

I think it is because Jerusalem is one of the places in the world that is truly a crossroads for a majority of people in the world, because when we look at the development and history of religions, those things that have occurred in and around the city of Jerusalem have not only sent fundamental, positive repercussions East and West, but they have somehow been tied to defining developmental periods throughout the history of the world.

Although we have not yet located the center of the universe, I think in terms of man's experience on this planet, the city of Jerusalem, along with very few other places in this world, Jerusalem deserves being placed in that category. I think it is entirely appropriate that the Rotunda of the United States Capitol be used as the place for the recognition of the 3,000 years of inhabitation of the city of Jerusalem.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman in support of the resolution saying this is a year that it is particularly appropriate to be having this celebration. We could not have chosen the 3,000th year, obviously, but as we look at the peace process moving forward, something that I think many of us thought would not happen in our lifetime, this City of Peace may indeed soon be an example for dialogue for the entire globe.

All of us who have worked so hard on issues of peace in the Middle East, while we understand there are tremendous challenges ahead, this is a very exciting time, with hopefully the beginnings of a real peace for that region of the world, something that will not only hopefully bring benefit to the people there, but people around the globe, and open up the holy places to the multitude of religions that see Jerusalem as their center, to give pilgrims from all religions a greater opportunity to visit the holy sites and to spend time in the Middle East.

For those of us who have been to Jerusalem, it is truly a special city. I am privileged to be here with the gentleman from California, urging support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 29

Whereas the Senate wishes to make the 3,000th anniversary of King David's establishment of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel;

Whereas Jerusalem, the City of David, has been the focal point of Jewish life;

Whereas Jerusalem, the City of Peace, has held a unique place and exerted a unique influence on the moral development of Western Civilization; and

Whereas no other city on Earth is today the capital of the same country, inhabited by the same people, speaking the same language, and worshipping the same God as it was 3,000 years ago: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Architect is directed to make the necessary arrangements for a date in October to be mutually agreed upon by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate, after consultation with the Minority Leaders of the two houses, for the use of the Rotunda for a celebration of the founding of the city of Jerusalem.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, the concurrent resolution just concurred in.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE MARTIN FROST, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable MARTIN FROST, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 10, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House,  
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L of the Rules of the House that my office has been served with a subpoena issued by the District Court of Tarrant County, Texas.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not inconsistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

MARTIN FROST,  
Member of Congress.

OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 234 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2405.

□ 1230

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2405) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. KINGSTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When in the Committee of the Whole House on Wednes-

day, October 11, 1995, title IV was open for amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER.

Page 109, line 10, strike "\$8,757,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$86,757,000".

Page 116, lines 19 and 20, strike "Committee on Science" and insert in lieu thereof "Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources".

Page 119, lines 9 through 23, strike paragraphs (1) and (2) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

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

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

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

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

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

(3) MULTIYEAR CONTRACTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), and notwithstanding section 1341 of title 31, United States Code, and section 11 of title 41, United States Code, the Secretary may acquire data under multiyear contracts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) VESSEL AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall use excess capacity of University National Oceanographic Laboratory System

vessels where appropriate and may enter into memoranda of agreement with the operators of these vessels to carry out this requirement.

Page 119, line 24, strike "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

Page 120, lines 3 and 4, strike ", including activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2)."

Page 121, line 3, insert "(as of September 30, 1996)" after "Observation Buoys".

Page 121, lines 6 through 8, strike paragraph (7).

Page 121, lines 9, 11, 12, 13, and 15, redesignate paragraphs (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12) as paragraphs (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11), respectively.

Page 121, lines 16 through 18, strike paragraphs (13) and (14).

Page 121, lines 19, 20, 22, and 24, and page 122, line 1, redesignate paragraphs (15), (16), (17), (18), and (19) as paragraphs (12), (13), (14), (15), and (16), respectively.

Page 123, line 19, through page 124, line 6, amend section 443 to read as follows:

**SEC. 443. TERMINATION OF THE CORPS OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.**

(a) NUMBER OF OFFICERS.—Notwithstanding section 8 of the Act of June 3, 1948 (33 U.S.C. 853g), the total number of commissioned officers on the active list of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall not exceed 358 for fiscal year 1996. No commissioned officers are authorized for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1996.

(b) SEVERANCE PAY.—Commissioned officers may be separated from the active list of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. In lieu of separation pay, officers so separated shall be eligible only for severance pay in accordance with the terms and conditions of section 5595 of title 5, United States Code, and only to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

(c) TRANSFER.—(1) Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense and under terms and conditions specified by the Secretary, commissioned officers subject to subsection (a) may transfer to the armed services under section 716 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Transportation and under terms and conditions specified by the Secretary, commissioned officers subject to subsection (a) may transfer to the United States Coast Guard under section 716 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) Subject to the approval of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and under terms and conditions specified by that Administrator, commissioned officers subject to subsection (a) may be employed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as members of the civil service.

(d) REPEALS.—(1) The following provisions of law are repealed:

(A) The Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers' Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 853a-853o, 853p-853u).

(B) The Act of February 16, 1929 (Chapter 221, section 5; 45 Stat. 1187; 33 U.S.C. 852a).

(C) The Act of January 19, 1942 (Chapter 5; 56 Stat. 6).

(D) Section 9 of Public Law 87-649 (76 Stat. 495).

(E) The Act of May 22, 1917 (Chapter 20, section 16; 40 Stat. 87; 33 U.S.C. 854 et seq.).

(F) The Act of December 3, 1942 (Chapter 670; 56 Stat. 1038).

(G) Sections 1 through 5 of Public Law 91-621 (84 Stat. 1863; 33 U.S.C. 857-1 et seq.).

(H) The Act of August 10, 1956 (Chapter 1041, section 3; 70A Stat. 619; 33 U.S.C. 857a).

(I) The Act of May 18, 1920 (Chapter 190, section 11; 41 Stat. 603; 33 U.S.C. 864).

(J) The Act of July 22, 1947 (Chapter 286; 61 Stat. 400; 33 U.S.C. 873, 874).

(K) The Act of August 3, 1956 (Chapter 932; 70 Stat. 988; 33 U.S.C. 875, 876).

(L) All other Acts inconsistent with this subsection.

Following the repeal of provisions under this paragraph, all retirement benefits for the NOAA Corps which are in existence on September 30, 1996, shall continue to apply to eligible NOAA Corps officers and retirees.

(2) The effective date of the repeals under paragraph (1) shall be October 1, 1996.

(e) ABOLITION.—The Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Corps of Operations and the Commissioned Personnel Center are abolished effective September 30, 1996.

Page 4, amend the item in the table of contents relating to section 443 to read as follows:

Sec. 443. Termination of the corps of commissioned officers.

Page 126, line 14, through page 127, line 9, strike section 453.

Page 127, line 10, and page 128, lines 1 and 11, redesignate sections 454, 455, and 456 as sections 453, 454, and 455, respectively.

Page 129, after line 9, insert the following new sections:

**SEC. 456. CONVEYANCE OF NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE LABORATORY AT GLOUCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS.**

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property comprising the National Marine Fisheries Service laboratory located on Emerson Avenue in Gloucester, Massachusetts.

(2) TERMS.—A conveyance of property under paragraph (1) shall be made—

(A) without payment of consideration; and

(B) subject to the terms and conditions specified under subsections (b) and (c).

(b) CONDITIONS FOR TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of any conveyance of property under this section, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts shall assume full responsibility for maintenance of the property for as long as the Commonwealth retains the right and title to that property.

(2) CONTINUED USE OF PROPERTY BY NMFS.—The Secretary may enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts under which the National Marine Fisheries Service is authorized to occupy existing laboratory space on the property conveyed under this section, if—

(A) the term of the memorandum of understanding is for a period of not longer than 5 years beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) the square footage of the space to be occupied by the National Marine Fisheries Service does not conflict with the needs of, and is agreeable to, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

(c) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—All right, title, and interest in and to all property conveyed under this section shall revert to the United States on the date on which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts uses any of the property for any purpose other than the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries resource management program.

**SEC. 457. CLEANUP OF NOAA FACILITIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall cleanup landfills, wastes, dumps, debris, storage tanks, property, hazardous or unsafe conditions, and contaminants (including, without limitation, petroleum products and their derivatives), on lands which the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and its predecessor agencies abandoned, quitclaimed, or otherwise transferred, or is

obligated to transfer, to local entities or landowners on the Pribilof Islands, Alaska, pursuant to the Fur Seal Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 1161 et seq.).

(b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—To carry out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) by December 31, 1995, execute agreements with the State of Alaska, affected local entities and landowners, and in the case of new landfills, the Indian Health Service;

(2) manage the cleanup required in subsection (a) with the minimum possible Federal overhead, delay, and duplication of State and local planning and design work;

(3) receive approval of the State of Alaska for the cleanup plans prepared as a result of the agreements described in subsection (b)(1) where said cleanup is required by State law;

(4) receive approval of affected local entities and landowners before conducting cleanup work on their property, if such approval is not obtained by agreement in accordance with paragraph (5);

(5) to the maximum extent possible, and notwithstanding any other law, carry out duties under this Act and under other Federal laws on the Pribilof Islands through contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements, including agreements on a reimbursable basis, with the local entities and landowners and with residents of the Pribilof Islands; and

(6) not require financial contributions by or from local entities or landowners.

(c) CONTENTS OF AGREEMENTS.—The agreements described in subsection (b)(1) shall—

(1) require the Secretary to clean up all sites referred to in subsection (a), as soon as possible;

(2) specify the Secretary's responsibility to—

(A) contribute to the planning and construction of new or redeveloped landfills;

(B) provide technical and financial assistance and training to the local entities and landowners and residents of the Pribilof Islands; and

(C) to the greatest extent possible, secure their participation in carrying out this section.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "cleanup" means, without limitation, planning and execution of remediation actions for lands described in subsection (a) and redevelopment of landfills to meet regulatory requirements; and

(2) the term "local entities and landowners" means those local political subdivisions and entities that have received or are eligible to receive lands under the Fur Seal Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 1161 et seq.).

Page 4, strike the items in the table of contents relating to sections 453 through 456 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 453. Eligibility for awards.

Sec. 454. Prohibition of lobbying activities.

Sec. 455. Report on laboratories.

Sec. 456. Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts.

