leading this effort. I hope to be able to join him in the coming months to bring forward other topics. As I understand it, we will be looking at the Gore tax on long distance calls, a tax that Al Gore promoted, that actually was never voted on directly by this House of Representatives, but now every person who places a long distance call in this country pays to the FCC because of this man. I understand that we will also be looking at some of his record when he was in the Senate, what did he vote for, what were his prerogatives, what were his preferences on taxes.

Somebody told me, and we are going to track this down before we say it categorically, but somebody estimated they thought he might even be more liberal than TEDDY KENNEDY. It takes a lot of work to be more liberal than TEDDY KENNEDY in the United States Senate. We will look at the record and bring it out and tell the American people that.

I thank the gentleman from California for giving me an opportunity to participate today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman. I would just observe the motto of the University of California is lifted from the Bible, ''Let there be light.'' We intend to shine as much light as we can so that, as the Bible says, ''The truth shall make us free.''

With that, I would like to now acknowledge our distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. WELDON) who will share insights with us and perhaps will explain why AL GORE was not allowed to make the taxpayers fund his pet project of raiding money from NASA to show constant images of the earth from outer space.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for arranging this special order to talk about some of the issues that our Vice President has promoted and some of his policy positions.

Recently I had the opportunity in the Committee on Science, as we were marking up the NASA authorization bill, to offer an amendment cutting the funding to a satellite that had been promoted by the Vice President. The satellite was called Triana.

The Vice President originally announced his concept for this on March 13, 1998 in a speech that he gave at MIT. He is quoted as saying, ''It will help us reach new heights of understanding and insight.'' All this satellite really is is a picture of the sunlit side of the earth that would be available on the Internet; interestingly, a service that is already available right now on several Internet sites. Simply what they do now is, they take several weather satellite images and combine them together to produce what AL GORE wants to spend $70 million producing and then maybe another $100 million launching into orbit.

□ 2015

Now the Washington Post ran an article about the Vice President's speech where they stated, quote, that GORE almost literally dreamed up the idea in his sleep about a month ago, so that would have been in the middle of February of 1998, waking up at 3 a.m. one night, according to a White House official, and I would like to point out to

my colleagues that there were a lot of people waking up at 3 a.m. around that same time in my congressional district, not because they were getting great wonderful ideas for new satellites that they could order NASA to go ahead and produce, but because they had gotten pink slips from NASA because they were supposedly short of money. Indeed, there were actually 600 people laid off because of a supposed $100 million shortfall in the shuttle budget. But then miraculously, after Mr. GORE proposed this idea, NASA, the agency that he to a certain degree has been ceded control over by the President, found tens of millions of dollars has been put towards this project.

Now in my opinion not only was this satellite as proposed by AL GORE not necessary, as it is already available on the Internet, and not only was it a waste of taxpayers' money, but as well it is really bad science. As I understand it, there was really no peer review to indicate that this science project was really needed. Indeed the only peer review that actually occurred, according to my understanding of it, was the peer review of how to build the satellite.

It is planned to be launched on a shuttle mission. This will take up space on the shuttle, space that could be used to deploy other more important research projects.

As I stated, a lot of people were waking up around the same time that AL GORE was waking up worried in my congressional district whether or not they were going to have a job. But I would like to point out to my colleagues that I believe if AL GORE is allowed to fulfill his true environmental vision for America, there are going to be a lot of people waking up in the middle of the night because they do not have a job.

We just heard tonight from the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) about his position on the internal combustion engine and his desire to totally eliminate the internal combustion engine. How many hundreds of thousands of jobs currently are involved in producing automobiles, selling automobiles in the United States, and he would like to eliminate the automobile? And I, for one, could tell my colleagues that there are a lot of good purposes that come out of the use of the internal combustion engine.

Might I just mention that most ambulances run on the internal combustion engine, most fire trucks run on the internal combustion engine, and yet Mr. GORE would like to eliminate the internal combustion engine and probably put millions of Americans out of work currently in the auto industry, and they, too, will be waking up in the middle of the night, but not with brilliant ideas for new satellites, but instead waking up in the middle of the night because they do not have a job.

Might I also point out that AL GORE is the biggest champion of the so-called global warming treaty that would call for the United States to eliminate 25 percent of its industrial production in order to come within these supposed caps on carbon dioxide elimination, something that the Chinese do not have to adhere to, most South American countries, African countries, Asian countries. It is believed by many economists that if we actually implemented this treaty that AL GORE wants us to implement, it could result in the loss of thousands of American jobs.

And then I am so pleased that my colleague from Indiana mentioned the section in AL GORE's book on Taxol. I have taken care of cancer patients who have gotten Taxol, and what a great drug that has been, what a great tool it is in the hands of oncologists as they treat patients suffering from cancer, and to cite in his book that maybe we should not be harvesting this drug from these trees because we have to cut down three trees for every person we save, in my opinion it is shameless.

When I got elected to the United States Congress and left my medical practice and realized that I would be coming to this town and having to work in a government under the authority of Bill Clinton and AL GORE, I got Earth in the Balance, and I read Earth in the Balance, and let me tell my colleagues it caused me to wake up in the middle of the night knowing that the second in command in this country had such values and opinions where he places the value of a tree over that of a person, and I highly commend my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for calling this special order. Reading Earth in the Balance to me was a real eye opener. It clearly lays out the reality of AL GORE's true values, and might I point out that he stated those very clearly in his acceptance speech at the Democrat National Convention back in 1992 where he stated that he thought the thing that united all Americans together was the environment.

Point of fact: All Americans support a clean environment, as I do, and there is plenty of evidence to indicate that the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act are having their desired effect. Water quality standards are improving, air quality standards are improving, and there is not an environmental crisis. We are making good headway in this problem area. If there is an environmental crisis anywhere, it is in these Third World and Communist countries where they do not enforce any kind of environmental standards, it is not here in the United States, and for AL GORE to cite that the environment was the thing that unites all Americans in my opinion is a tremendous insight into what his true values are.

Now I am not going to stand here tonight and speculate on what unites all Americans. We can have great debates about that, whether it is freedom that we all cherish, the right to free speech, worship as we wish, the right to start our own business. We could go on and on about what is it that unites us all. We are truly a diverse Nation. But to cite the environment as the thing that unites us all in my opinion is a tremendous insight into the distorted value system that this Vice President has, and I strongly would encourage all my colleagues and all Americans to read Earth in the Balance, particularly those that work in the automotive industry, to get a better understanding of the values of Vice President AL GORE.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me take up on a comment that my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), pointed out. Part of my concern about current policy and the Vice President's leadership is that in fact it is not good for the environment even because he is so interested in making a political statement about this that the actual effects end up being negative, and I will give my colleagues an example from my subcommittee, the oversight hearing that we had on EPA's regulation of particulate matter and ozone which came out about two years ago. We heard testimony from governors who told us do not go forward with this, we are making tremendous strides in cleaning up the air in our State based on the old standards. If you go forward in what many think is an illegal rulemaking, and turns out the courts just last week validated that rule. They said they threw it out and said it is unconstitutional, but the governor warned: If you go forward, there will be all this controversy, there will be lawsuits, and the programs in his state, and this was Ohio, will be put on hold effectively because all of the businesses will wait to see which standard do they have to meet.

So the result of very radical posturing on the environment, and by the way, one of the reasons they threw this out was that EPA could not justify the rule itself made any difference on protecting health and safety and the environment, but they wanted to ratchet down the requirements and say we have done something; the result was that for 2 years people all over the country who are trying to comply with the Clean Air Act did not know whether the old standard would apply or the new standard would apply, and so any innovative future-looking plan to reduce emissions, to come up with more efficient engines, to cut back on the use of energy, those were effectively put on hold until they knew which standard they had to meet.

So my problem in part with Vice President GORE'S approach towards the environment, of making it such a political statement that you come up with the goofy analogies that he has got Nazis in the book is that it does not really do a service to legitimate conservation efforts which people are every day taking part of in this country.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing up that point.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I am going to yield here in just a second to our good colleague from Florida, but just to observe, to corroborate what you said, the very thing Mr. GORE claims to support, the environment, his policies are actually hurting. It is the same thing in the area of national forests. I said earlier we have more standing timber than at any time in the 20th century. We also have the worst forest health than any time in the 20th century. Great over growth in the forests, huge amounts of dead and dying trees, all brought about by the horrific forest management policies of the Clinton/Gore administration catering to these sorts of extreme, bizarre, goofy views, and I yield now to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for his comments.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding again, and I just want to amplify on what my colleague from Indiana was talking about. If you look at all these new areas where the Federal Government has gotten itself involved in in the latter half of the 20th century or the second half of the 20th century, a lot of what the Federal Government has done has really not had a positive effect, and the best example there is education.

The Federal Government in the 1970s, really dating back to the 1960's, began to involve itself in the educational system, and concomitant with that actually educational performance standards in the United States have deteriorated. But the one area where the Federal Government has passed some laws that seem to have had a beneficial effect is in the area of the environment where we have had a good marked improvement in air quality standards and water quality with the implementation of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act.

What is very important about what my colleague from Indiana just said is we are not done with implementing the features of the Clean Air Act and I believe also features of the Clean Water Act, and there are governors and States and municipalities that are still working to adhere to that standard, and it is believed by many who are truly knowledgeable people in this arena that if we just simply allow them to continue, and my colleague is correct in that they have suspended action for the past 2 years because of this concern of a new standard, if we just leave them go, that water quality standards and air quality standards would continue to improve and actually get better.

And I just cite all this to point out that to claim that we have this crisis when actually the air is better and the water is better, I know I did my medical school training at Lake Erie, and Lake Erie was a mess, and now Lake Erie is a clear lake, it is dramatically improved.

I grew up on Long Island not far from New York City in the mouth of the Hudson River. The Hudson River was a disaster. It is now much better. There is still more clean up that needs to be done, but we are heading in the right direction.

And for the Vice President to claim that literally the world is falling apart, that we have this absolute environmental crisis, I believe is absurd, and it certainly is absurd to entertain a serious discussion of a person with such extreme, extreme values be placed in the position of Commander in Chief of the United States, and I really thank the gentleman for yielding again. He has been very gracious in yielding his time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Let me just say again, citing another example, of how GORE, Mr. GORE'S views actually are hurting the objective he claims to advance, namely protecting the environment. The Clinton-Gore administration has absolutely resisted any change to the disastrous Endangered Species Act which has probably more than any other single act been of detrimental effect to so many taxpayers who own private property throughout the country, and oddly enough there is a very perverse incentive that the federal law now creates, specifically the Endangered Species Act. If an endangered species should be found on or about your property, you become subject to extensive Federal regulation that can cause the massive loss of value of your property, like up to 90 percent.

□ 2030

So the perverse incentive is that far from wishing to conserve and help the endangered species, the incentive for the property owner is to get rid of the endangered species. There is a phrase, shoot and shovel and bury, something like that, whereby property owners, if they find one, try and get rid of it.