Sec. 457. Cleanup of NOAA facilities.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of the managers of the bill at the request of the Committee on Resources to make the following changes in the bill.

What it does is it modifies the NOAA fleet modernization termination language to allow NOAA to use their existing vessels if the Secretary of Commerce determines that using the existing vessels is the most cost-effective option. The language precludes NOAA from engaging in significant repairs to extend the life or upgrade the existing vessels.

It modifies the NOAA Corps elimination language to more closely parallel the Committee on Resources's language. The amendment will terminate the uniformed NOAA Corps at the end of the fiscal year 1996 while also providing corps members with the ability to transfer to the Coast Guard or to the Department of Defense or to NOAA as civilian employees if these agencies determine that their services are required.

I will give an example of that. I think all of us recognize that one of the things that we want to do is keep the hurricane planes flying and this will allow NOAA to transfer the pilots of those airplanes to the agency itself to fly those planes in the future.

It makes some modifications to the termination list. Specifically, the bill will now be silent on the following issues: The National Coastal Research and Development Institute, the Southeast United States Caribbean Fisheries Oceanographic Coordinated Investigations Program, the Sea Grant Oyster Disease Account, and the termination of the Chesapeake Bay buoys, which will be delayed until September 30, 1996.

The amendment also adds language to transfer a fisheries lab from the National Marine Fisheries Service to the State of Massachusetts. This language is identical to the language reported by the Committee on Resources.

The amendment also adds language to strengthen the cleanup requirements for the Pribilof Islands in Alaska. Once again, this language is taken from the resources bill.

The amendment also makes a technical correction to fix a number of numerical errors in the bill, and strikes language that has been identified by the Congressional Budget Office as resulting in direct spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARR: At the appropriate place in Title IV insert the following:

**SEC. . OCEAN APPLICATIONS BRANCH.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Commerce shall establish and maintain within the Administration a program to be known as the Ocean Applications Branch (in this section referred to as the "Branch").

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Branch shall be to make oceanographic and other information developed by the Department of Defense Fleet Numerical Meteorology and Oceanography Center available for private, educational, and government use pursuant to agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Commerce. It shall be the goal of the Secretary of Commerce to support the activities of the Ocean Applications Branch through user fees.

(c) LIMITATION ON CLOSURE.—The Secretary of Commerce shall not terminate operation of the Branch, before the Branch fully funds its operations through private sources, including user fees, or fiscal year 1996, whichever comes first.

Mr. FARR (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. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment here that was adopted unanimously in the Committee on Resources and I ask that it be inserted into this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment essentially requires NOAA to keep open the Ocean Applications Branch, which is a small office that is moving toward privatization to fully develop its own privatized funding. The Navy's Fleet Numerical Meteorological and Oceanographic Center in Monterey is the leading global marine forecasting center and provides all the military's ocean forecasting data.

The center provides real time oceanographic data from a variety of satellite and terrestrial observation posts. This information is used to generate up-to-the-minute marine analysis and weather forecasting for over 1,000 private and public center users, and I ask that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is no controversy on it. It has been unanimously agreed to in the policy committee.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, is there any authorization that deals with this amendment?

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would reply to the gentleman from California, no, as the amendment deleted the authorization. It is in the appropriations bill. It is under the ocean analysis. It does not increase that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is there a 1-year exemption on closure in this amendment?

Mr. FARR. Yes, there is. The bill is only good for a year, and so as the last sentence in the amendment states, it says that the Department of Commerce shall not terminate it for the fiscal year 1996 or whenever the user fees become successful, whichever comes first.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, we are willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for accepting the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAXTON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAXTON: Page 114, line 19, strike "(a) MARINE PREDICTION RESEARCH.—".

Page 115, strike lines 1 through 17.

Page 122, strike lines 10 through 21 (and redesignate the subsequent subsection accordingly).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], chairman of the committee, has agreed to accept this amendment. It merely adds the Committee on Resources, which shares jurisdiction over the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to the distribution list of a report on NOAA Program terminations authorized by H.R. 2405. On this list there are several programs with resources jurisdictions.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. The gentleman from New Jersey made the, what I considered unfortunate juxtaposition of the term noncontroversial with the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Science agreed with it. Does that mean that he thinks that whatever the chairman agrees to is noncontroversial?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I apologize for that unfortunate use of the word uncontroversial. I certainly did not mean to represent the position of the minority in this matter.

Mr. BROWN of California. I appreciate that consideration. As far as I know, it is noncontroversial.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. This amendment is acceptable.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Saxton amendment to H.R. 2405. I am a member of the Resources Committee, which is the principal authorizing committee for sea grant, as well as a cosponsor of H.R. 1175, the authorizing legislation for this valuable program.

The National Sea Grant College Program is a network of over 300 colleges, universities, secondary and elementary schools, and research institutions throughout the country focused on the wise use of marine resources. Sea grant has proven to be a highly effective Federal-State partnership that responds to local as well as national needs.

Sea grant is the ocean-based corollary to the Land Grant College Program. Sea grant uses high quality, competitive, merit-reviewed science to address critical marine resources

issues, and disseminates the results of that work through its education and marine advisory services.

More than half the funding for sea grant comes from non-Federal sources—every dollar we invest in sea grant is matched by its participants. Sea grant is often the seed money for State, local, and private funds to come together to help our Nation utilize more fully its vast publicly owned marine resources.

For example, in my home State of Maine, sea grant technology, products and data have helped create jobs. In particular, as a result of Maine sea grant research on lobster reproduction and growth, the following companies were established:

Dodge Cove Marine Farms, Inc., Newcastle, ME; Great Eastern Mussel Farms, Inc., Tenants Harbor, ME; Island Maid, Beals Island, ME; Lobster Products, Hancock, ME; Maine Lobster Technology, Lamoine, ME; Mook Sea Farms, Damariscotta, ME; Northeast Labs, Winslow, ME.

In short, Mr. Chairman, sea grant deserves our support. The Resources Committee has reported out a comprehensive, responsible sea grant reauthorization measure which has the support of the 30 sea grant colleges and the Sea Grant Association. Certainly, sea grant deserves more than 29 lines in a 152-page bill. Support the Saxton amendment and pave the way for H.R. 1175 to come to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAXTON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAXTON: On page 122, line 5, strike "Science" and insert instead "Resources and the Committee on Science".

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that Chairman WALKER has also agreed to this amendment. Like the first amendment, this amendment adds the Committee on Resources to the distribution list for a report, this time on NOAA laboratories. NOAA's labs are used for the support of its resource management activities, including fisheries research, and the Committee on Resources would benefit very much from this information.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, the majority side accepts this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Our side has reviewed the amendment and finds no problems with it and are glad to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAXTON

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer one additional amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAXTON: On page 128, line 16, strike "Science" and insert instead "Resources and the Committee on Science".

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year Chairman DON YOUNG of the Committee on Resources introduced legislation to reauthorize the sea-grant program. The Committee on Resources is the primary committee of jurisdiction for the program and has reported the bill to the House. The Committee on Science received a secondary referral on the bill and has also reported the measure. The Committee on Resources agreed in good faith to let the bill we are now considering come to the floor before having worked out a compromise with the Committee on Science on the NOAA provisions over which we share jurisdiction. Unfortunately, the Committee on Science has refused to negotiate on sea grant.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, unfortunately the Committee on Science has not negotiated on sea grant. This bill includes the Committee on Science's version of sea grant, not the version reported by the committee with primary jurisdiction. Therefore, I am offering an amendment to strike the sea-grant provisions from the bill. This will allow H.R. 1175, the bill Chairman YOUNG introduced earlier this year, which has been acted on by both committees of jurisdiction and is now in a position to come to the floor.

The national sea-grant college program is a network of over 300 colleges, universities, secondary, and elementary schools and research institutions throughout the country focused on the wise use of marine resources. For nearly 30 years, the sea-grant program has played an essential role in helping our Nation to utilize more fully its vast publicly owned marine coastal and Great Lakes resources which are vital to the lives of Americans living in the rapidly growing population areas along the coastal areas.

This bill is modeled after the land-grant college concept. Sea grant uses high-quality, competitive merit-reviewed science to address critical marine resources issues and dismantles the results of that work through its education and advisory service activities. Federal funding for sea grant is highly leveraged. Nearly half of the total program cost is derived from non-Federal sources.

H.R. 2405 guts sea grant. H.R. 1175, the bill reported by the Natural Resources Committee, which has primary jurisdiction over sea grant, does not gut the program. Quite to the contrary, it improves it. H.R. 1175 makes significant improvements in sea grant by streamlining the proposal review process, reducing administrative costs, capping the total program costs below services level, and clarifying Federal and university roles in the program. H.R. 1175 is also consistent with the House-passed Commerce appropriations bill which we might add makes appropriations consistent with our bill, H.R.

1175 should be the bill that the House considers. If Members believe, as I do, that the long-term viability of our Nation's marine resources should be maintained for future generations, then I urge they will vote for this amendment.

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania: Page 115, line 7, strike "\$34,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$51,000,000".

Page 115, line 12, strike "\$1,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000,000".

□ 1245

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today is in support of the sea-grant program. As the former ranking member of the Oceanography Subcommittee and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and now a member of the Committee on Science, I support the program in its entirety.

I am here today to offer an amendment which I understand Chairman WALKER has agreed to accept, which would in fact raise the authorization level up to the amount that is being offered by my friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON]. This removes the dispute in terms of the dollar amount, and also I think takes away what is I think the most egregious item in the Saxton amendment, which is the deauthorization of the whole program.

If the Saxton amendment were to pass today as a part of our science bill, in effect the entire authorization for sea grant would be removed. They are telling us that it would be restored at some future time. That may or may not happen.

What I am proposing is to raise the authorization level up to the exact same amount that my friend from New Jersey is offering today, because I support the program. The chairman has agreed to accept that funding level and to continue the program, and even to work with the Members and the committee individuals who have other changes they would like to make and perhaps would like to see come on a future authorization, which I am prepared to also support as the author of this amendment.

The key thing I am concerned about, Mr. Chairman, and all of our colleagues should be concerned about here today is if the Saxton amendment passes today, the entire program is deauthorized. It is removed from the bill and there is in fact no sea-grant program in the science legislation. That I think would be a mistake.

We have the commitment from Chairman WALKER to work with us. We have the commitment from me, as the author of this perfecting amendment, to work with the members of the Committee on Resources on other concerns

in two areas that they feel are important.