Now, of course, one should not do that. That is a felony under the Endangered Species Act and it is wrong and undesirable, but nevertheless the law should be worded in such a way to encourage people to make the right choices.

This law is just the opposite. It encourages people to make the wrong choices. It is very heavy handed. It is top down. It is punitive. Well, it is socialism. But, of course, as the economist observed, I think Mr. Hahn, whom I believe I cited earlier, he indicated that this is environmental socialism.

What is the basis of socialism? Force. We can go back to George Washington, who understood that. In speaking of government, he said government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force, and like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.

It appears that Mr. GORE likes the use of force, likes the use of government, and wishes to increase its use and increase the power of the government. In fact, on almost any issue he always has the same answer: more government.

It does not matter what the question is. If the question is how do we stop the killings that occurred in that awful situation in Colorado, well, it is more gun control even though gun control had nothing to do with it. Even though there is no showing that that could possibly work, they always have an answer: more government.

The Endangered Species Act, have to make it tighter; have to raise the fines; have to increase its applicability; we have to go from species to ecosystems and extend our control over the whole ecosystem.

Campaign finance reform, we have to have more of that. That is from the mouth of Mr. GORE, if one can believe it, and yet the fact of the matter is the very reforms that Mr. GORE gave us that are in present law have created disastrous conditions that he now decries.

What is the answer? We just do not have enough government. More fines, more punitive actions, more restrictions on our constitutional freedoms. This is the approach taken by our Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. MCINTOSH.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is saying and would just contribute one more example of how the policies that Mr. Gore has put forward are counterproductive to the environment.

The global warming treaty, the U.N. treaty that he signed on behalf of the United States of America, his maiden voyage into the area of foreign policy and representing this country, he neglected to insist in the negotiation that countries like China or Mexico or Latin American countries or India or South or North Korea be bound by the articles of that treaty. Instead, most of the restraint was on the United States.

So it was a treaty that brought us more government here in America, government that would increase the price of gasoline by 50 percent; government that would force coal miners to lose their jobs throughout this country; government that would threaten our auto industry and cost us a million jobs as those jobs are sent to China, Mexico, Latin America and all of the countries that would be exempt.

So he seems to be not concerned about government overseas but concerned about creating government here. The net result for the environment is that the worst polluters are left scot free. China will produce more global warming gasses in the next 20 years than the United States, and yet they will not be subject to this treaty.

He cannot solve the global problem.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman will yield, our policy seems to be to bend over backwards and do everything we can for China, despite the fact they point their missiles at us and take advantage of us in every way.

Mr. MCINTOSH. In the end, the environment is the loser, and so are the American workers who lose their jobs.

The only winners are those people who sought to make a political point and stand up and say, we are for the environment. To my way of thinking, that is not good government, and it reflects a disproportionate emphasis on short-term political gain and no consideration for what is in the best interest of the United States.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) for his participation tonight.

I encourage everybody to read ''Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit.'' We will be back for the next chapter as we examine further the dangerous and extreme and outrageous and, as my colleague said, goofy views of the Vice President of the United States, Mr. AL GORE.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I will take up that entire 60 minutes.

I want to briefly respond actually to some of the comments that we heard in the previous hour, and then talk about the new economy and how we can adopt our government to address the issues that it brings to the fore.

I was interested to hear for an hour, the 2000 campaign is still a ways away, and for any of those who are wondering whether or not it is going to be positive, I guess the gentlemen who preceded me have answered that question in the negative. It is going to be relentlessly negative.

Amongst the charges that we heard tonight, I understand now that Vice President GORE wants to get rid of ambulances and fire trucks. If the other people are to be believed, that is a core of his policy. Those who were not listening to the comments, what they were saying is Mr. GORE has concerns about the internal combustion engine and would like to replace it. They implied that since these engines are now in ambulances and fire trucks, for him to oppose the internal combustion engine must mean he wants to get rid of ambulances and fire trucks.

I think this sort of extreme negative campaigning is bad for our entire system of government. I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of their issues I actually agree with. I think we can get up and talk about what we stand for and move the country forward, instead of relentlessly trying to pummel whoever emerges as the leader of the party we are opposed to.

I do not think that serves democracy and I am somewhat saddened to see that, as I said, 20-some months before the campaign even starts we are full bore on the ripping apart of the person who we think is going to lead the opposite party. Let us talk about a few positive issues, what we stand for and the direction we want to take the country in.

Towards that end, that is what I want to talk about today. I talk as a member of the New Democratic Caucus. We try to each week as new Democrats to present a message, an issue that we want to talk about, that we think the country needs to address and that our government needs to address.

New Democrats are essentially moderate, pro-business, pro-growth Democrats within our caucus, and the issue that I want to talk about today has to do with the new economy and how our government can institute policies that address the changes that that new economy brings to our country.

First of all I want to talk about what I mean by the new economy. Everyone has heard about the Information Age, about the global economy. It has almost become a cliche to say that we live in a global economy that is based far more on technology, but just because it is a cliche does not make it any less true. It is the dominant feature of the last few years of the 20th century and will be the dominant feature as we move into the 21st century, as our economy changes.

We must adjust to it. We must understand what moves and motivates this new economy and adopt the policies that adjust to those changes to best serve the people of this country.

It is a good news/bad news situation. The good news is it creates so much opportunity, the advances that we have had in the technology from computers to telecommunications to all points in between, to software, have created tremendous amounts of choices and tremendous amounts of opportunities in a wide variety of fields.

It also creates challenges. The central challenge that it creates is adjusting to change. The world simply changes more rapidly today than it did previously. Therefore, we have to be ready to make the adjustments as new technologies come on board, as the world changes.

I am 100 percent confident that we can do this; no question about it. We can benefit from the dramatic increase in productivity, in growth, that high tech industries give us and adjust to the changes, but not if we do not think about the issues in a new light, think about what the Information Age, what the global economy means to the policies that we need to adopt.

To strip this to its core, what I am talking about is people. The reason I care about technology issues is because of the district I represent. The Ninth District of the State of Washington, it is a blue collar district, and one of the most important things that the leaders in our community, whether they be government or business, can do is ensure that a strong economy exists so that the people of districts like mine and throughout the country can get good jobs, make enough money to take care of their family and pursue their dreams and their interests as they see fit.

Maintaining that economy is what is going to bring it home to everybody. Not just the top 5 percent, not just the Bill Gateses of the world, but every single person in the country who needs to have a good job to support their family or just support themselves can benefit from policies that embrace the high tech new economy. It is going to be important to real people from one end of this country to the other.

I think when we talk about the high tech new economy it is important to break it down. There are really five areas of the new economy. First of all we have computers, and in that I include software and hardware. We have the Internet. We have telecommunications; biotech, which is primarily health care products that are developed; and lastly we have all of the products that those first four things help create.

I think there is a mistake sometimes that people make, that technology is just a certain sector of our economy; there are certain, quote, high, unquote companies and then there are low tech companies. Every company is affected by technology. Obviously, some are more affected by it.

Intel, Cisco Systems, Microsoft, these are companies directly in high tech. But even a company, even a retail store that sells clothing apparel is affected by the quality of the software that they have, that can track their inventory and track their customers and find out new opportunities.

One of the examples that I think shows this is a small company that is actually starting up in my district that is trying to develop, coincidentally, back to the internal combustion engine, a new engine that will generate power. I have not figured out a way to make it drive an automobile, but what it can do is it can generate energy and replace some of the old methods of generating that energy.

The advantage of this new engine that is based on the ram jet physics, stuff that I do not even begin to understand except to say that it works and it generates energy much more cleanly and much more efficiently than current methods, the person who was able to generate this product had worked on the technology in the defense sector. He had worked on it with jet airplanes but they had never quite made the connection down to the more civilian use of generating energy.

He was able to generate that because of the rapid advancing in computers and software that enabled him to test theories more rapidly. Stuff that would have taken decades to get through to test, he could literally do in a matter of weeks, and that enabled him to test theories and move forward and get to the point where he actually developed the engine.

In the biotech sphere, I talked to some folks in the biotech industry just

last week, and they said from 1985 to today they have been able, through the use of computers and software, to reduce the time it takes them to analyze data to the point where a project that they did in the mid-1980s took them 5 years to analyze, that data today they could do in an afternoon.

This application spreads all across our economy. So those five sectors need to be encouraged and fostered to grow because they impact all aspects of our business.

As we get into an increasingly competitive global economy, we want our companies in the U.S. to be the ones that advance fastest and furthest and do it first so that we can take the advantage and get the economic benefit of that for our country. Therefore, we need to adopt policies that reflect this. We need to look to the future and say, as the world changes, as technology moves forward, what do we need to do to be ready for it?

Certainly we cannot go with policies that we had 50, 20, even 10 years ago, when technology has changed. Remember 5 years ago the Internet was pretty much a nonfactor. It was an idea. It was out there, certainly, but the explosive growth in the last five years was not foreseen but by the smallest number of people. Now that affects every aspect of our economy. We need to be ready for those sorts of changes.

Towards that end, I have six main policy areas that I want to make people aware of, that we in government need to address to try to adjust to this high tech economy. The first one has to do with export controls, and this is one that actually applies to more than just the high tech economy. It just becomes more of a factor because of the global nature of our economy that the Information Age makes possible.

We have a number of policies in this country that restrict the exportation of our products, specifically restrict the exportation of technology products or create unilateral economic sanctions against the export of all products. This creates a problem for one simple fact, and for one simple reason: Ninety-six percent of the people of this world live someplace other than the United States, yet the United States is currently responsible for 20 percent of the world's consumption.

□ 2045

What that means is that if our companies are going to grow, if markets are going to increase, they are going to have to have access to markets outside of this country. Currently, our policy on unilateral economic sanctions places sanctions on dozens of different countries that limit our ability to export.

Now, the reason we place those economic sanctions is because we disapprove of something that that country has done, and that makes a certain amount of sense, if our action to place those sanctions would change the action by that other country that we disapprove of. But the reality is it does not. All it means is they go someplace else to buy their products. In essence, what we are doing is we are punishing these other countries by telling them that we will not take their money and that is not much of a punishment. It drives them into the arms of our competitors.

We need to rethink our unilateral economic sanctions policy. Multilateral sanctions make sense. If we can get enough people together, enough of our allies together to condemn an action, condemn a country and place sanctions on them, then that can work. But taking the action unilaterally does nothing to advance the policy aims and only hurts us economically.

In the technology realm, we place restrictions on the exportation of encryption technology; that is, technology that is used basically to protect data on a computer, to make sure that people cannot access it who you do not want to access your information. We also place restrictions on the exportation of so-called supercomputers. The problem with that is because computers are leaping ahead so fast and so quickly, a laptop basically could have been, will some day be a supercomputer and is close to getting there under the definition that we have in policy today.

We need to understand that in trying to restrict the exportation of this technology, the world has changed. I think this is one of the key areas that shows how we need to adjust. In the old days, we did not want this technology to get out there because it had national security implications, and it clearly does. If one has good encryption technology, if one has good computing technology, it affects one's ability to have weapons basically to commit harm, to do a variety of things. It has military significance.

But the question is, how do we prevent other people from getting that technology. Can we simply as the United States put our arms around it and say we are not going to let it out and nobody else is going to get it? No. Encryption technology in particular. One can download it off the Internet, dozens of other countries sell it. It is going to get out there. In fact, this is going to hurt our national security. Because if we restrict the exportation of encryption technology in this country, our companies will slowly fall behind. They will not be able to get the customers because they will not be providing the best product. As we fall behind and other countries get further ahead of us in this technology, we lose our ability to be the leaders in the technology.

The encryption companies, software companies in this company who produce encryption technology cooperate with the FBI and the NSA to help them, show them the advances in the technology. That helps us be ready to deal with the national security implications. If we lose that leadership role, countries in other parts of the world are not going to share that information with our National Security Agency or the FBI. We need to be sure that we allow the exportation of that encryption technology so that we can continue to be the leaders in that area.

Another important area is education, and that gets to the change points. In a rapidly changing world, we need to constantly update our skills. We live in a society where all of us are going to need to continually be learning. We need to adjust our education system to understand that. In the good old days when basically all one needed was a high school education and could go out and get a job and probably take care of their family; my father did, he had a high school education, got a job as a ramp serviceman for an airline and ready did not update his skills very much during his 32 years with that airline and was able to take care of his family.

In today's world, we need to update our skills. We need to make sure that our education system is ready for that, and that our education system is also ready to educate our children in technology issues and to enable them to change as rapidly as they need and update their skills.

The Internet is the key to all of this. The way the system basically works, what computers and software enable us to do is they enable us to generate and store a large amount of data, and that is very valuable, as in the engine example I cited earlier. By being able to generate that information, they were able to develop a product. That is the start of it. The Internet basically is the step that enables one to transmit that data.

Back to the example of a retail clothing shop, if it is a chain, if they have 25 or 30 stores spread throughout the country, they can share data. Basically being in any one of those stores is like being in the home office and by being able to share that data enables the company to move forward, or, if they are designing something, they can trade the design back and forth and not have to be in the same place.

What we need to do is we need to encourage the Internet. Overregulating the Internet would be one of the biggest mistakes our government could make. It would put us in a position of restricting its ability to grow, and it is very important that we allow the Internet to grow and prosper and do the things for our economy that it has already started to do.

There is also an issue, and this is primarily in the area of biotech, but also in other areas of patents. We need patent reform so that people have the incentives necessary to develop new products, secure in the knowledge that they will be able to keep the patents on those products and benefit from them. Otherwise, they will not get into the field and try to develop them.

Research and development is also a critical element. We have in this country the research and development tax

credit. Unfortunately, it is only good for one year and every year we have to come back and renew it. Well, we need to make that permanent. The reason is because if one is a company planning for the future and deciding how much to put into research, a lot of these products are not developed in one year, and if one does not know if the resources are going to be able to be there for more than one year, it hampers one's ability to make that investment. We have the opportunity to permanently extend the R&D tax credit this year and give companies that incentive to go out there and continue to develop the new products that they need to develop.

Lastly, and this is tied into the Internet, we have the issue of broad band, basically access to the Internet. The Internet is great, but currently only about 20 percent of households in this country have access to it, and a much smaller number, very minute number, have access to so-called broad band Internet access.

Put simply, broad band means that the Internet moves more quickly for us. Now, if one is just sending e-mail or simply surfing the net, that may not be such a big issue, but if one is trying to send data, if one is developing that new design, if one is in the automobile industry, one develops a new design for an automobile and one wants to send it out to one's top 25 executives throughout the world, to be able to send that much data over the Internet requires a larger pipe. Otherwise, it will take forever to send the data out and to download it to whoever has received it.

The most important thing in this area is we need to build the infrastructure. Think of the Internet today in the same way that the railroad was in the 20th century. In the 20th century, the railroad gave us the ability to connect our country, but first, we had to build the track, and it was very expensive to build that track, so we gave incentives to go out there and build it, and it made a lot of sense because it helped grow our economy rapidly.

We need to do the exact same thing with broad band technology. We need to give companies ever incentive out there to go out there and build the infrastructure. Lay the fiber, lay the cable, put in the phone lines, do whatever is necessary to connect as many people in this country as possible, not just to Internet access, but to fast, broad band Internet access.

Overregulation can kill this. If we regulate companies too much so that they do not have the proper economic incentives to go out there and build the infrastructure, it will not happen. Because yes, there is a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow if you are the company that best develops Internet access, but you have to make a major investment up front to get there and you may not be willing to do that if the environment is too regulated.

Those are just six issues that I think we need to touch on, but the important thing is simply to embrace change, understand the new economy. We cannot fight it. It is not an option. It is here. We need to understand it and try to make sure it works. I think one of the greatest challenges for this country is to make sure that it works for everybody. Because right now, it works fairly well for the top 20 percent, but the potential is there to make it work for everybody, and we need to understand it and go about addressing the issues in a way that make it available to the entire country, because it has the massive potential to keep our economy moving forward, to keep productivity high, and to create good jobs. That is why I think that the new economy and the high tech aspects of that new economy is so critical.

I am pleased to have with me the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), who is going to address these issues as well.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for highlighting these issues. Of course, the gentleman has made very clear that what we are talking about here is not just a sector of the economy. We are talking about the economic growth for all people. In fact, to borrow from a campaign slogan of a few years ago and modify it, rather than saying it is the economy, stupid, I think we would say, it is the productivity, stupid. In order to have the kind of productivity growth we have had in recent years, it calls for just what the gentleman has been laying out.

The gentleman and some of our colleagues here may have heard a speech by the Chairman of the Fed, Chairman Greenspan a week or so ago marveling at the productivity growth of the United States. We know to have good growth in productivity we need a well-trained workforce and we need new ideas, and we need to have systems for exchanging ideas rapidly. We need the kind of openness that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) has been calling for. We need the kind of high technology that is not, as the gentleman says, just one sector of the economy, but that is found throughout the economy and throughout all sectors. And, we need training and education to make it work. The gentleman has laid out the ingredients, no doubt about it.

High technology has fueled so much of our Nation's economic growth in recent years, and whether it is in New Jersey or in Washington or in Michigan or in California; in fact, in all of the States of this country, it explains why our economy is doing so well compared to many other countries around the world. In order to keep it going, we need to maintain an education system that is as good as the technology demands.

There are no unskilled jobs in today's economy in America. The car one drives no doubt has more computing power than an Apollo spacecraft. It demands good education; it demands openness of ideas and exchange of ideas, freedom of exchange; and it also demands an investment in research and development.

The gentleman spoke about the R&D tax credit. It was created nearly two decades ago in 1981. It has been extended nine times, but it has only been extended year by year. An R&D investment decision, a research and development investment decision requires years of advanced planning. If a company cannot count on an R&D tax credit in the future, it is hard to do the necessary planning.

So I wanted to join with my friend here and commend him for highlighting these points and join him in talking about the importance of these issues for all people in America.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Actually, I should point out that the gentleman from New Jersey is not just a Congressman, he is also a physicist, which means he actually understands the details of a lot of this stuff a lot better than I do, and I am wondering if the gentleman could offer us any perspective, because research in dealing with high technology is something that the gentleman has some background on in his work as a physicist. I wonder if the gentleman could apply that in some of the work that he has done and how important it is and what can be developed, particularly concerning research and development, and how that can be applied.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I spent much of my career in research and development and there is no question, one has to take a long-term perspective. We cannot lose sight of the day-to-day activities, but one has to take a long-term perspective. A permanent extension of the R&D tax credit would be very valuable to industries that engage in research and development.

I should say that as a scientist I do understand, in fact, the jet engine concept that the gentleman was describing earlier. In fact, it is becoming widely used now in so-called cogeneration plants to generate both heat and electricity that can be used for powering say a research campus or a cluster of apartment buildings or a small community, and it came about because of research in an area that was not directly related to energy generation. It was research in aerospace. And as a result, in fact, we were talking about it today in connection with the NASA authorization.

□ 2100

There is a need for investment in research in such things as jet engines. In this case, the benefit came not only in providing better commercial aircraft, better military aircraft, but it also turned out to be a more efficient way of generating electricity. That is providing savings throughout the country, throughout the economy. So research and development does not always pay off the most in the area where you expect it to.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I think that is a very important point.

When we look at a lot of the products out in the market today, it would be very interesting for everybody in society to sort of track one of those products, how it came into being, the steps that were taken, the investment that was necessary, the people power that was involved, and it makes us understand the importance of research and development.

I think biotech is a great area to look at this. Everyone is aware of the drugs that have come out that have generated tremendous amounts of money, but we also have to look at the process that these companies had to go through to get to that product.

Basically they were working for sometimes as much as 8 or 15 years without ever generating any revenue, without ever getting any return on the product that they were trying to develop. I am not talking about not making a profit, I am talking about not generating any revenue, because their product was not yet developed and being sold.

If you have that type of situation, who is going to spend money for 8 years and not have any revenue? We need incentives, we need incentives for investors and incentives for the companies to make that sort of long-term commitment. It is not just biotech products, but the engine we are talking about was researched for years before someone generated one and they could generate the electricity that they were looking for.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, my district in New Jersey, and as the gentleman knows, New Jersey is indeed a research State, going from Thomas Edison to Albert Einstein to the biotech companies of today, I have two biotech companies in my district, of the many, many dozens around the country, two that have actually started to generate a profit.

They have started to generate a profit after, one is 18 years and the other is about 14 years, and they have some very clever, I think probably very desirable, and ultimately very successful products. But it took a long time and a lot of work to develop those, and there are many, many biotech companies that are not turning a profit, they are living on hope and investment at this point.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. And there are many that never will turn a profit.

Mr. HOLT. But those that do can change our lives.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Exactly. So we need to set up a system that gives the incentives to invest in these sorts of products. It is not just biotech, it is in every single aspect of the high-tech community, giving the incentive to put the money into research helps us move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman. It is my pleasure to join him in this special order, and I thank the gentleman for doing it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman is quite welcome. It is nice to have a physicist in Congress to help out with these very difficult issues.

I just want to wrap up this topic by emphasizing how important it is and how it touches our lives. I think one of the biggest challenges we have right now as a society is to make sure that the message gets out that technology is for all of us, that it affects all of us in a variety of different levels.

I think there is a tendency, and in fact, I was never that computer literate until a few years ago, and I always thought, you know, of first computers and then the Internet that that is just not something that I deal with.

Well, it is something that everybody is going to have to deal with, and it is a good thing. It is a positive change in our lives. Yes, it is change and change is difficult, but it will open up windows of opportunity that we could never imagine if we simply understand that change, understand what the information economy has brought to us, and how our society needs to adjust to it.

I think in the long run it is going to give us a better society and a stronger society, but it is not only a matter of embracing it but understanding it, and advancing the policies that are going to make sure that we all benefit from it.