I am committing to work with them publicly and to help them bring an authorization bill to the floor to deal with those other concerns. I would hope that our colleagues on the other side would support this effort, because it also allows us in this bill, where we consider the issue in the Committee on Science, to allow this program to be kept intact and increase the dollar amount.

I would have offered this amendment to increase the dollar amount in committee, but the chairman wanted to keep the dollar amount in line with the budgetary number that was given to him, and therefore I did not offer that amendment. I am offering it today, and the chairman has graciously agreed to work with us.

I think for the benefit of this program we ought to put aside the petty politics of the staff members who cannot agree on a common solution, and Members ought to come together and realize that those Members who support the program have a chance to keep the program intact, raise the dollar amount up and to work with the Committee on Resources on the concerns they have raised relative to two other specific parts of the program that they feel are not included in this bill. I would hope our colleagues would support it.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first let me express my appreciation for the movement that the gentleman has shown relative to the level of funding. I do appreciate that. However, I must also say that it is somewhat disingenuous to characterize this amendment as a deauthorizing amendment.

The gentleman knows full well that this program ran out of its authorization time at the beginning of this year and, just like the Endangered Species Act and many other laws which are currently ongoing without an authorization bill, this one is as well. So I think it is a mischaracterization of this process to say that this amendment deauthorizes the act.

What we are trying to do is to put in place a policy statement, through the process that we have been engaged in on a bipartisan basis together, to bring an appropriate bill to the floor. So, once again, I appreciate what the gentleman has done but I strongly disagree with his position.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but the facts are that when we take the sea-grant program out of this bill, there is no authorization in the science bill for the national sea-grant program. What I am attempting to do is to raise the dollar

amount, as well as to work with the Committee on Resources to address those other concerns that they have.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, and I think we ought to ask for the ruling on this, my understanding is that the Parliamentarian has ruled that this program has exact joint oversight by both committees, both the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources. What it appears to me is that perhaps staff, not Members but staff is really behind this effort to exert who has the control over it.

That is the worst part of what we are talking about here, because in the end we all agree the sea-grant program is a good program. It deserves to be funded. The chairman of the Committee on Science is accepting the funding level. The chairman of the Committee on Resources has agreed to work with us on the changes that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] wants to make. I have agreed to support them and to work with them.

So there really is no issue unless we allow the staff to dominate this debate and have their petty feuding over which staff is going to control the final product to come before this body. I ask my colleagues to support the perfecting amendment.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PALLONE. My understanding was that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] made a motion to strike and now the gentleman from Pennsylvania's motion relates to the funding level. Is that in order?

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments pending. One is a perfecting amendment offered to the bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], and then the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has an amendment to strike. The Weldon amendment will be voted on first.

Mr. PALLONE. If the Weldon amendment passes, if I could inquire, then is the Saxton amendment still in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee would still vote on the Saxton amendment because it would strike that amended language as well as other language of the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to speak on the Saxton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again I have no problem with raising the funding level, I certainly would support that, but my concern is that this not impact the motion to strike offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], because I think that that is certainly equally if not more important in the context of the underlying bill. My concern is that the underlying bill not only provides less funding, which now presumably would be corrected with the Weldon amendment, but also has some significant changes in the authorization of what the Sea Grant program would be all about.

I much prefer the Committee on Resources version, which is why I support the Saxton amendment, because the Committee on Resources version essentially is well thought out and continues much of the outreach in education that currently exists in the Sea Grant program. In other words, Sea Grant is not just research. Sea Grant is not just grants that are given to academia or to institutions in order to do research. It is very much an outreach program that provides education and takes that research and translates it into the field.

Let me just give an example. I myself am a former Sea Grant specialist. I worked as part of what we called the Sea Grant Advisory Service. The Sea Grant Advisory Service exists in most if not all the coastal States, and basically what they do is, they go out into the community and they help marine owners and they help fishermen and they help coastal users with various problems that they have on a daily basis.

Sea Grant also is involved in actual educational functions. Some of the people actually teach in the universities. There is a lot of public outreach, which is the reason the Sea Grant has received so much public support. It is a very unique program because the public supports it, because they see the direct results of the research and what is done in the universities transferred into the field.

The problem with the Committee on Science version of this bill is it essentially eliminates marine advisory services, it essentially eliminates the Sea Grant Fellows Program, it eliminates a lot of the education and outreach programs that are an integral part of Sea Grant. For that reason, I support very much the Saxton amendment because the Committee on Resources continues these outreach and educational activities. I have no problem with increasing the funding, but that does not take away in any way from what the Saxton amendment would accomplish.

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

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, are the educational aspects that he was just mentioning not peripheral to the central point of Sea Grant? Are we really not supposed to be talking about research and development?

Mr. PALLONE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, absolutely not. Let me give an example, if I could.

When I worked at Rutgers University as a Sea Grant extension specialist, many of the people that were there actually had 3 functions. One was what we called research, one was teaching, and one was outreach. I was totally outreach. I used to just go out in the field with the marine owners, the fishermen, whatever, and work with them.

But basically what would happen, there would be people at Rutgers doing research, often that had direct applicability to what was going on in the field.

For example, research would be done on how to improve, for example, certain types of fish species or prevent pollution, and then we as extension specialists would go out and apply that research actually with the fishermen. Of course there was also the teaching element, those who would teach at the university.

The unique relationship between those 3 things, extension, research, and academia, was very important. I think if we eliminate the extension, which is one of the things that is in this bill essentially, we are going to really eliminate a lot of the public support as well as why Sea Grant makes sense.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So the gentleman believes at this time when we are trying to find things in the budget and set our priorities, that helping these fishermen that he is talking about is really an important enough use of the taxpayer's money that we should cut other programs to support this?

Mr. PALLONE. It is not just fishermen Mr. Chairman. It was anyone basically who are coastal users, people who lived at the shore, people involved in commercial cargo activities. I really do not think we should eliminate one aspect of it but perhaps by try to see how money can be used, reduced perhaps but used for all 3 functions rather than eliminate one aspect.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman would yield further, it just seems to me that what he is describing is a program that is very nice. We tried to save the really solid research end of this Sea Grant program. We tried to trim from it those things that were not essential. From what the gentleman has described today, and I know the people listening have to make their own determination, those are really nonessential items for the Federal Government to be involved in.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I would disagree with the gentleman completely. I think maybe that is one difference between the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science. They put the emphasis on the research and the academia. We on the other hand are looking at the practical application of those skills in the field. I would argue just the opposite that those are just as important if not more.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have been attempting to work out the situation here with regard to the bill. Obviously there are some differences in the scope of the program between what the Committee on Science action was and what the Committee on Resources action was. I think we are agreed that we need to have a way of deliberating both areas.

I happen to agree with the approach that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has taken in raising the money up to the appropriation level at this point. That probably is the right course to take at the present time.

However, the Committee on Resources feels as though it has some areas that they would like to address, and so what we have agreed to here is to take, as I understand it, the Weldon amendment to the Saxton amendment, pass that as a substitute, and that would raise the money in the bill. Then at a later date the Committee on Resources will bring their own bill affecting this program to the floor that would deal with further authorizations, and it is my understanding, if the gentleman from New Jersey can speak for the chairman of the committee, that we would have an exchange of letters asserting that by us allowing you to bring your bill to the floor independent of a referral to us, that that would not in any way jeopardize any kind of co-equal jurisdiction we have over the program; is that correct?

Mr. SAXTON. If the gentleman will yield, that is essentially correct. I think it is important that we make this move today. I once again appreciate the fact that you are willing to meet us at the appropriate target with regard to funding. I would just point out that during the debate under an open rule as I understand it when H.R. 1175 comes to the floor, that will give us the opportunity to debate the issues that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] just spoke about and that are also of concern to me, namely, the Sea Grant Fellows Program, the Marine Advisory Service Program, as well as provisions that are in H.R. 1175 that relate recommendations made by the National Academy of Sciences which help to streamline the program. There may be some other issues involved under that open rule as well.

With that having been said, we agree to accept the Weldon amendment today.

□ 1300

Mr. WALKER. Reclaiming my time, obviously the Committee on Resources at that time can bring anything they want to the floor for further authorization of the Sea Grant Program. What this action would do today is assure the program is authorized at the level of funding that the Weldon amendment anticipates and then we would move toward further potential authorization at a later date.

Mr. SAXTON. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. As I say, it is my understanding then we would have an exchange of letters to this effect.

Mr. SAXTON. If the gentleman will yield, it is implicit in this the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, will support our effort to bring H.R. 1175 to the floor.

Mr. WALKER. What the gentleman has agreed to is not to hinder your efforts in any way to bring the bill to the floor. The gentleman may have some questions about the provisions of your bill.

Mr. SAXTON. That is OK.

Mr. WALKER. I am certainly not going to hinder you bringing your bill to the floor.

Mr. SAXTON. Just so we have your assurance that you will support our effort to get the bill to the floor.

Mr. WALKER. Sure. That is what we have agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, it has been my intention to support the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] with regard to this matter and for reasons which I will elaborate on.

Actually, I think all of the people who have spoken here have agreed that the Sea Grant Program is a valuable program and one that should be continued. Unfortunately, the authorization for that program expired at the end of fiscal year 1995, and we are now seeking to reinstitute the reauthorization and determine the level of authorized funding.

Again, we all agree that the two committees, Science and Resources, have joint jurisdiction over this program, and in the past we have worked closely in order to resolve any differences that might have occurred as a result of differing attitudes toward the program.

There are some rather sensitive issues involved here which I hesitate to bring up again, but as I indicated at the beginning of the debate on this bill, it does not really matter too much what we do on this bill, since it is not going anywhere. But it does offer an opportunity for some discussion of policy issues which I think are important.

Policy issue No. 1 illustrated here is that two committees now both headed by distinguished Republican Members of this body have some serious differences with regard to what constitutes real research and what constitutes an appropriate role for the Federal Government.

The Committee on Science, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, takes a dim view of programs which are not real research, not basic research, but which are applied research or technology development.

The Committee on Resources seems to be oriented more toward support for programs which do apply research to the needs of the people of this country, and in this case, the maritime industry, and is quite willing to support these appropriately selected applied research and technology development programs which have obvious economic payoffs to the people of this country.