The Internet has the ability to connect people, just for example. I have heard some people say, well, they are worried that the Internet is going to divide our society even more between the haves and have nots, those that have technology, those that do not.

I see the Internet just the opposite. The Internet basically enables anybody, for the ever-decreasing price of a laptop and the ability to hook up a telephone line, to get access to information that was previously the exclusive purview of the few. You would have to go off to institutes of higher learning or know people who were highly educated in order to get access to this information. Now it is right there on our computers, virtually anything we could imagine, for us to access for a very cheap price.

That has the possibility, I think, to really broaden the opportunity of this country, to make it more inclusive and bring more people along on these issues.

Government has a role to play. Sometimes that role is getting out of the way. As I mentioned, do not regulate the Internet, and do not overregulate the telecommunications industry so people do not have the incentives necessary to build that all-important infrastructure.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the United States is a leader in the development of new technology. Historically, the R&E tax credit has played a major role in elevating this great Nation to such a significant and influential leadership position.

However, with greater market challenges in the future, we will have to fight hard to maintain the U.S. lead in new technology and innovation.

Simply put, the tax credit is an investment for economic growth and the creation of new jobs.

It strengthens our international position, and often results in an enhanced quality of life for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the R and E tax credit has been on the books for many years, and there is no doubt that it has proved beneficial to our Nation's technology enterprise.

But, there is also no doubt that its benefits could be even greater if the credit were made permanent and the perennial uncertainty were eliminated.

I urge my colleagues to support this concept of a permanent R&E credit and support the type of research activities that will maintain American technological leadership into the 21st century.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it has a more positive role to play, like in education, giving people access to higher education, continuing education, through grants, loans, incentives to companies, whatever. That is an active role the government can play.

So it is a matter of balancing between those two things. Sometimes government needs to get out of the way, sometimes it needs to help, but more than anything, it needs to understand, needs to understand what the new economy is and how to make it best work for all of our citizens.

A DISCUSSION ON MURDER SIMULATION AND ON THE SITUATION IN KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to visit about a couple of subjects tonight. I thought the first half hour we would talk about the murder simulators that are being created or are created and are currently in existence in our country, and then perhaps spend the last half hour, I have invited a colleague of mine to come over and talk with me. He is an expert in foreign relations. We are going to talk a little more about the situation in Kosovo.

First of all this evening, I want to talk about murder simulation, murder simulation.

Last weekend I had the opportunity to have dinner with a good friend of mine, good friends of mine, Dr. Mohamed and Simi Hasan, and their heritage is in Pakistan. I asked them about Pakistan. We got on the subject, obviously, of the shootings in Colorado, at the Columbine High School. I asked them about the situation in Pakistan.

In Pakistan, they told me that there at a very young age young boys are given fully automatic weapons, fully automatic weapons. Those are the types of weapons that have been outlawed in this country, against the law in this country since about 1937.

I asked my friends, the Hasans, as we had this discussion, do you have these kinds of incidents in Pakistan? And the answer was no. I said, what do you think is the difference? Why does it not happen in Pakistan but happens in the United States? It happens even here in our home State of Colorado. As many know, I am from the State of Colorado.

They said, I will tell you why. Give me just a minute. And Mrs. Hasan excused herself. She came back to the dinner table and she had this magazine. I hope the publishers of this magazine have an opportunity to visit with me at some point in the near future.

This magazine is called ''Next,'' the Next Generation. It is about video games. It would be more properly titled ''Next, Murder Simulator.'' What do I mean by murder simulator? As I go on with this discussion this evening, remember a couple of things.

First of all, simulators in our society are very common. Any Members who have ever studied the art of flying know that we have simulators to teach our pilots how to fly airplanes. We even have simulators today that show people how to drive cars. Now, unfortunately, we have simulators that train and put impressions on very young minds in our country, how to murder.

There are a few questions this evening we should consider as I continue with my remarks. Let me go through some of them.

Number one, what kind of responsibility and accountability are reflected by our society, and even more specifically, what kind of responsibility and accountability are reflected by the editors and the board of directors and the contributors to this Next Generation video magazine, as well as some of the games or video murder simulators that I am going to talk about?

What types of values, what kinds of values are we teaching our young people with the types of murder simulators I am going to show the Members in just a couple of minutes? What type of values are being taught here? What types of values do we want to teach our young people?

These are young, fresh minds. Impressions can be made very easily on these young minds. This is the next generation that is going to lead our country, and the generation that is going to create a generation behind them to take their place. What kinds of impressions do we want to make? What kinds of accountability do we want from the people who make those impressions? What kind of future does it offer for our country?

Let us talk about what kinds of responsibilities the video game industry has. Here, as I am about to show the Members, they celebrate the most explicit form of violence that a teenager can experience. They celebrate it, they show it off, the most violent type of experience that a teenager can experience. We sell it, not we but video producers out there. The murder simulators are sold by corporations in this country. They are highlighted in magazines, like this magazine right here, The Next Generation.

These games appeal to the worst values in our society. We know what kinds of values we want to teach our young people. We have some great young people in this country, and they have a wonderful future, but we have to guide them. We have been there. As adults, we have had that experience. We know that we were blessed, most of us, with experienced guiders, our parents, who guided us, helped take us through life. Now we have that obligation.

Why should we have games that appeal to the very worst of elements, the things that all of us would dread the most, the things that horribly, horribly went wrong at Columbine High School in Colorado 3 weeks ago? We glorify these kinds of things in video games in this country.

What are the relationships that exist? What kinds of relationships do these types of games portray in our society?

In a single video game, remember this, in a single video game, a teenager will see more death and violence than they would in a week's worth of TV. We could take any programs we want and take one week's worth of TV, and we will see in one video game more violence simulation than that whole week of TV.

Does this turn on, does this ask a question? What is the mystery here? What is going wrong here? Something is wrong with these games.

Do the producers of these games, and I am going to ask this, in fact, we have some of their names, and I would be very interested at some point to talk to them out there to find out if they have children, and if their children are allowed to play these kinds of games that they advertise in magazines like this or the kinds of games that they manufacture, that they go and sell to our teenagers, to our young people.

Do they allow their own children to do this? It will be a very interesting question to be asked of some of these corporate executives.

Are they legally empowered to deliver this kind of thing? Yes, they are legally empowered to do it. Sure they are. People can talk slut talk, too. People can talk terrible things.

Let me tell the Members, we are about to get into this game. Let me caution all of my friends out there who have children, if there are any children watching this evening, anybody on C–SPAN that might be watching our discussions here on the floor, please be advised in advance that there are some very gruesome situations that are going to be portrayed by video games.

By the way, we do not find this on the House floor, we can find it in any video arcade, practically any video arcade Members want to walk into. I have not been to a video arcade in many years. This last weekend, as a result of my discussion with my friends over dinner, my wife and I actually went to a mall and went to a video arcade place located within the mall.

I was amazed. We can see it right there. There are kids in there with their guns. Of course, every once in a while they put money in, they pay money, and there it is, murder simulation, blowing this person away, blowing that person away.

By the way, people do not just drop. There are depictions of their insides, of the exit wounds, of all kinds of things on these video games. These are young people. This was a fairly conservative community, of which I went into the mall to go into this video arcade. These kids were everywhere, I would guess, from 7 years old to 13 or 14 years old, playing these video games.

What do Members think the impression is that goes on the mind of a young 7-year-old boy who sits in front of this game shooting, and the more he shoots, the more body parts fly out on this video arcade?

□ 2115

Well, hold on, because let us take a look. I went through this magazine right here. Again, I want to keep showing this because if any of my colleagues have any questions or doubts about my comments this evening, before they criticize me, before they pick up the phone and call my office, I urge my colleagues to go out, go to their local mall this weekend, and go to a video arcade store and see what kind of games, what kind of murder simulation is taking place in there, and then draw the question upon your own mind:

One, what kind of values are we teaching our young people? Number two, does this have an impression on the mind and could somebody possibly, through some kind of devious thought, extend these to the kind of murder situations that we see with gangs on the streets or in the worst case scenario as we saw at the Columbine High School?

Let us go ahead and begin the video murder simulator. This is an advertisement. This is a two-page ad and it is found in the ''Next Generation'' magazine. This magazine, this is the June issue, so their ad is found inside this magazine.

The video game is titled ''You're Gonna Die.'' Now I have got a red laser here. Follow my light. My light is right there at ''You're.'' ''You're Gonna Die,'' that is the name of the video game.

Right here is a human body. By the way, the weapon they are holding is a fully automatic, it looks like a fully automatic weapon outlawed in this country since 1932. Surrounded by the head of the human body, that is not red hair. This body is laying in a pool of blood.

Remember, this game can be played by a 7 year old. This game can be played by a 10 year old. This game can be played by a 13 year old.

Here is some of the advertising that is contained within this ad. This, by the way, is called ''Kingpin, Life of

Crime.'' That is the name. This is the ''Kingpin'' game, ''Life of Crime.''

Up here, ''Target,'' now my colleagues may not be able to see this but I will read it for them here, ''target specific body parts and actually see the damage done, including exit wounds.''

Well, by gosh, let me tell my colleagues something. This Saturday, I am going to be in Cortez, Colorado. Do my colleagues know what I am going to be doing in Cortez, Colorado? I am going down there for a memorial service for a gentleman named Dale Claxton. Who is Dale Claxton? Dale Claxton was a police officer who was shot and killed in the line of duty in the State of Colorado 1 year ago. He was shot 27 times.

If these people, the people that produce this game, want to see exit wounds, maybe they ought to come visit with me and I will show them some pictures of exit wounds. I do not think it is very funny, and I do not think it is an amazing game. I do not think it ought to be something that should be sold in the marketplace. I sure as heck do not think it is something we ought to expose to our young, young children as a game. Put in the quarter, get to simulate murder.

Let us go on. Let us go on to our next box right over here. ''Even the odds by recruiting the gang members you want on your side.'' So even the odds. One gets to go out in this game, and one has vicious gang members that they get to pick, kind of like when one lined up in school and one got to pick who goes on which team. You are on the blue team, you are on the red team, you are on the blue team, you are on the red team.

In this particular game, one gets to pick which vicious gang members one wants on one's team so one can go out and play the game ''You're Gonna Die''. Or steal a bike or hop a train to get around town. On the game, it simulates a train so that one can figure out how to jump onto it, or to steal a bike. Steal a bike, not borrow a bike, not take one's own bike. It is also incorporated within here.

Built on top of the revolutionary Quake II engine. Includes multiplayer gang bang death match for up to 16 thugs. Actual game play screens. Talk to people the way you want, from smack to pacifying. Talk to people the way you want under this game, from smack to pacifying.

Here are the people that really ought to be proud of it, ''Kingpin, Life of Crime.'' We will go through some of the names of the corporations that actually make this product and market this product, and then go to this magazine and ask this magazine to put it in the hands, like the hands of that young man whose parents I had dinner with last week. We are going to talk about those people in just a moment.

Let me say to my colleagues that I used to be a police officer. I do want my colleagues to know that I am a member of the House Entertainment Task Force. I believe in good entertainment. I think one has a right to good entertainment. I think there is a lot of good entertainment out there without having to revert to this.

But when one puts these kind of video games in a video arcade in a mall, it is almost as if one has a magnet drawing these young people into this thing. Really, I just want all of my colleagues, I know that I have said this already, but I think it would be so important for my colleagues, this weekend or as soon as they go by a mall or a video arcade store, go on in there. Walk through there. Just observe what one sees.

Then think about. Well, was Congressman SCOTT MCINNIS way off base when he talked about this? Does this game really belong out here in the mall for kids to come in and spend their money on? Does a game that talks about target specific body parts and actually see the damage done, including exit wounds, is that what we ought to do?

Should we not have a question about where some kid in our society, and I say some because we have a lot of good kids, a lot more good kids by a large, large margin than bad kids, but is it possible that some of the kids that take the wrong path in our society are influenced by these kind of games?

We know that simulation influences pilots when we have pilots on a flight simulator. We know that puts an impression on their mind. We know it trains them to fly an airplane. Same thing with the car simulator. We know that if we put one in that car simulating machine, one will learn how to drive a car better. One will actually think one is driving a car, and it will put impressions on one's mind. It imbeds them on one's mind.

This game does exactly the same thing, except it does not do it for flying, it does not do it for driving, it does it for murder. Murder. Kingpin. We will talk about him in a minute.

There is another game. This is an ad for the D–Link video game. Remember, I did not have to search, go out and do a lot of research to find these games. I got one magazine, this magazine right here. I got one more magazine similar to it in my office. So I just picked up two magazines randomly. This was sent to the House. It is a June edition.

One does not have to search very far to find what I am finding. This is not a rare kind of thing, a unique circumstance, and a Congressman just happened to go pull this stuff up through a lot of extensive research. One can buy it probably, I would guess, at any magazine shelf, rack.

Let us look at this game. ''Gratuitous violence is 200 times faster with the D-Link network.'' Gratuitous violence, those are the key words. Let us define what Webster's Dictionary says is meant by the word ''gratuitous.'' It is very important. Apply their definition to the game.

Gratuitous, in the dictionary. Gratuitous: not called for by the circumstances. In other words, there are no circumstances calling for this kind of action. It is without reason. This kind of action is without reason. There is no reason for it. It is without reason. It is without cause. It is without proof. It is adopted or asserted without any good ground. So it is adopted or it is asserted without any good ground, as a gratuitous assumption.

Now look it up here. Let us just put this in here. Not called for by circumstances, without reason, cause, or proof, and adopted without any good ground, et cetera, with a D-Link network 200 times faster than other online games. Violence. It is exactly what it does. Gratuitous violence.

Here is the next one. This caption is used to promote the game ''Legacy of Kain, Soul Reaver.'' ''Destroying your enemies isn't enough, you must devour their souls.'' ''Destroying your enemies isn't enough, devour their souls.'' Of course the game helps one do that.

For those of my colleagues who use the Internet, I think they would find it very interesting to go ahead and download this. If one downloads this on one's computer, and Next Generation publishes this, this is owned by Kingpin, if one downloads it, it allows one to see, and this is a quote, this is a quote from my download, we did this on the Internet, ''Now available, a wonderful,'' look at the word it uses, wonderful, ''a wonderful depiction of a massive gang hit. Blood splatters galore.''

So from the Kingpin web site, go ahead and put Kingpin in the search on the Internet, pull up their web site, and that one is going to find in quotes. Here is their definition. ''It is now available, a wonderful depiction of a massive gang hit. Blood splatters galore.''

That is what we are making available in our society. People that do this, they make money off of this. Do my colleagues know what drives this? Not a conscious, not a conscious decision to do something that contributes to society. That is not what drives this kind of video game and the mind behind it. It is not somebody trying to educate our young people. It is not somebody that, with good intent, is trying to give a strong impression and education for our young people. It certainly not somebody that is trying to create some kind of religious base for our young people.

This is driven by one word, greed, G-R-E-E-D. That is exactly what makes these people create these games where one can call, like ''Kingpin, Life of Crime,'' ''You're Gonna Die''.

Think about it, folks. We are allowing greed to drive these kind of games, and these kind of impressions are being made on our young people, and then we question, gosh, what went wrong in Littleton, Colorado? Why did that happen in Littleton, Colorado? What is happening to our young people?

What is happening to our generation that allows our young people to have

these kind of things? What is happening to our generation that, driven solely by the word ''greed,'' manufactures, sells, and advertises these kind of programs?

As I mentioned, I want to talk about, for a minute, Interplay executives. As I said to my colleagues, it is my opinion there are people, this by the way, and I am not sure of the complete corporate structure, other than we have the corporation names down in the bottom of the advertisement, one of the corporations is called Interplay, another corporation is called Xatrix, another one is Crystal Dynamics, and Eidos.

On this one, who is Interplay, and what do they stand for? Interplay Entertainment Corporation is a worldwide developer, publisher, and distributor of award-winning entertainment software for both core gamers and the mass market.

Interplay Corporation, Interplay Entertainment Corporation was founded in 1983. Interplay offers a broad range of products in the action, adventure, role playing, strategy and sports categories across multiple platforms, including Nintendo 64. The company completed its initial public offering in June 1998.

There are other things about it. Interplay, on the maximizing franchise and brand value, Interplay seeks to publish hit titles whose strong consumer appeal and resulting consumer loyalty will create opportunities for franchise titles, sequels, add-ons and merchandising.

As we went further in the web site, we found out who some of the Interplay Executives are. Brian Fargo, Mr. Fargo is chairman of the board of directors. He is the chief executive officer, and he is the president. I am going to contact Mr. Fargo.

I am going to contact Mr. Kilpatrick. Mr. Kilpatrick, Christopher J. Kilpatrick in fact is the president. I am going to contact Mr. Kilpatrick.

Manuel Marrero, he is the chief operating financial officer. He is the corporate secretary. Phil Adam, Phil Adam is the vice president of business development. I am going to contact Phil. Kim Motika, vice president of strategic development; Trish June Wrightt, vice president of product development; James C. Wilson, vice president of finance; Jim Maia, vice president of North American sales; Cal Morrell, vice president of marketing; Jill Goldworn, president of Interplay and OEM, Inc.; David Perry, president of Shiny Entertainment, Inc.; Peter Bilotta, president of Interplay Productions Limited.

I am going to contact each of these people. In fact, I am sending a letter to them. I am going to ask them a few questions.

Let us talk about Brian, Brian Fargo, chairman of the board of directors, chief executive officer and president. He could put a stop to this that fast. Brian, all you would have to do in the morning is pick up a telephone and say, take that thing off the shelves now.

□ 2145

And the next time, Brian, somebody comes up to you and says, hey, this is the kind of video game, ''You're Going to Die,'' Mr. President, it is going to show body parts and it will show exit wounds and they can pick their own gang members, what do you think, Mr. Fargo? Do you think this is good for his company? Do you think that he can make a lot of money off this, should we put it on our shelves?

And, Mr. Fargo, you are going to have the opportunity to say, ''No, our company does not need money like that. Our company is not in this for greed. Our company sees no values in putting this kind of game on the market. Our company, Interplay, is ready and prepared to accept responsibilities.''

You know why you should be saying this, Mr. Fargo? Because my bet is your children, Mr. Fargo, do not play these games. My bet, Mr. Fargo, is that you and your wife probably have never sat down with any child, any child, probably not any adult and played this game.

In fact, Mr. Fargo, I bet if I sat down with your family and wanted to explain this game to them in the front room of your house, you probably would be deeply offended and you would probably say to me, ''I have more values. My family deserves more than what you are about to exhibit to them.''

Well, Mr. Fargo, today you have a responsibility to set in your own mind that the first thing you want to do when you get in your office tomorrow morning is to call up your production manager and say to your production manager, ''Stop production of the video game called 'You're Going to Die'.''

And if you do not, Mr. Fargo, then I want you to think about Littleton, Colorado, and Columbine High School. Every time there is a gang shooting in this country, every time there is any kind of violence like that that could possibly come as a result of playing your murder simulation machine, which you allow to be produced for money, which you market out there, you ought to think about it. You ought to think about your own kids.

And, Brian, I am not just talking to you. Colleagues, I am talking to everybody that works for this corporation and every other corporation out there that makes video games. We all have a responsibility as adults. It is not a free ride anymore. We are adults. The responsibility of the future of this country does not belong to our parents anymore. It belongs to us. And before too long, it is going to belong to the generation behind us.

We now have values and principles that we have to stand up for, even when it means that we could get money instead. It is our generation that has the responsibility. And everybody that works for a corporation like this, every chief executive officer in this country that has a video arcade game manufacturing facility or any other type of product that simulates murder, ought to go to the office tomorrow morning and pull it off the shelves. They ought to tell their research and development people, ''Do not ever bring another product like that to my desk. Because, if you do, you are going to work for somebody else if you are lucky enough to find a job.''

Let us see tomorrow how many executives really carry out what I think is a responsibility incumbent upon them not just as chief executive officers but as concerned parents and as concerned citizens in this country.

I am going to write them all a letter, these names, I am going to write these people letters. I would be happy to copy my colleagues on them. I am going to ask them to do just what I have talked about.

Let us talk about another entertainment company, Xatrix, X-A-T-R-I-X, Entertainment. Now, they are somehow connected with Interplay Entertainment Corporation to produce ''You're Going to Die.'' Here is what Xatrix's mission is:

''Our goal is to create games that are revolutionary, innovative, inspiring, and, most of all, fun to play.'' That is fair enough. ''Truly a development lead organization, Xatrix seeks to customize its titles with new and emerging technologies in an effort to give gamers what they want. As third acceleration of on-line gaming emerged, Xatrix looks at the forefront with an unparalleled game play technology and design. Technological and creative vision has no boundaries.'' Think of that. This is a corporation saying to you ''technological and creative vision has no boundaries, and we intend to push the limits of interactive gaming.''

Well, who accepts advertisements? Put ourselves in the mind of a magazine. Who on Earth, if they brought this game to us, which one of my colleagues would be willing, if they owned a magazine or a newspaper, which one of my colleagues sitting on this House floor tonight or any of my colleagues that are listening to me, how many of them would be willing to run an ad for this video game ''You're Going to Die,'' which, as I said earlier, targets specific body parts where they actually get to see the damage done, including exit wounds? How many of you, raise your hands, how many of you would be willing to sell this advertisement to help these people market these murder simulators?

Well, we have got a list and we have got some people that are very, very willing to do it.

Let me read for my colleagues, Imagine Media. This, by the way, is an organization that is willing to take these kind of ads. They are not only willing to take these kind of ads, they are willing to place these ads in the hands of

young children throughout this country and they are willing to do it for a buck. That is what is driving it.