The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], has already indicated that he feels that this is not an appropriate role for the Federal Government, and he very eloquently defends that position.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California to defend it some more, if he wishes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I think, at a time when we are having

to make major budget cuts in so many programs, that we do have to make choices and that when we make choices in a situation just like today, and I think this does demonstrate a difference in philosophy, not in morality, not in values, but a difference in philosophy as to what Government should do, but when the Government is involved in helping fishermen or helping people who do coastal work, coastal shipping, or live near the coast, that perhaps other programs are more important than those programs, and perhaps when people are making money in the fishing industry or in the shipping industry, they could pay for those type of activities, especially at a time when our budget is too tight.

Mr. BROWN of California. We do not have a basic disagreement there. I would personally like to see the private beneficiaries of Government research or development pay for as much of it as possible, and if we can just work out a common scheme for doing that, you and I can support that.

The gentleman and I do not want to be overly critical, but he also seems to imply, and this is another one of those delicate issues, that anytime we do not support the language and the numbers in this authorization bill, that we are not really interested in balancing the budget. Now, the gentleman knows that it does not make much difference what we think on this side, but he is raising an argument which the Republican chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations are going to find disturbing because they have already raised the numbers above what is in this bill as any members of the Committee on Appropriations will tell you, and that is all that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey really seeks to do, is to raise those numbers up, plus eliminating some language that would put restrictions on what could be done under the Sea Grant Program.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. If the gentleman will yield further, some of us on this side of the aisle are even more committed budget cutters than others on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BROWN of California. I understand that. I understand that, and in fact I am trying to accentuate that difference so that since you know it, what I am trying to do, you should seek to resolve that before it becomes something that I will raise on the floor and try and confound you with.

But the real point is, and I have said this over and over again, we are not, in the authorizing committee, bound by the budget resolution. It does not matter what we put in there. I can be 50 percent above what is in the budget resolution, because it is only binding on the Committee on Appropriations, and these numbers are the way the authorizers indicate priorities. We are not spending money. We are indicating priorities.

The interesting think here is you have not been consistent on your side

with regard to your approval of raising our numbers in this bill up to the appropriators' level. In this case, the chairman has agreed to do it, and in another case the chairman agreed to do it. There have been four cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, in order to entertain this vast audience I have here, in two out of the four cases in which we had amendments to raise the numbers up to the Committee on Appropriations level already approved in both the House and Senate, on your side you agreed to go along with two, on the other two you said, "No, that is a budget buster. It shows we do not care about balancing the budget." I resent those arguments, very frankly. You know they are not true, and I know they are not true. Let us use a little common sense and work out an agreement that represents the best thinking of both sides and see if we cannot get behind it and support it and avoid these fictitious arguments about who is the biggest budget cutter both on your side within your party and between the two of us.

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

Mr. Chairman, I feel like I am in the middle of a jurisdictional dispute, which I am. We are not talking about whether or not the programs are good programs or bad programs. We are talking about a concept of whether or not we ought to bust the budget with this miniscule amount of money that is doing a great deal of good for a great many people in this great country.

Yes, we can talk about budget busters. Yes, we can talk about conservatism. But we have a program that is working, a government program that combines the resources and the capabilities and the talents of the State of Alabama, for example. Under our Sea Grant Program, the universities, the private industry and the Government are working together to make this a better world, to help provide for the future feeding of people in this country and other countries, and to eliminate diseases such as salmonella that are taking place in some seafood problems throughout the world now.

So while we are caught in this jurisdictional problem of who is going to get credit or who is going to have control, let us not lose sight of the fact that we are talking about a very vital program to the people of this country which costs a very small amount of money, and I think at this point we have reached the stage, if I am not mistaken, I say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], I came to speak in favor of your amendment that now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is introducing a substitute or an amendment to your

amendment saying that they are going to fully fund under his authorization bill, and yet fully support you when you come to the floor for the reauthorization level.

I think it is imperative that we do support the Committee on Resources on the full authorization level because we are talking about a 4-year program instead of a 1-year program. So at this point I suppose we are at the stage where we are all going to support you, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], and applaud your efforts to bring the funding levels back up and then get behind the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the Committee on Resources to ensure that this vital program continues.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the point here, and I would just want to add again that the Committee on the Budget, in their deliberations, zeroed out the Sea Grant Program, and those of us on the Committee on Science who went to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] worked with him to raise up an authorization level to put funding back in. It was not what we wanted. It was around \$34 million, but it was, in fact, increased funding.

What we have now done is we have increased it to a much higher level, which is a level that the Committee on Resources had in their mark, and I think, as I have said publicly, I am very happy and pleased to work with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and to support the other priorities and concerns he has. So we move ahead, get the program, keep it intact and work with the natural resources bill to support that when it comes to the floor as well.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, in his eloquent remarks, presented almost precisely the position that I am taking here, but I think you recognize that we do have a collision basically within your own party as to what the appropriate role of the Federal Government is in supporting the kind of research that is involved in the Sea Grant Program, and that needs to be resolved. I thought it had been resolved under the Reagan and Bush administrations, but now that understanding is no longer holding. We are told that that is not respectable research to cooperate with industry and users and trying to develop programs that benefit the American people, that that should be done by the private sector and that there should be no Federal Government involvement in it.

We need to come to closure on that point. What is the role of the Federal Government? I am not trying to dictate it. But I do not like to be going

through these specious arguments all the time because of a difference which does not get fully explicated as to what the appropriate role of the Federal Government is and has been and should be in the future, and I am hoping that the gentleman, with keen insight and common sense, like yourself, will help us to resolve that problem in a constructive way, and I will go along with the gentleman's position.

If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has worked out something with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], I am not going to object to that as long as it does not obscure the larger debate which is taking place here, which is my purpose in taking up the time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, I will say, that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I recognize sometimes the amount of control that the Committee on the Budget would like to impose upon the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield on that point very briefly, the gentleman stated the Committee on the Budget had eliminated the Sea Grant Program. What the gentleman means is that in the report of the Committee on the Budget, there was language which assured that the program would be discontinued. The report language is guidance, no more, and the first budget resolution is not binding until it is confirmed by the reconciliation bill in the final action, and the appropriators know that. There has always been tension between appropriators and members of the Committee on the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. BROWN of California and by unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield further, I am enjoying this discourse so much. This is a point that all new Members need to understand particularly, this tension between the Committee on the Budget and the appropriators, to say nothing of the authorizers, is a constant factor here, and the tension over who has the predominant role will always continue in a Congress made up of prima donnas like we have. So to state that the first budget resolution abolished the Sea Grant Program is a slight exaggeration. The final action will depend on what your committee does in terms of funding the program and ultimately what the House as a whole does in terms of confirming the authorization for the program.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, as you know, we did not have this particular problem when it was all under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine, which, as we all know, has been abolished, and now you have two sort of separate jurisdictions. But the good theme of what I am

hearing here today is that we have almost unanimous agreement that we want to continue to Sea Grant Program. We want to continue it with adequate funding level, without busting the budget, as some might say, because we recognize how valuable these types of programs are and what a contribution they make, what a contribution they make to the betterment of life here in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Saxton amendment and the National Sea Grant College Program. For well over 25 years, the Sea Grant Program has worked toward making the United States the world leader in marine research and the sustainable development of marine resources. The cuts proposed by H.R. 2405 would be devastating and make it nearly impossible for this program to continue providing its valuable services.

Despite being a relatively small program, Sea Grant provides significant benefits to the Nation by providing a high return on federal investment through its promotion of economic growth, helping to create private sector jobs, and by educating a skilled work force able to compete in the international workplace.

Mr. Chairman, as a member from the great State of New York, the only State in the country bordering both the ocean and the Great Lakes, I have had the opportunity to see this program focus on protecting and enhancing our environment for ourselves and for future generations. Sea Grant is virtually the only source of funding devoted to marine policy studies and it is making major contributions to the advancement of fisheries management, pollution remediation, seafood safety and marine engineering.

I currently have the privilege of employing a Dean John A. Knauss Sea Grant fellow, Cinnamon Rogers. Her background in marine and coastal policy has been an invaluable asset over the past year.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has the largest jurisdiction over ocean resources in the world. The Sea Grant Program is essential to ensure that these resources are managed responsibly and effectively and to solve national marine resource problems without the need for costly regulation or intrusive government involvement. The cuts proposed by H.R. 2405 would dramatically affect our Nation's ability to maintain the economy of coastal regions, address long-term national needs, ensure survival of threatened habitat and species, and train future marine resource scientists and managers.

I urge my colleagues to support the National Sea Grant College Program by voting in favor of the Saxton amendment.

□ 1315

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

The perfecting amendment was agreed to.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a clarification in the form of a parliamentary inquiry here.

My understanding of the situation before the last vote that was just taken was that I had an amendment pending to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] had an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] was a perfecting amendment, and it was to the bill, and it would take precedence of an amendment that strikes language from the bill. So the Weldon amendment gets voted on first.

Mr. SAXTON. That is correct, inasmuch as his amendment was an amendment to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. His amendment was a perfecting amendment to the language in the bill.

Mr. SAXTON. All right.

So, Mr. Chairman, what I need to do at this point is to ask unanimous consent to withdraw my original amendment; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my original amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is withdrawn.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank, first of all, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] for allowing me to do this ahead of his amendment, and I rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and I would like to ask him about the NOAA aircraft, the 14 aircraft that NOAA flies as weather surveillance and hurricane surveillance, and I would ask the gentleman if these aircraft have been eliminated by H.R. 2405.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the answer to the gentleman's question is "no."

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. And, if the gentleman would answer, would these aircraft continue to be based where they are presently?

Mr. WALKER. The bill does not alter the bases of specific aircraft.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. WALKER, H.R. 2405 terminates the NOAA Corps. Does the termination of the corps prevent NOAA from conducting important hurricane surveillance activities?

Mr. WALKER. I say to the gentleman the answer to his question is "no," it is not the intention of the committee to terminate important hurricane surveillance activities. The committee simply does not believe it requires uniformed NOAA Corps members to fly these planes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. One further question, if the gentleman would.

The manager's amendment, which was adopted, includes language which allows members of the NOAA Corps to transfer to the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard or NOAA Civil Service if they are needed. Is this accurate?

Mr. WALKER. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, and I thank the members of the committee for their concern about this.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: Page 108, line 9, through page 109, line 4, amend subsection (g) to read as follows:

(g) WEATHER SERVICE MODERNIZATION.—Title VII of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 is amended—

(1) in section 706—

(A) by amending subsection (b)(6) to read as follows:

"(6) any recommendations of the Committee submitted under section 707(c) that evaluate the certification.";

(B) by striking "60-day" in subsection (c)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "30-day";

(C) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) FINAL DECISION.—If the Secretary decides to close, consolidate, automate, or relocate any such field office, the Secretary shall publish the certification in the Federal Register and submit the certification to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives.";

(D) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(f) TRANSITION PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall maintain for a period of at least two years after the closure of any weather office a program to—

"(1) provide timely information regarding the activities of the National Weather Service which may affect service to the community, including modernization and restructuring; and

"(2) work with area weather service users, including persons associated with general aviation, civil defense, emergency preparedness, and the news media, with respect to the provision of timely weather warnings and forecasts.";

"(2) by amending section 707(c) to read as follows:

"(c) DUTIES.—The Committee may review any certification under section 706 for which

the Secretary has provided a notice of intent to certify in the plan, including any certification for which there is a significant potential for degradation of service within the affected area. Upon the request of the Committee, the Secretary shall make available to the Committee the supporting documents developed by the Secretary in connection with the certification. The Committee shall evaluate any certification reviewed on the basis of the modernization criteria and with respect to the requirement that there be no degradation of service, and advise the Secretary accordingly."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members, both present in the Chamber and listening in their offices, will pay close attention to my amendment today because it is indeed a public-safety amendment.

The Weather Service Modernization Act, which was passed in 1992, established procedures for the modernization of the National Weather Service. A critical part of that law was the requirement that no weather office can be closed or automated without a certification that the closure would not result in degradation of service to the affected area.

Now pursuant to that modernization act an implementation plan was passed by the Weather Service that would propose to close many Weather Service offices around this country including my Weather Service office there in north Alabama which also serves southeastern Tennessee as well. There are 300 existing Weather Service offices right now, and, according to the implementation plan, those numbers would be reduced to 118.

Now, under current law, Mr. Chairman, the certification requires a review of local weather characteristics, comparison of weather services within the affected area and, importantly, a review of the weather radar coverage. The process requires a publication in the Federal Register and a period of public comment before a closure takes place. I think the public participation in this process is critical.

Now the bill before the Chamber here today eliminates any certification requirement before the Weather Service can close an office, and let me repeat that. This bill eliminates any certification requirement before the Weather Service can close an office. That means that a bureaucrat can determine by the stroke of a pen which of those Weather Service offices will be closed and when those Weather Service offices will be closed, and this is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I say this is indeed a very critical public-safety argument here in my amendment today. Requiring a certification that there is no degradation of services is a matter of public trust. No Weather Service office should be closed without the guarantee that an area shall receive at least the same kind of Weather Service protection that it has received in the past. There must be some kind of accountability to the process of closing those offices, and a certification requirement provides an accountability.

So what do we do because none of us want a government bureaucrat exercising that kind of authority? We have got to meet some middle ground here, and I think that is what my amendment in fact does. My amendment does not preserve the existing certification process. It is a compromise amendment.

What we are doing with the amendment is currently there is a requirement that each closing certification be published in the Federal Register for 60 days. We reduce that requirement to 30 days. Currently there is a requirement that the modernization transition committee be consulted twice during the certification process. My amendment reduces that to one consultation. And in the third place, Mr. Chairman, currently there is a requirement that the Weather Service maintain a liaison officer in every closed office for 2 years. This is wasteful and not necessary. We eliminate that requirement by this amendment and simply require that the Weather Service maintain a program for 2 years, a program for 2 years that will provide timely information to Weather Service users in the community that is losing the Weather Service office.

Now this amendment, by reaching that kind of compromise, will save \$15 million over 5 years and will eliminate redundancies that are currently in the law, but at the same time we will maintain the essential requirement that there be a certification of no degradation of service when a weather office will be closed.

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

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] and his aide, I think who will be leaving his office shortly, Mr. John Hay, for their excellent work on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have the most unpredictable weather in the world in the United States. We appropriate money every year for disasters whether they be hurricanes, tornadoes, severe weather. Certainly for us to have in this bill a guarantee for public safety and public input to certify that a closure of an office warning people about severe weather conditions should not take place unless there is this needed public safety. In this bill we are spending several hundred million dollars on shuttle safety, and we should. We should protect our astronauts when they take off in that shuttle. Certainly we should have a certification process that allows all our citizens in this country the input as to how to make sure that they are adequately warned if they have a severe lake effect coming off Lake Michigan in my district in the State of Indiana that sweeps across the entire northern part of the State.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's bill does that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] has expired.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Again I think with this compromise process, as the gentleman and I know brutally well in our separate areas, we have raised concerns within the committee about the modernization process and the fact that we are likely left in gap areas that many studies have determined, and recently we have engaged in jumping through every hoop, crossing every "t" we can cross, in order to fairly preserve this modernization plan to make sure the citizens of our areas are in fact protected. I think this is an additional guarantee that those of us that are concerned about this modernization process are given some protection that before they can close our offices in my case, move the office 100 miles south of my area, and recently my Weather Service office went out because it was struck by lightning, and we were served from this 100-mile-away Weather Service office, and the coverage was disastrous. We were given 2 and 3 minutes notice of tornadoes.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman and I have worked very hard, and I congratulate him, as well, for bringing this issue to the floor.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] and say this amendment is doing a real service not just to the people in Indiana and Alabama, but all over the country, insuring that they get adequate warning, insuring that there is public input, and that this streamlines the bureaucratic process and actually saves some money to the taxpayer in the long run as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, in our bill we have eliminated the union-written certification requirements that have stymied efforts to consolidate Weather Service offices from 215 to 118. The Cramer amendment, while not going back to the old certification requirements, offers a new and streamlined version, yes, but a version that will still result in the maintaining of unnecessary Weather Service offices and maintaining a process that is unnecessary. What we are talking about is jeopardizing a \$35 million savings over 5 years. The NOAA IG supports our position, and that maintaining the system, even if it is streamlined, is unnecessarily costly, and we are trying to come about and trying to solve a problem.

Mr. Chairman, for years we have had a number of Weather Service offices that were just not necessary. There is legitimate concern which we will hear from several Members in a moment. I am sure that their areas may in some ways be affected detrimentally.

□ 1330

Let me say for the record that we have noted their concerns, and that

there will be a hearing next week on this issue to ensure that each and every one of the people who Members will hear in one moment, supporting the Cramer amendment, that their concerns are dealt with, and that their concerns and their problems that might erupt from the situation, that it is corrected.

There is no reason why we should pass a Cramer amendment in order to solve the problems we are going to hear about in the next couple of minutes. What we need instead is to have an honest approach to the issue, so that we can, if anybody is left out, if there are some gaps in the plan, that they be taken care of, rather than set in law a streamlined process, yes, from what the old process is, but a process that will still result in offices that are unnecessary being left open, and add to the cost of closing offices that are unnecessary, as the NOAA IG has already stipulated.

This amendment was brought up and defeated in committee, and let me again state, the problem that are emerging, in that some areas are not being covered adequately, which we are going to hear in a moment, are being taken care of. There is no reason for us to pass the Cramer amendment. In fact, passing the Cramer amendment will be counterproductive and will cost the taxpayers unnecessary money, because the problems that will arise can be handled in a different way. We are already on the road to handling these problems.

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time and thank the chairman of the committee, and of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the Committee on Science, both now and in years past. They have in fact bent over backwards to make sure those of us who were extremely nervous about this modernization plan were given opportunities to question, poke holes, because what we said then and what I say now is, "Do not use our citizens as guinea pigs. Do not, just for the sake of balancing the budget," and this is a small amount of money, I might add, "do not risk out citizens' lives." I have had people sitting in church who were blown away by tornadoes, and I cannot stand here and let the gentleman say this is simply a budget issue.

I wish we had had the hearings the gentleman is talking about before we brought this bill to the floor today. I am glad we are having the hearings next week, but I must again say this is a public safety issue and not a budget issue.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, we did schedule these hearings long before we knew when this bill would be coming to the floor, and as the chairman of the subcommittee, and with the full support of

the chairman of the full committee, we are moving forward methodically to make sure that there are no gaps in our reform measures.

The gentleman's proposal, the gentleman's amendment, does indeed come at the problem from a certain way. I am just saying that it is counterproductive and may in the end cost the taxpayers money, where we can solve the problem by looking at it independently and not setting down guidelines that, in the end, will cost the taxpayers money.

I recognize the gentleman's point. He is very concerned about his constituents. Everyone who is going to be speaking here on this issue is concerned about the lives of their constituents and the lives of other citizens of the United States. I just think we can handle it in a better way, and modernization does put—even as we have said, the Doppler radar is going into effect. We have a whole new radar system that we have approved and authorized the money for, so we are very concerned about safety, enough to spend money on this new radar system.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER], but again, I want to try and provide a little additional background here.

First, of all, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science has not been divided on the issue of modernizing the Weather Service. We have felt that we could provide improved service and less expensive service through updating the equipment to the best in modern radars and so forth, and we have sought to do that.

In any period in which we have a major technological transformation, there are people who are going to be upset, some for causes which are fantasy; that is, they just distrust new technology, maybe; and others for a legitimate reason, that the technology may not work as advertised, it may not be effective, and it may degrade, as has been pointed out here, the level of service for certain particular areas.

However, the general principle is we should move ahead with modernization, we should do it reasonably well, but we should recognize the special problems of the transition. I want to say just a word about that. We wrestled for months and years over how to alleviate this concern for a degradation of service. The provisions that were finally adopted represented, again, a consensus as to how we could protect the interests of the public that was concerned, while we proceeded to go ahead as expeditiously as possible with upgrading the system.

Some of the fears for degradation of service were real, some were imaginary. There were some even here in the Congress who felt that maybe a Republican President would have shut down a

weather station in a Democratic district just to maybe get even with somebody. Now that we have a Democratic President, there are Republicans who probably feel that they might be discriminated against by a Democratic President.