Remember, as I said earlier, this is not being driven by good will, obviously. It is not being driven by an intent to educate our children. It is not being driven to simulate somebody how to drive a car better. It is not being driven to show simulation for flying an airplane so they know how to fly a plane better. It is being driven out of greed to make a buck off murder simulation.

And it is done through this magazine. I will hold it up again. ''Next Generation,'' which is published by Imagine Media, Incorporated, in Brisbane, California, I think. It is 150 North Hill Drive.

At any rate, let us get into what they are saying. This is inside the magazine: ''Imagine Media is aimed at people who have a passion, a passion for games, for business, for computers, or for the Internet. These are passions we share frequently. Our goal is to feed your passion with the greatest magazine web sites and CD ROMs imaginable. We love to innovate. We love to have fun and we seem to love to say 'passion' a lot. We have a cast iron rule always to deliver spectacular editorial material. That means doing whatever it takes to give you the information you need. That means doing whatever it takes. With any luck, we will even make you smile sometimes. Thanks for joining us.

''Next Generation also has a passion for changing the text that the marketing people give us if it gets in the way of a section that we usually put funny text in. Heck, sometimes it is all that that keeps us going. See above this box for more funny little text.''

So what they are saying here is that they have a passion. They have a passion. You do whatever it takes whatever it takes to market this kind of trash. That is exactly what this magazine does.

Now, this magazine, granted, has some other advertisements in it that are not offensive in nature. It would be very easy for this magazine to sell copies off the news stand without putting this on their middle fold-out page. They could do it without this advertisement.

This advertisement that you see right here, this is what this duplicates. This is exactly that ad right here, ''You're Going to Die.'' Now, this one right there, look at it, for greed. For greed. I wonder if the people at Imagine Corporation that print this ''Next Generation'' magazine, I wonder if they sit down with their families, the editor in chief. And we have got the names here. Let us ask them.

Chris Charla, C-H-A-R-L-A. He is the editor in chief; Sarah Ellerman, managing editor; Tim Russo, senior editor; Jeff Lundgran, review editor; Blake Fischer; Lisa Chido, assistant art director.

I want to know something on the Imagine. That is ''Next Generation.'' I want to ask them a question. Have they sat down with their children as the editor here, Chris, or Sarah as the managing editor, Sarah, have you sat down with your children and showed them that ad? Have you sat down and showed them this particular ad? Have you, Sarah? Have you done it, Sarah?

What have you said to your children, Sarah? ''This is how I make money''? ''This is how your mother goes out and makes money''? Chris, how about you? Do you sit down with your children and say, hey, ''I am your dad. That is what I do for a living right here. I sell it. I sell murder simulators to young kids not much older than you kids''? ''And by the way, kids, as soon as we get time, maybe we will go down to the video arcade and play the game that daddy advertises or that mommy advertises.''

Come on, colleagues, it is trash. We know doggone right that the people that publish that magazine, that editor and that managing editor whose names I just mentioned, we know darn right their kids do not play these games. We know darn right that they do not talk to their kids in the kind of language that they put in this magazine.

You know why? Because when it comes to their own children, I would guess, I do not know them, I would guess they have pretty strong values. And when it comes to their own children, I would guess they have pretty definite dreams for them. And when it comes to their own children, I bet they are very protective of what those children are exposed to. But when it comes to other people's children, there is a little different interruption that comes in, and it is called ''greed.''

They do not protect other children. They are not concerned about other children. And they put this right in the middle of their magazine. And not only that, this corporation, which is a different corporation now, puts it on the Internet and allows you to zoom in and see some very graphic, as they say, blood splatters.

Well, how about the corporation that owns this particular magazine? You know what was real interesting that I found out when we went on the web? This is not detective work, by the way. This is information on the web site. I did not have an agency go out and look it up. We pulled it up on the web site very easy.

We found out about Imagine Corporation, the executives. And what really surprised me was the executives listed their family. They listed their family members. For example, the president of the Entertainment Division, Jonathan Simpson-Bint, one of the things in his biography is Jonathan lives in San Francisco with his wife Caroline and their infant son Milo. John, have you sat down and showed Caroline what you advertise? Would you ever in your wildest dreams, in your sickest moments, would you ever sit down with Milo, your son, who I am sure is a beautiful, beautiful young son, a son whom you have big dreams for, would you ever sit down and show this to him?

Answer it for me. Answer the question, Jonathan. You know what? I hope when you do that tomorrow morning you too go to your corporate offices and say, ''Pull the ad. We do not need to sell this kind of trash through our magazine to make a buck. We can make plenty of money without reverting to doing these kind of video murder simulation machines to the young people of this country.''

And it does not end. We have somebody else, the president of the Business and Computer Division, Mark Gross. Mark Gross says on the web page he is the father of the coolest 8-year-old, the coolest 8-year-old on the planet, and lives with his family in Burlingame.

Can my colleagues imagine a father saying, hey, I have got the coolest 8-year-old on the planet? Now, there is a proud father. There is a father that cares about his kid. There is a father that is beaming with pride. That is when he goes home at night when he is with the family. But when he is at work, this is what they do. This is the kind of stuff they market, not to his children, not to Jonathan's child Milo, but to my children, to the children of my colleagues, to everybody's children in this chamber. That is what these people market.

Tom Balentino. This surprised me. He is the Chief Financial Officer. He makes sure they make money off this. He is the one that does the accounting on this ad.

□ 2145

Remember, I am not complaining about the ad, it is the message in the ad. Let us not be confused in these comments. Do you know how many children he has? Five. He has five of his own children. Why would somebody with five children just endanger a family who has just one child? Just one child. Why would you, if you owned a corporation, feel a necessity to go out there in your magazine and create and allow this kind of advertising, or how could you as a parent go out and produce this kind of game?

How can you sit down with your bright mind while your children are playing in another room, and what kind of sick mind does it take to devise this type of video arcade murder simulation game called ''Kingpin, Life of Crime,'' where you get to pick your gang members, where the video game allows you, and I will repeat it up here, to target specific body parts and actually see the damage done, including the exit wounds. What kind of father or mother could do that? Well, our society has produced some of them.

And Holy Klingel, Holy is the mother of two preschool children. It is either Holy or Holly, I am not sure which. Let us just say it is Holly. Holly, have you done it with your two preschool children? Have you taken them to play

this game? Would you let them be exposed to this game? Why do you participate in this? Driven by greed, I guess?

Does anybody want to go out there on the streets today and put in our video arcades this kind of murder simulation game? I think I have gotten my message across pretty clear to you. There are a couple of things that I am going to ask.

First of all, the Internet providers, you have a responsibility. I know we have got the freedom of speech. I am not asking for the creation of a new governmental agency to come down and force you to surrender your freedom of speech.

But I am asking you to exercise responsibility as an adult. Exercise responsibility as a business executive and pull some of this garbage off your Internet sites. You do not need it. You do not need it to pay your bills. You do not need it to make your company well known throughout the country. And for gosh sakes, the children of this country do not need it. Think about the kids.

I will bet a lot of the names I just mentioned to you are soccer parents. I bet a lot of the names of the people that I just mentioned to you talk with pride about the children in the next generation, that we need more schools for them and we need better teachers, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Yet in the background, in the background they are the creators and the advertisers and the marketers and the profiteers of this game.

There is one other thing I am going to try and do as a Congressman. I hate to take this down because I want you to see how grotesque it is, but I feel I have a responsibility as well. I was giving some thought to what can I do as a Congressman to help here? How can I help?

One, I think it is important to come to the House floor of the U.S. House of Representatives and pass on this message, which is what I have been doing for the last half an hour or so. Second, I think it is important for me to figure out how to devise some type of action that we can take. I do not want to create more laws. I am not sure that is the answer.

Obviously we need to spend more time in our families. When you get down to it, the bottom line is family. It is not just your family. So these corporate executives that produce this kind of murder simulator ought to have a family responsibility beyond their own family.

But there are other things that we can do, too. Here is what I am going to do on my part. I am going to contact the Consumer Product Safety Commission. Everybody has thought the Consumer Product Safety Commission is about seat belts or child restraint seats or dangerous toys. I think this video arcade game and games similar to it which are murder simulators, are dangerous toys. I am going to ask them for their thoughts on it.

I am going to contact the video game makers, many of whom I have mentioned tonight, and ask them for a voluntary recall. I am also going to contact their board of directors. I am going to contact the video game magazines and ask that they pull all their advertising. They do not need it.

I am going to notify Parent-Teacher Associations and other child advocacy groups and make them aware of these video games. I am going to sit down with every PTA I can. I am going to sit down with every parent organization I can. I am going to sit down with every group that has been formed as a result of the shooting in Littleton, Colorado, and I am going to show them your advertising. And I am going to say it is time for us to take some parental marketing strength to the marketplace.

We need to talk about this. We need to publish the fact that these kind of games are out there, and we need to urge parents, we need to urge every parent in this country in the next few days, not months from now but in the next few days, every father and mother and every grandmother and grandfather in this country should take enough time to go to your local video arcade amusement center and take a look at what kind of games are in that facility. If you do not agree with that, you ought to file a complaint with the owner.

I notice that as I begin to change subjects here, that I have had a colleague of mine join me from the State of Georgia. I am glad the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is here. If I might, if the gentleman would not mind, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman for a couple of minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for that. I am a father of four children. Of course our kids like to play video games here and there. So I share your concern and I appreciate your raising this issue with the Members of Congress because it is something that, as you have said, does not necessarily take a new law but we need to raise the awareness about it.

I wanted to ask you, when children buy these games or go into a video arcade where these games are offered as one of the choices, is there any kind of label, any kind of warning the way there is with explicit CD lyrics when you buy, that has the warning? Is there any kind of warning on these?

Mr. MCINNIS. There is a label. Mind you that this particular advertisement which I show right here to the gentleman from Georgia is contained within this magazine. This magazine can be bought by anybody. A 5-year-old can buy the magazine. In addition, this particular game is made by Interplay Entertainment Corporation. We pulled it up on the web. So anybody that knows how to use the Internet, and I know kids, 6, 7-year-old kids that can begin to use that, young children, they can pull it up as well.

There is over here in the corner, a little label, a little M, that says mature audience. There is a little warning label right here in the corner. There is absolutely no kind of restriction. This magazine, of course, does not say for mature audiences only. When you get onto the web site, you can access it, so in essence this little warning system means nothing.

But what amazes me, to my good colleague from Georgia, is this game is so grotesque. As I mentioned earlier, it talks about the exit wounds, the body parts, splattering of blood. It is so grotesque, we should not be asking the question to the manufacturer, ''Is it better if we put a warning label on it?'' We ought to say to the manufacturer, ''Don't you have your own family? Don't you have your own kids? Would you take this game home tonight?''

My bet, as the gentleman from Georgia knows, is I will bet there is not one executive associated with any of these corporations that has this game at home for their video arcade for their own children.

Mr. KINGSTON. I have had actually some of these action items which you had listed, I have done on explicit CD lyrics, and basically from the large vendors gotten the shoulder shrug. ''Your kids don't have to listen to it. We have lots of people. Your kids don't have to play it.''

If following your action items a parent wants to write the manufacturer and ask the question, do you feel proud making this, do you feel good about 13-year-olds who are on the edge, high risk kids who are left alone for hours as Klebold and Harris were doing, they played these type games, not necessarily this game but they played violent video games for hours, as I have read the news reports. If parents want to do that, how can they get the address? I know that the manufacturer's name is listed on there, but how do they get the address on who to write the letter to?

Mr. MCINNIS. That is a good question. The first thing on the awareness level, and I agree with the gentleman from Georgia and I appreciate his points, I think that just the gentleman and I talking on the House floor to these manufacturers and asking them to stop production of these gruesome murder simulators will not work because I think they will just disregard us. But what will work on the awareness level is for parents to actually physically go into these arcade amusement centers.

We can urge people, anybody who has a child or anybody that knows a child, cares about children, should in the next 3 or 4 days make it a point to go into a video arcade amusement center and see what kind of games are being played in your neighborhood center. And then what they should do is go to the owner of that store, of that arcade facility and say, ''That game doesn't belong in our community. That game doesn't belong in this store. You ought to send it back.''

In the meantime, I can tell you, I do not want this magazine to have more

sales, at least with the kind of advertising. Mind you, there is some advertising in this magazine to me that seems very legitimate, that is fine advertising. I would not use the products, but it is not a death message in there that they are selling.

But this magazine, Next Generation, you can go to any store, I would guess, any large magazine store, and you will find these magazines on the racks, video game on the racks. Simply pull it up, look for an ad, if you see an ad on this kind of game, ''You're Gonna Die,'' it is very easy, pull it up on the web. It also has addresses in there and addresses of the magazine.

On top of this, you have got the name of the corporations in the bottom of this ad and they have a web site there, www.interplay.com, king in corpse. Notice the web site, king in corpse. That is their web site. Sick web site. Nonetheless, it has addresses for the corporation.

But to my colleague, I think the best thing for us to do for awareness is urge parents just in the next few days, go down to the video store and take a look for yourself. Do not take our word for it, take a look for yourself. If you are offended as I am by these games, tell the local proprietor about that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Or as you pointed out that web site, and you might want to read it again, if people have the Internet, to call up the web site and that would maybe be the starting point in the search.

But when you are talking about the sponsors of the Next Generation magazine, even if somebody is legitimately selling tennis shoes, which is certainly an innocuous and a healthy product, they still are sponsoring this magazine. This magazine could not get in the hands of 12-year-olds without that tennis shoe commercial.

One of the things that I have always advocated to people is you have a lot of power through the voting booth but you have a lot more power every day at the cash register. If you write a letter to XYZ Widgets and say, ''I'm going to quit buying your product because of who you support through your advertising,'' they are going to respond to that if they get enough letters.

Here we are right now in a society that is trying to come to grips with this terrible Columbine High School situation. We are looking for things. This is not going to solve it by itself, but is this a piece of the puzzle? I would say that it is a piece. It is part of the toxin that our children have to live, breathe and eat and sleep and be exposed to in one form or the other.

And is this healthy as an influence on your child? Will this bring your child better to a healthy, normal type life-style or will it take him away from it? Then if you say, ''Oh, I'm not worried about it,'' well, how many hours are you comfortable with them playing the ''You're Gonna Die'' video? Do you want your kid playing it 1 hour, 2 hours, 3 hours, 5 hours a day? As parents we have to ask ourselves these questions. And will exposure to this move your kid along in the right direction that you want him or her to be moving in? Probably not. That is why we have to be very aware of all the things that are after our children's minds and their souls.

Mr. MCINNIS. As the gentleman from Georgia knows, these young people can be impressed so easily. The mind impressions. There are a lot of studies that have been done to see what kind of impact these kind of things have. We know they have an impact. Just the same as this simulator has an impact for a pilot that is learning how to fly.

Your question was about urging the letters. My reluctance tonight to give addresses for, for example, Interplay Entertainment Corporation, which is very easy to find on the web and so on, my reluctance in giving addresses is if a lot of letters do not go there, I do not want these corporations to think people do not care.

That is why I have decided to take the route of urging every parent, I hope some people are watching this evening that have children or know children or care about children, or a local PTA or a local school association or the local teachers' union or teachers association. Go yourselves to that video arcade store and see what is happening.

I was mesmerized the other day when I went in and I saw this video game. There was a kid there, I could not believe how fast that finger was going. He has got two guns and he is shooting like this in this video arcade, and the people are blowing up, blood all over the video screen and things like that. The way that kid was moving that and even going like this, across, it amazed me. That is what is going on in that mind. That kid is not out playing football or baseball.

By the way, the community where this is has wonderful recreational facilities for their young children. It is not like this kid had no other choice. But I hope to get some parents into these video arcade stores and they are saying, ''Hey, my kid's not coming in here.''

The question that should be asked, as the gentleman from Georgia brought up, I think the standard here of every chief executive officer in this country, every chief executive officer in this country, before he or she approves this kind of product, they ought to ask, ''Am I willing to take it home for my children?'' Instead of asking, ''Is it going to make us a buck?'' is it going to drive the greed of this corporation, the question that should be really asked is, ''Would I show it to my own children? Would I let my children or my grandchildren play this game? Would I want them exposed to this?''

□ 2200

As my colleague knows, it is just not the Littleton disaster, as he pointed out. Every day we have shootings or violent incidences, not just shooting, but violent incidents in this country. This cannot help but play a part, but my colleague said it all comes back to the core of the family, family responsibility, corporate responsibility.

Mr. KINGSTON. I get very concerned when you raise an issue like this, that people say, well, as my colleague knows, this is a First Amendment. But my colleague has touched on it, that we are not trying to pass a new law, we are not trying to amend the First Amendment at all. We are saying, ''You know what? This is out there, and it's going to be out there, but bombarding children with it, particularly high-risk children who already maybe have trouble in their home, emotional trouble at school, drug problems, alcohol problems that are already after their minds and after their hearts; then this comes along. And, as my colleague says, instead of going out there playing soccer or football with kids where they experience interaction and teamwork and sportsmanship and so forth, they are holed up in some dark little room in the house, and they are just poking away at the keyboard or on the joy stick, and I also think one of the things is we lose a lot of our generational imparting knowledge because these kids become such, and I do not know if we have a word for it yet, but it is cyber introverts, where they can compete, communicate in cyberspace on the Internet or with high-tech video, but they cannot talk to their fellow human beings any more.

Mr. MCINNIS. Well, it is cyber youth, and I want to let my colleagues out here know, because you are listening to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and myself, we are fathers. We have had some experience. We both have children, and our wives have children, and I mean share that same kind of experience. So we are not speaking as novices.

And so I think my colleague's points are very valid, and I do want to say that in the last hour, as my colleagues know, we have been talking about this horrible video game which I call a murder simulator, but I do not want it to cast too black a cloud because we should all remember that in this country we have a lot of things going right with our young people. We have a lot of parents who do care. Most of the parents in this country would never let their children play this game. Most parents in this country, because they love their children, would never let this in their facility. Most schools in this country would never let this be played. Unfortunately, a lot of businesses and many video arcades might, but there is so much more goes right with our children than goes wrong. When we find something that goes wrong, we still need to work on it, but there is a lot more that goes right.

So I yield to my colleague to wrap up, but I do appreciate the gentleman coming over. I think we both share the view, obviously we share the same viewpoint, and I hope we have done some good with awareness.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) because as a father he is doing the right thing, as a representative from Colorado that has all the eyes on us. As my colleagues know, we are trying to put these puzzle pieces together, and I do think that exposure to this, excessive exposure to unnecessarily violent video games, certainly is something that we should talk about, and as my colleagues know, as a father of a 16, 13, 10 and 8 year old, I am glad that there are people like the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) who is bringing this out because frankly I do not know about all this, and we parents have to talk and see what our kids are up against and be more alert.

And, as my colleague knows, what we do is we raise our antenna a little bit higher and a little bit different direction, and then we, as parents, as my colleagues know, are watching out. But I think the gentleman's action plan is a sound one, and we might want to look at that one more time, but to contact the Consumer Product Safety Commission, contact the video game manufacturers and makers, ask for a voluntary recall, contact the Video Game Magazine and ask them if they will pull all their advertising, notify the parent-teacher associations and other child advocacy groups, and my colleague said there are a lot of groups that have sprung up as a result of Littleton, and they should be looking at this, and then find others games that could desensitize children to violence.

And I know the story of one little girl who was crying one time when she watched the evening news, and she did not get to watch much TV at home, and she said, ''You know, I know when there's a TV show where somebody is murdered that it is just a TV show, but this was the evening news, and, Daddy, there was a mommy who killed her little girl, and it was real life,'' and the little girl telling me the story was in tears because she had not been desensitized, and when you think about a mother killing her own daughter, it should bring tears to all of us. As my colleagues know, big and small, that this is a real situation, and so often we blend okay because it happens a lot on violent TV or on violent video. It desensitizes us to real life, but when you see somebody who has not been desensitized, how they react to life is totally different.

Mr. MCINNIS. As my colleague knows, on this particular video game, You're Going to Die, when you kill somebody on this video simulator, it puts points on the board. You score. You get a positive reaction from the game. You win. A little light goes on, here is the score. The more you kill, the more points you put on the scoreboard.

Mr. KINGSTON. Unfortunately for young children, high-risk victims and perpetrators of Columbine, Harris and Klebold, there is no reset button. Once you did it, it is forever.

Mr. MCINNIS. Reclaiming my time, I do thank the gentleman very much, and as I said, to conclude this evening, there is a lot that has gone right with our young people, and we have millions of kids that go to schools every day, and we do not have these kinds of incidents that occur, and we do not have gang killings in every community every day of the week, but we do have some problems out there.

So we have tried to do our part, and I ask you to do your part.