We feel that these are more in the realm of fantasy than fact, but the concern about a degradation of service is real. The elimination of the opportunity for public hearings would be a tragedy to due process in this country. We believe that it is important that we move ahead expeditiously; that we, however, allow for a transition period, that we allow for a process of public hearing and review whenever there is a change that is proposed, and that we take into consideration all the factors that would be involved.

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, the long history behind this process, which is being improved by the amendment suggested here, as a matter of fact, and saves money, this warrants the adoption of this amendment in the public interest, as well as in helping us to meet the goal of improved efficiency and less cost.

Mr. WAMP. 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 Alabama [Mr. CRAMER], as I supported that amendment at the level of the Committee on Science, recognizing that for the folks back home, the Democrats and Republicans are working together on this issue. I commend the Chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the full committee, and those on the other side, because we have worked together for a number of years on this issue.

When it comes to health and safety, we are working together to make sure that politics does not enter into this. I do not believe for a second that it has or is entering into this. However, with the potentiality of degradation in some areas of the Weather Service as we transition into a brand new national NEXRAD system, which is coming online, it is important that we do not have soft spots. Let me give a recent example.

In southeast Tennessee, which I represent, which has been identified as one of five vulnerable areas in the country by the National Research Council's findings, which they are now reporting on to the Department of Commerce, we are awaiting, I think, Department of Commerce clarification to make sure that these five areas are potentially degrading areas, so we can actually accommodate through some construction these areas to improve these areas.

As Hurricane Opal last week worked its way up through the Gulf of Mexico right through, I suppose, the district of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] and my district, we have had our people who have relied on our local Weather Service office for years calling Morristown, TN, some 114 miles to the northeast. Storms do not come from

the northeast to the southeast in the southeastern part of the United States, they come from the south. We have to have that service and those reportings coming from a closer area.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] very responsibly offered legislation at the committee level to accommodate these soft spots. I commend him for that. The transition, our local Weather Service Office is closing. The calls came from our local media representatives to the Morristown office. We did not have the responsiveness that we have had in recent years as this hurricane came through town. These are critical health and safety concerns that must continue to be addressed.

I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] for the hearings, but again I do think this is a responsible approach. It does not matter where it comes from in this body, from that back corner or this back corner; when it is a responsible approach, we need to all embrace and recognize it. I urge all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

□ 1345

This team worked, saved lives and mitigated millions of dollars in property damage. Furthermore, it enabled Federal officials to control releases from the Central Valley Project dams, thereby avoiding further destruction downstream significantly. During this emergency, the radar in Sacramento which provides primary coverage to the region north of Redding failed to adequately detect precipitation in the mountains where the flooding originated. Had it not been for the heroic efforts of experienced Weather Service personnel in Redding, the devastation would have increased dramatically.

Mr. Chairman, despite the firefighting lessons we learned last spring, the Weather Service is still determined to eliminate the requirement that the service certify that the closures would not degrade services to the region, which could literally place the safety of thousands of people in jeopardy.

Mr. Chairman, this would have ramifications that move far beyond even flood management. It would also severely impact the Weather Service provided to forest fire dispatchers from the Forest Service, BLM and California Department of Forestry, who are housed in the same facility as the Weather Service and who have relied on the forecasting for meteorologists and technicians in the Redding office for over 30 years. Furthermore, it would jeopardize the safety of travelers along the vulnerable Interstate 5 corridor who rely on the accurate storm and snow reports for safe passage between Oregon and California.

Mr. Chairman, the situation in southern California is not unique. There are communities all over the country which are in jeopardy of losing

adequate weather service under the present modernization plan. We must reinstate a mechanism to check a potentially dangerous bureaucratic fiat.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that mechanism. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Cramer amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an issue where I think we really get to the heart of Government. We can talk as much as we want about reducing the size of government; government, over the last several years, getting involved in issues that it should not be involved in. The Government's branch and its breadth has taken too much of the private sector in this country.

However, this is an issue that if there is anything that the Federal Government should be doing, is it should be providing a quality weather service for the hundreds of millions of people that live in this country. Every one of our districts are affected by quality weather service.

The standard that presently exists is that through change of service, there has to be a finding that there is no degrading of service to the region. The language in the bill would take that out. It is real simple. What it would allow is that an area of the country, any area of the country, could have a degradation of service.

Let us think about what that means on the practical level, what it means around the country. Let us also talk about Florida, first and then my district, second.

Within the last several weeks, as unfortunately happens, and statistically it is going to continue to happen, we had a devastating, deadly hurricane that came on to the shores of Florida. This particular one landed in the north Florida region, the panhandle of the State. Florida is a large State. That is a less populated area than most of the State of Florida. Several million people evacuated their homes knowing up-to-the-minute reports of the change in that particular storm, again, although it happened the same day as the O.J. verdict, all of us knowing that, it changed very quickly. It changed to a category three storm very quickly. Without really cutting-edge ability, we would have seen probably thousands of lives lost. The Weather Service did its job in that instance.

My district goes from Palm Beach County in Florida to Key West. The Florida Keys is a chain of islands 110 miles long. When you are sitting in Key West, which is a city of 40,000 people where there happens to be a Weather Service station, which provides into the Caribbean weather analysis in terms of potential hurricanes and potential storms that on a day-to-day basis are incredibly valuable to commerce in the keys in terms of fishermen. But really, the ultimate time comes in terms of a hurricane situation.

In the Florida Keys in terms of transmission issues, in terms of being able to acquire information, the Weather Service is actually going through the debate, or going through the analysis right now in terms of trying to close the station in Key West. It is in a very rigorous analysis that they are being forced to go through now, that there will not be a degradation of service, and there is a great deal of debate about that.

Mr. Chairman, as a person who represents those people, 40,000 people in Key West and the 80,000 people who live in the Florida Keys, and the 2.5 million people that live in south Florida, that if something is going to happen to that particular station, that it become an automated station, at least that at a very objective, critical, analytical level, that that station will be evaluated. To say well, we just do not have enough money to do that analysis, we just do not have enough money, that we have to close that station, is beyond me. I mean just absolutely beyond me, that as a society, as a government, as a country, we would be saying that.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the most basic, literally the most basic governmental function. I ask my colleagues who are opposed to this amendment to speak up and say, government should not be involved in the Weather Service. Maybe what we ought to do is privatize the Weather Service. You know, have a 900 number that will privatize the Weather Service and maybe the private industry will get into this and they will be out there predicting hurricanes. If you think that there might be a hurricane, you will dial the 900 number or something and get a weather report from this new agency.

I urge my colleagues, because this is critical, not just for Florida, but to every person that lives in this country, to adopt the Cramer amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment. I heard the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] a moment ago, and everybody ought to listen to the folks that are speaking on this. Now, the gentleman is a good friend. He has tied his bark on a tree. I am no big spender. We are here supporting the gentleman's amendment, so this is clearly not a situation where we are talking about saving a lot of money. We are talking about public safety, we are talking about the need to pay attention to what the gentleman is saying. He is saying, keep the language, as has been repeated, calling for certification, but before any closure of any station we will determine whether or not there is a degradation of service.

I serve the western part of North Carolina. A few days ago I was catching a plane, sitting on the runway, and we could not go out because of fog. Probably 200 yards down the road it was clear, but we had to sit on the run-

way because it was too foggy for us to take off. We sat a considerable period of time. I doubt if a station of some distance would have picked that up.

I also know that many times we have squalls, small storms, things that occur in the mountains that the two stations that are going to be handling our area may or may not pick up. Now, I am perfectly willing to see the station close. I am perfectly willing to see the new stations take place. But I am not willing to see that happen until we have certified, until we have determined, whether or not the public safety is being met.

Now, if you believe that the Federal bureaucracy is 100-percent perfect and you are willing to bet your lives and the friends and family on the fact of that perfection, then you do not need to pay any attention to this argument. If you believe as I do, though, and the people of western North Carolina, first of all, the Federal Government will mess up a 1-car funeral in most cases, and there was a recent ABC report just a few days ago that showed that millions of dollars of new technology that was being put into airports was failing a substantial portion of the time, then you will see that the gentleman's amendment is necessary until we see whether or not that new technology works, and whether or not we need to change it before we close the existing service.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues who have previously taken the microphone, Republicans and Democrats alike, liberals, conservatives, and moderates in support of the Cramer amendment to H.R. 2405. Regrettably, the bill in its current form is nothing less than a breach of faith.

The bill before us today repeals sections 706 and 707 of the Weather Service Modernization Act (Public Law 102-567). These sections, and in particular subsection (b) of section 706 requires, pursuant to the implementation of the Weather Service modernization plan "The Secretary (of Commerce) shall not close, consolidate, automate, or relocate any field office unless the Secretary has certified that such action will not result in any degradation of service." For the past 3 years, our constituents have been repeatedly assured that a local weather station would not be closed under any plan to modernize weather service operations, unless there were a certification, as required by law, that the closing of that station would not result in a degradation of service.

Mr. Chairman, we made a promise, and the issue before this House with regard to the Cramer amendment is whether or not we will keep that promise. I have said to my constituents, other Members of this body have said

to theirs, we will not close your local weather station unless we can assure you, after careful review, that there will not be a degradation in service and, consequently, no increased threat to public health and safety.

The bill before us today deletes this promise, this requirement of certification of nondegradation prior to the closure of any National Weather Service office. During the Energy and Environment Subcommittee markup of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1995, I offered an amendment to restore the current law language regarding certification, keeping the promise that we have been repeating to our constituents. I now support the Cramer amendment which preserves the core promise made to our constituents and provides a sensible streamlining of certification requirements above and beyond the merit of the legislation itself, beyond the certification contained in the Cramer amendment.

The issue here is one of good faith. Can our constituents trust our promises once they are made? We have here a series of promulgations going back over 3 years based on statutory law that no station will be closed without a thorough review and a certification from the Secretary. The issue here is not about weather; the issue here is about integrity and whether we of this body will keep the promises we have made in prior law.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an affirmative vote for the Cramer amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are in a period of reevaluating that which the Federal Government ought to do and that which it no longer should do. I do not think at a time when weekly we see reports of damage or even loss of life due to severe weather, the American people believe the United States ought to get out of the business of helping Americans understand what is coming at them in light of dangerous or threatening weather.

We are in a period of moving toward greater cost efficiency in weather forecasting. As various communities leave their old systems and move to new systems, they are entitled to the assurance that the quality of weather forecasting in their area will not be jeopardized, will not be diminished, and that is what the certification is all about.