In conclusion, I would ask that each and every one of you in the next three or four days commit to your spouse, commit to your children, that you as an adult will go to your video arcade amusement center, just walk through and see what kind of games you think those young people should be exposed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). The Chair would remind all Members that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and not to the viewing audience.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CALVERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EHRLICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on May 26th.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On May 18, 1999:

H.R. 669. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 to carry out that Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 20, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2206. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commuted Traveltime Periods: Overtime Services Relating to Imports and Exports [Docket No. 99–022–1] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2207. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemption [OPP–300832; FRL–6073–1] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2208. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Diflubenzuron; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP–300844; FRL–6075–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2209. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clofentezine; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300843; FRL–6075–6] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2210. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Emamectin Benzoate; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300856; FRL–6079–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received May 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2211. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Amendment of Affordable Housing Program Regulation [No. 99–25] (RIN: 3069–AA–73) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2212. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Amendment of Affordable Housing Program Regulation [No. 99–26] (RIN: 3069–AA82) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2213. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Integration of Environment, Safety and Health into Facility Disposition Activities—received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2214. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants Allegheny County, PA; Removal of Final Rule Pertaining to the Control of Landfill Gas Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [PA107–4066a; FRL–6111–8] received April 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2215. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Oregon [OR 48–1–7263a; FRL–6127–4] received April 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2216. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans, Texas; Recodification of, and Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Chapter 114 [TX98–1–7386; FRL–6117–3] received April 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2217. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD), and the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) as revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) [CA 164–0112a; FRL–6324–8] received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2218. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference [NC–9915; FRL–6335–8] received May 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2219. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Wyoming [WY–001–0002a and WY–001–0003a; FRL–6344–2] received May 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2220. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Ferralloys Production: Ferromanganese and Silicomanganese [IL–64–2–5807; FRL–6345–7] (RIN: 2060–AF29) received May 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2221. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Mineral Wool Production [FRL–6345–4] (RIN: 2060–AE08) received May 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2222. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Georgia; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference [GA–9915; FRL–6335–9] received May 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2223. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Identification of Additional Ozone Areas Attaining the 1-Hour Standard and to Which the 1-Hour Standard is No Longer Applicable [FRL–6344–4] received May 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2224. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Polyether Polyols Production [FRL–6344–7] (RIN: 2060–AE–86) received May 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2225. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval of State Operating Permit Rule Revision; New Jersey [NJ002; FRL–6333–8] received April 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2226. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 98F–0130] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2227. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2228. A letter from the Director, Division of Policy, Planning and Program Development, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Special Disabled Veterans and Vietnam Era Veterans; OMB Control Numbers for OFCCP Information Collection Requirements—received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2229. A letter from the Director, Office of Insurance Programs, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program: New Premiums (RIN: 3206–AI54) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2230. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Change in Survey Cycle for the Southwestern Michigan Appropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206–AI68) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2231. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—West Virginia Regulatory Program [WV–077–FOR] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2232. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Texas Regulatory Program [SPATS No. TX–045–FOR] received April 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2233. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Virginia Regulatory Program [VA–110–FOR] received April 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2234. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Western Pacific Bottomfish Fishery; Amendment 5 [Docket No. 981204297–9091–02; I.D. 110698B] (RIN: 0648–AK21) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2235. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park, Hawaii; Public Nudity (RIN: 1024–AC66) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2236. A letter from the Chief, Operations Division, Directorate of Civil Works, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Rule Establishing an Administrative Appeal Process for the Regulatory Program of the Corps of Engineers—received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2237. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Hallock, MN [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–5] received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2238. A letter from the Program Support Specialist Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher Segelflugzeugbau Model ASH 26E Sailplanes [Docket No. 98–CE–98–AD; Amendment 39–11142; AD 99–09–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2239. A letter from the Program Support Specialist Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Model SE 3130, SE 313B, SA 3180, SA 318B, and SA 318C Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–54–AD; Amendment 39–11150; AD 99–09–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2240. A letter from the Program Support Specialist Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–87–AD; Amendment 39–11138; AD 99–08–51] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2241. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Charleston to Bermuda Sailboat Race, Charleston, SC [CGD07–99–024] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2242. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Waiver application; tank vessel; reduction of gross tonnage [USCG–1999–5451] received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2243. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA 90) Phase-out Requirements for Single Hull Tank Vessels [USCG–1998–4620] received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2244. A letter from the Program Analyst Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directive; Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Models A36, B36, TC, 58, 58A, C90A, B200, B300, and 1900D Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–11–AD; Amendment 39–11148; AD 99–09–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2245. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29543; Amdt. No. 1926] received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2246. A letter from the Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alternative Means of Compliance for the Pilot-In-Command Night Takeoff and Landing Recent Flight Experience Requirements [Docket No. FAA–1999–5584; Amendment No. 61–106] (RIN: 2120–AG77) received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2247. A letter from the Deputy Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Professional Research Experience Program (PREP) (RIN: 0693–ZA29) received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

2248. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Equitable Relief from Joint and Several Liability [Notice 99–29] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2249. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Tax Credit—1999 Possessions Population Figures [Notice 99–22] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2250. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Start-up Expenditures [Rev. Rul. 99–23] received May 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2251. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's justification of budget estimates for fiscal year 2000, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on rules. House Resolution 179. Resolution providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense (Rept. 106–150). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 180. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 883) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands (Rept. 106–151). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1858. A bill to promote electronic commerce through improved access for consumers to electronic databases, including securities market information databases; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 1859. A bill to require the United States Postal Service to submit certain reports to Congress before implementing the next rate increase for first-class postage, and to provide certain procedures regarding the use and sale of postage stamps during the initial period of such rate increase; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. CARSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. LEE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FORD, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1860. A bill to require managed care organizations to contract with providers in medically underserved areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS (for himself and Ms. DUNN):

H.R. 1861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deductibility of business meal expenses for individuals subject to Federal hours of service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 1862. A bill to combat nursing home fraud and abuse, increase protections for victims of telemarketing fraud, enhance safeguards for pension plans and health care benefit programs, and enhance penalties for crimes against seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 1863. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the treatment of bonds issued to acquire renewable resources on land subject to conservation easement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 1864. A bill to standardize the process for conducting public hearings for Federal agencies within the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HORN:

H.R. 1865. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for the construction of an addition to the American Merchant Marine Memorial Wall of Honor located in San Pedro, California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 1866. A bill to provide a process for the public to appeal certain decisions made by the National Park Service and by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 1867. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOHN (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BOYD, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FROST, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1868. A bill to provide for a rural education development initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FROST, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HORN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CONDIT):

H.R. 1869. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the prohibition on stalking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARSON (for himself and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to a volunteer firefighter savings account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1871. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make permanent the special immigrant religious worker program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. BARCIA):

H.R. 1872. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to designate as an Interstate Oasis certain facilities near the interstate highway system; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

H.R. 1873. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum taxable income for the 15 percent rate bracket; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHAFFER (for himself, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. HILL of

Montana, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. EWING, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1874. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum amount of wages that a farmer can pay for agricultural labor without being subject to the Federal unemployment tax on that labor to reflect inflation since the unemployment tax was first established, and to provide for an annual inflation adjustment in such maximum amount of wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROGAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. COX, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JOHN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LINDER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1875. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow the application of the principles of Federal diversity jurisdiction to interstate class actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALENT (for himself and Ms. DANNER):

H.R. 1876. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to incorporate certain provisions of the transportation conformity regulations, as in effect on March 1, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. THURMAN (for herself, Mr. CRANE, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 1877. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide for duty-free treatment of personal effects of participants in certain world athletic events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. LEE, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H. Res. 181. A resolution condemning the kidnapping and murder by the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) of 3 United States citizens, Ingrid Washinawatok, Terence Freitas, and Lahe'ena'e Gay; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H. Res. 182. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Park Service should take full advantage of support services offered by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. GILCHREST):

H. Res. 183. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the settlement of claims of citizens of the United States against the Government of Germany with respect to the deaths of members of the United States Air Force resulting from the collision off the coast of Namibia of a German Luftwaffe aircraft with a United States Air Force aircraft on September 13, 1997; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Geert Bozen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Edwardo Reyes and Dianelita Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 73; Mr. METCALF, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 116; Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 125; Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 141; Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 206; Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 216; Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 271; Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 274; Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WEYGAND, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. VENTO Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. QUINN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio,and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 306; Mr. BERMAN and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 348; Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 351; Mr. HILL of Indiana.

H.R. 352; Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TAUZIN Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 353: Mr. MOORE, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 355: Mr. WU.

H.R. 357: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 372: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BONIOR, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 405: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 406: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 410: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 413: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 461: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 483: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 486: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 534: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 567: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 632: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 642. Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. BONO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COX, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. OSE.

H.R. 643: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. BONO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COX, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. OSE.

H.R. 668: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 670: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 709: Mr. SHOWS and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 749: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 776: Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 804: Mr. QUINN and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 827: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 828: Mr. WU and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 852: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 870: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 875: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WATERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 881: Mrs. NORTHUP and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 987: Mr. RILEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 997: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1006: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1053: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 1063: Mr. SABO and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1083: Mr. BOYD and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1102: Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NEY, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1109: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1111: Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 1127: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1130: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1154: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 1180: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1195: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

HR. 1217: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Ms. LEE, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KLINK, Mr. WU, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1227: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 1238: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1239: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LARSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1256: Mr. COX, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 1260: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1272: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1300: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1304: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WEINER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FORD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1325: Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1349: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1350: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1354: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1355: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1402: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SPENCE, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LARSON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 1420: Mr. VENTO and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 1445: Mr. UPTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1450: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1525: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PHELPS, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1527: Mr. LARSON.

H.R. 1530: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 1546: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1584: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. KING, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WALSH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MORELLA, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1598: Mr. FILNER, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1622: Mr. SHAW and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1631: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1649: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1659: Mr. DIXON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1684: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1689: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1690: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1706: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 1739: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1777: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1778: Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1791: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 1798: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1819: Mr. SANDLIN and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1857: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. FROST, Mr. OSE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WEINER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. HANSEN.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. BERRY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. BOEHLER and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. HANSEN.

H. Con. Res. 109: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WU, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Res. 169: Mr. OLVER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 178: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. RIVERS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 883

OFFERED BY: MR. SWEENEY

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 5, line 6, insert ''State Government, local government, and'' after ''To protect''.

H.R. 883

OFFERED BY: MR. SWEENEY

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 5, line 6, insert ''State Government, local government, and'' after ''To protect''.

Page 9, line 16, after ''management plan'' insert the following: ''that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs, and''.

H.R. 883

OFFERED BY: MR. SWEENEY

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 9, line 16, after ''management plan'' insert the following: ''that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs, and''.

H.R. 883

OFFERED BY: MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 9, line 6, after ''in the United States'' insert ''(other than an area within the State of Colorado)''

H.R. 883

OFFERED BY: MR. VENTO

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 11, beginning at line 25, strike ''conserving, preserving, or protecting'' and insert ''governing the management of''.

H.R. 883

OFFERED BY: MR. VENTO

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 12, line 1, strike ''or protecting'' and insert ''protecting, or managing''.

H.R. 883

OFFERED BY: MR. VENTO

AMENDMENT NO. 8:

Page 12, line 1, strike ''or protecting'' and insert ''protecting, or managing the use of''.

H.R. 883

OFFERED BY: MR. VENTO

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

''SEC. 7. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS CONCERNING THE DISPOSAL, MANAGEMENT, AND USE OF LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a–1 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

SEC. 405.—No Federal official may enter into an agreement with any international or foreign entity (including any subsidiary thereof) providing for the disposal, management, and use of any lands owned by the United States and located within the United States unless such agreement is specifically authorized by law. The President may from time to time submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate proposals for legislation authorizing such agreements.''.

H.R. 883

OFFERED BY: MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

AMENDMENT NO. 10: on page 9, line 13, strike ''2000'' and insert instead ''2003''.