Let me give you a for instance, because I represent an area that has this problem before it right today: Williston, ND. Williston, ND, is scheduled to have its forecasting station come out. Five employees and one meteorologist will be moved.

□ 1400

When this is accomplished, it will be the largest nonobstructed geographic area without radar coverage in the country, and in Williston, ND, let me

tell you we have very, very severe weather conditions to deal with.

We have been told that an automatic surface observing system is going to take care of our needs. We have been told that a system with radar 120 miles away in Glasgow, MT, and 130 miles away in Minot, ND, are going to cover the needs for the people living in the Williston area. We have been given this assurance notwithstanding the fact that 95 percent of all tornadoes, perhaps the very most dangerous life threatening circumstance we have to face, will be grossly underdetected by a radar system 130 miles away.

A consulting radar meteorologist for Williston has found that radars over 100 miles away would be grossly inadequate for detection of winter snowstorms, tornado vortex signatures, microbursts, and gust fronts, all of which we have and all of which threaten life.

Good, reliable weather forecasting is critical to everyone. When you live in a rural area that has the types of weather swings and the severity of weather conditions that we experience in North Dakota, it can literally be a matter of life and death. Do you come in from the farm to the city? Do the school buses run? We need reliable weather systems.

If you are going to take from areas like Williston their weather forecasting station, then, by golly, you better be prepared to certify that we are not going to have a degradation of service. That is why I rise in strong support of the amendment before us and urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Chairman, I suppose it does little good in the emotion of all of this to actually talk about what the experts have to say in these matters, but I am going to try anyhow because I am reminded a little bit of testimony we had today before the committee in which it was being talked about in educational context.

The witness described a situation where back in the 19th century someone by accident designed a jet engine and realized that this jet engine could propel things at a very high speed. But the problem was that they mounted it on a stage coach, and because they had mounted it on a stage coach, it just destroyed the stage coach because they put it on outmoded technology, and so on.

This debate reminds me of that. Here we are, we are in the process of devising and putting in place a modern weather service, a modern radar system that allows us to get good coverage across the country. In fact, it is working. We have had about 100 of these NEXRAD radars that have been installed. They have been commissioned and are operating successfully.

What we have got is a series of people that have come to the floor and basically talked about the weather service

that they now have. They say that the weather service they now have is not giving them the kind of forecasts they need and we have lives in danger. That is right. That is the reason we are trying to upgrade the weather service. We are trying to do a job of upgrading it and making safety better.

But what does this amendment do? This amendment gets in the way of having that done. How does it do it? Well, the Department of Commerce, the inspector general says, and I am just quoting from his letter, one of the experts who has actually examined this thing in detail, he says, "We believe that the legislative requirement for certification imposes burdensome and costly restraints on the National Weather Service's ability to modernize and restructure its field offices."

In other words, what is happening here is, what we are about to pass if we pass this amendment will be a process that will undermine our ability to get the new radars that have some opportunity to do something about the degraded weather service that all these folks are talking about.

He goes on and he says further in his letter, "The legislative requirement for certification is an unnecessary and outmoded concept."

This is the stage coach, folks. We have got the jet engine and so on, we are trying to put it in place, in place in a jet airplane so it can actually be used, and what we are doing here is going with an outmoded concept.

I know what the gentlemen coming here are concerned about, and legitimately so. The National Research Council had a recent report in which they talked about the NEXRAD coverage, and we have had a number of people come here and talk about the fact that they were in one of those locations that has a potential for degradation of service under that particular study.

Well, the fact is that the report also provided a process for dealing with those locations. But what we are doing here is, we are trying to figure out a way to deal with what were essentially five locations across the country and keep in place hundreds of unnecessary weather offices.

Let me quote again from the inspector general. He says, "Therefore, any legislative proposal that seeks only to streamline but not to eliminate certification will maintain a process that is both unnecessary and costly."

This is my concern about the amendment. I agree with everybody here who wants to protect their citizens and so on. I certainly want to protect the people in Lancaster and Chester counties from having weather-related problems, but we want to make certain we have good forecasts. Every Member here wants to do that. That is what we are here to do. But the bottom line is, what you are doing is you are putting in place a very costly system that will maintain all of the old structures and prevent us from doing the new struc-

tures that actually work in a time-sensitive way.

I guess maybe the old order is something that everybody just kind of clings to because it is what they know. But in all honesty, if we are really going to discuss the health and safety of our American citizens, we ought not do things that undermine the ability to provide those safe modern systems.

The problem with this amendment is it takes an outmoded approach. It goes to a certification approach that the inspector general says is exactly the wrong thing to do. It preserves weather station offices whether or not they contribute anything. The fact is we are going to preserve a lot of outmoded offices that are not in areas that are degraded and we are going to preserve them for months, maybe years, under the certification process. That makes no sense really.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to be quick here because I know we are on limited time and the Members are probably weary of this, but I think it is unfair of the chairman to remind the Members that all we are about through this amendment is keeping offices open unnecessarily. In my area, I can accept that I may have to lose my weather service office, but do not let a bureaucrat by the stroke of a pen determine that my office is closed and that the services that I normally would get from that office would now be given to me from 100 miles south of there. I do not think it is fair to argue that that is what this amendment is all about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman I think what I did was argue what the inspector general argued. The inspector general of the Department of Commerce has made the arguments that I made here, and I quoted extensively from his letter. He is the one who is saying that the process the gentleman is proposing is an unnecessary, costly and outmoded process.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman would yield further, I am opposed to his opinion about this. I do not think he has been out there in the field in our districts experiencing the kind of weather impact that we have there and the dependence on those weather service offices, that we have a right to have a process created before they are closed.

Mr. WALKER. I think he has done an extensive study. The point he would make is where there are situations of potential degrading of service, we are going to step in and try to do something about that. In fact, I just talked

to the head of NOAA here a few minutes ago, at the end of this month there is to be a meeting where they are going to examine all of the next generation NEXRAD's that they want to put in place, additional NEXRAD's to cover possible degraded areas. So the weather service is entirely sensitive to this but if we pass this amendment, what we are going to do is we are going to prevent a lot of those from getting on line because we are going to be spending the money keeping offices in place that are not now capable of providing the most modern services.

I would tell the gentleman I think the safety argument is against doing that. Why in the world would we get in the way of doing the thing that is going to give us better weather information? That is what we are about to do. We are trying to preserve bureaucracy at the expense of getting better information.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is it your position that the Cramer amendment, the end result in all of it would not be more safety but instead would be a waste of the taxpayers' dollars? I believe that is where we are coming from. Because we have already, as the chairman of the subcommittee and chairman of the committee, guaranteed and given our word that we would work and have reached out to work with those people who say they are affected in a detrimental way. But there seems to be a breakdown in communication here.

A moment ago I asked my colleague from North Dakota to yield and what I wanted to ask him was he was saying that the weather stations are going to be this far away and the radar is going to be that far away. I wanted to ask him whether or not he had any technical experts that had told him whether or not that was inadequate.

The fact is today technology permits us to do things in a cost-effective way that used to cost the Government a lot more money, you had to have a lot more stations out there, a lot more people on payroll but now technologically we are capable of doing these things.

Mr. WALKER. I want to thank the gentleman, because the Federal Government is still buying vacuum tubes for the FAA and they are calling this the way in which we maintain safety in the FAA. They are still using technology that relies upon vacuum tubes.

Most young people in school today have never seen a vacuum tube because they understand that the way you do things efficiently is with computer chips. There are 3.3 million vacuum tubes on that computer chip.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that if we go to upgraded systems, we actually get better systems. I do not think there is anybody that doubts that maybe using this chip is a better way to provide safety in an air traffic control system than using a bunch of these vacuum tubes. But the Government has not gotten around to it. The same thing is happening in the weather service. Because of all the certification requirements, and let us face it, the certification requirement that was put in the 1992 law was designed specifically to make it as difficult as possible to close old weather service offices. As a matter of fact, it was done at the behest of the union that wanted to make certain that they preserved as many jobs as possible by keeping these offices from closing down.

We would be in a process of preserving here today this outmoded concept and doing so I think in a way that degrades our ability to bring on new technology and therefore undermines our ability to provide safe weather forecasting for the American people. I just do not think it makes any sense to do it.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. One of the questions, and I agree basically with the new technology. A number of us have problems which you have acknowledged. For example, in Fort Wayne, we have Indianapolis which is more than 100 miles, which is where one of the questions comes on the new radar, from the Indianapolis station, half my district is coming down from Michigan at more than 100 miles. Just to the east in another Member from Ohio's district in a rural area, they are coming up from Cincinnati more than 100 miles and another is coming down. Our EMS services are concerned about having to coordinate four different regions and we have not had a good answer to that. Our weather station is about to close. At the very least, these stations while we know that they are working on trying to upgrade the systems as you are talking about, we will not have protection in this period of coordination of the EMS services.

We have a question in part of Indiana, whether or not Indianapolis, there is a blockage, whether the radar can even pick up some of the tornadoes and severe storms that are coming across. While it is not perfect in the existing system, it is better than being unprotected while NOAA is working through this process. Many of us if we could be assured that we were not going to have a degradation of services in this process would understand your points very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 28 offered by Mr. THORNBERRY: Page 109, after line 4, insert the following new subsection:

(h) NEXRAD OPERATIONAL AVAILABILITY AND RELIABILITY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall take immediate steps to ensure the NEXRAD's operated by the Department of Defense that provide primary detection coverage over a portion of their range function as fully committed, reliable elements of the national weather radar network, operating with the same standards, quality, and availability as the National Weather Service-operated NEXRAD's.

(2) NEXRAD's operated by the Department of Defense that provide primary detection coverage over a portion of their range are to be considered as integral parts of the National Weather Radar Network.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, following on the last discussion, my amendment attempts to deal with some of the specific problems that have been incurred around the country because of holes that have developed in the National Weather Service radars. I think everyone agrees that modernization is very important. We need to have our people protected by the best technology possible. But what has happened is that some of the radars that are protecting people are managed by the Department of Defense rather than the National Weather Service, and those Department of Defense radars do not necessarily have to meet the same standards that the National Weather Service radars have to meet. As a result of that, sometimes the Department of Defense radars are not doing the job.

As so many of my colleagues who spoke on the previous amendment, we have an example in my district that shows just how serious this question is. On May 27, 1995, a tornado touched down in my district in Vernon, TX, and there was absolutely no warning because there was no radar operating at that time.

□ 1415

As a matter of fact, the backup radar was not operating at that time. All the radars that were covering that area were not operating. Ten minutes after the tornado passed through, as a result of eyewitness accounts, then there was a warning that was issued. Luckily that storm did not cause serious injuries, although it did cause some property damage. But the point is that some of these DOD radars are not operating the way they should.

I want to take a second to thank the chairman of the full committee in particular because he has gone out of his way to work with us in resolving these particular problems, but what we have found in my district is that sometimes

the communications line taking the radar signal to the National Weather Service office goes down, sometimes lightning knocks the power out of the radar, and then it takes as much as an hour to get the radar back on line. Several of the previous speakers have mentioned GAO reports and the National Research Council reports which talked about these particular problems with the 15 DOD radars.

The National Research Council recommended that immediate steps be taken to ensure that the 15 NEXRAD's under the control of the Department of Defense function as fully committed elements of the national weather radar network operating with the same standards, same quality and same availability as the National Weather Service NEXRAD's.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what my amendment does. It simply says the DOD radars that are an essential part of the system, that are the only thing some people have to rely on, must meet the same standards as the National Weather Service radars. We should not have some people disadvantaged in this new system of new technology because they happen to be covered by a DOD radar rather than a National Weather Service radar. This seems to be the least we can do to take the additional steps, not just require the Secretary to sign a piece of paper that says people will be protected, but make the changes in the field that will make sure people are protected.

I hope my colleagues will support the amendment.

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

We will accept this amendment. It prods the DOD to increase the quality of its portion of the weather modernization system, and we would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], for his diligence and hard work on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LOFGREN:

On page 110, after line 5 insert the following new sub-section:

"(d) Nothing in this Act shall preclude or inhibit the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration from carrying out studies of long term climate and global change."

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an important amendment to H.R. 2405 to clarify the confusion that exists over NOAA's role in carrying out climate and global change research.

The bill intended to provide \$86.7 million for NOAA's overall Climate and

Atmospheric Research Program, a reduction of over 27 percent from fiscal year 95 spending levels and 46 percent from the request. This cut is far beyond what other programs in this bill have absorbed.

Within this authorization, the bill does two things that must be regarded as profoundly narrow minded and deserve our special attention. First, the bill singles out climate change for a reduction of \$37 million, over a 40 percent cut. Second, in the committee's report language, there is a directive that eliminates the very idea of studying long-term climate change. The intent of the bill, the report states is that climate and global change. . . has been rolled into the interannual and seasonal climate change research line to ensure research is relevant to near-term events. That is, NOAA is no longer permitted to study long term climate change. It is only authorized to have a program that studies season-to-season changes.

What can be more short sighted than to first cut a program in half, then to dictate the scientific direction of the research such that it is prohibited from finding answers the Republican leadership may not want to know.

We have seen time and again in this Congress the face of extremism. If we define "ignorance" as "the act of ignoring" we can honestly say we have a conspiracy of ignorance in this Congress. Every agency which has been charged by Congress to study and assess the potential for long term climate change has been savaged in this budget cycle. And in the case of NOAA, there has been this additional insult of micromanagement.

I know that most of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle must know that problems do not simply go away if they are not studied. Global warming may or may not occur in the future—there is a legitimate margin of scientific uncertainty that must be narrowed through serious research.

Recently, it was reported that the United Nations-sponsored intergovernmental panel on climate change has reached the conclusion that the weight of evidence now supports the finding that green house warming is occurring. We are told that the subtle changes in the global heat balance will result in a greater incidence of severe weather such as hurricanes, tornadoes and severe winter storms. Certainly this past year should give many pause to wonder.

I do not think it is necessary for my colleagues to decide today whether they accept or do not accept the findings of the IPCC on global warming. What is necessary is that we continue to ask the right questions and make sure we know the answers in plenty of time to take action.

The Reinsurance Association of America has estimated that natural disasters from climate related events have recently risen to losses of \$1 billion a week in the United States alone.

They have taken a strong position in support of the Federal Climate Change Research Program for a very simple reason—continued research is a wise insurance policy.

More than a third of the GDP in the United States is directly linked to climate conditions in areas such as farming and forestry management, transportation, and public utilities, and real estate. If for no other reason than to provide for our future economic security, it is incumbent on this Congress to continue this vital research.

The amendment I am offering today does not deal with funding levels, although I feel this bill is woefully inadequate. Over the long term, I am hopeful that the appropriations conferees will see the value of this research even in a fiscally restrained environment.

My amendment would reestablish NOAA's mission to carry out long-term climate studies. It would recognize that a balanced research program must include both short-term studies of climate phenomena such as El Nino and long-term phenomena such as global warming. All of these studies, of course, are interrelated and contribute to our overall understanding of our planet. My amendment would remove the irrational directive in the committee's report that seeks to hinder this research by only allowing NOAA to solve half the problem.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is vaguely worded. It is a vaguely worded statement as to not inhibit NOAA from doing climate change research, and this issue was taken up in committee, and our bill received overwhelming bipartisan support.

But let me, just for the record, state that we have not eliminated climate research but instead what we have done in our bill, which it seems, although it is rather vague in the amendment, it seems to be her purpose to change this focus. We have focused the research of NOAA on more important functions, more important phenomena, for example, El Nino, which is vital to the safety and to the prosperity of people on the west coast and actually farmers throughout the United States. We have not in any way, for example, eliminated long-term climate research and, in fact, the bill authorizes long-term climate research at \$26 million.

However, in terms of what we believe that NOAA should focus on, if I can read from the report, the committee believes that this restructuring will ensure that climate and global change research will be focused on improving our understanding of near- and mid-term climatic events, and that is really what the crux of this issue is about, whether or not we should be looking and spending our limited resources at phenomena like El Nino that affect the lives of our people, or whether or not we will succumb to what I have called or at least what I believe to be, politically

inspired, politically inspired scientific exploration.

I believe that global warming, which is basically what we are talking about here, was generously funded by the administration over the last few years, and this basically is as a result of political rather than scientific pressures. We plan, by the way, to have hearings into the global warming issue, in which we will have scientists on both sides of the issue to discuss openly and try to have an honest dialog about the issue of global warming.

Unfortunately, when we had our last hearing on the ozone problem, and, by the way, I think it was a good, a very substantial hearing, we had fine representatives on both sides, we were attacked by Vice President GORE and the administration because we had both sides of the argument at our hearing. Well, for far too long what we have gotten is basically PC scientists who basically want to steamroller us on issues like ozone and like global warming, but the fact is that we believe that these issues should be looked at in toto, and we have, as I said, \$26 million authorized for long-term climate research. But we basically have combined it with interannual and seasonal climate change studies, which makes sense.

Instead of having basically huge chunks of our budget dedicated to this trendy global warming issue, instead we are going to take a balanced approach, spend \$26 million and put it in relationship with other long-term global climate change issues.

So I think that first of all this amendment is vaguely worded. We should not inhibit NOAA from involving itself in this type of research. The fact is that we have tried to focus NOAA on things that are meaningful and things that will affect the lives and property and safety of our citizens and the economy of our farm population, especially on the west coast. So I would strongly oppose the Lofgren amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. LOFGREN. I would note on page 94 of the committee report, next to the global category, there is a zero. We have zeroed the account out for global research. I am not suggesting that we add additional funding.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, that is because that money was folded into the interannual and seasonal climate change study.

Ms. LOFGREN. That is my point.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So we have \$26 million in there, and that is in the appropriations bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. The point I am about to make, sir, on the preceding pages in the committee report, we say we are limiting study to near and mid-term climatic events. What I am suggesting is it would be inappropriate for us as Members of Congress, not scientists, to impose our judgment on the scientists in that nature.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, we did not limit it. We focused it, and there is a difference between focusing and limiting. So if you say none of the money in here shall be spent for this, that is something else. But by focusing the efforts away from what I consider to be trendy science and a lot of other people believe the global issue is nothing more than trendy science, trendy liberal science, we have permitted people to look into this area, but tried to focus it on the areas that we considered to be responsible and practical and have some effect on our citizens.

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

I rise in support of the Lofgren amendment. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from California if he sees anything in this bill that would inhibit NOAA from carrying out long-term studies of climate and global change.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Nothing in the bill prohibits NOAA from doing this. It just expresses that we would like it to focus on certain other areas.

Mr. BROWN of California. Nothing in there prohibits it? Why does the gentleman object to an amendment that says nothing in this act shall prohibit it?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Basically, then, we believe that this amendment is vague and is nonproductive and could cause some confusion, which it already has on this floor.

□ 1430

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would argue that the gentleman's own report language is equally vague, and, in fact, it is kind of schizophrenic as a matter of fact, because while he gives on occasion lip-service to the importance of long-term research, he eliminates that category, merging it with short-term research, and makes it very clear in the language that the global change research will be focused on improving our understanding of near and midterm climatic events.

Now, I do not think the gentleman really wants to eliminate the long-term.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this is because we believe that this is where the best use of the money would be, but we do not limit it and restrict it from being used elsewhere.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is the point I am making. The gentleman's fuzzy language really does not limit long-term research, but he objects to saying it in the language of the bill. The reasons for that are quite simple. The gentleman has already revealed his feelings, which he has expressed many

times, that this long-term global warming stuff is what he calls—

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Liberal clap trap is the expression the gentleman is looking for.

Mr. BROWN of California. Liberal clap trap is one of the things he said. Politically inspired scientific exploration is another. Trendy global warming, I mean, the gentleman makes no secret of the way he feels about this. As I say, I think the gentleman becomes a little schizophrenic here, because he makes no secret of his view that this is not real science or basic research, which the gentleman is thoroughly committed to, is he not?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is correct. If I could answer the gentleman's question, there are some times in legislation, as the gentleman is aware, that things are not totally defined because we, during the hearing process, expect to receive a better understanding of an issue.

We have scheduled hearings on the issue of global warming. I expect that perhaps next year we might have a more definitive position. But at this point it has been more beneficial to have a little more open-minded approach than to state it that my beliefs happen to be the law of the land.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I admire the gentleman's open-minded approach to this issue. His language, of course, indicates how open minded he is on this issue.

There is another little thing I would like to have the gentleman remain open minded on. The gentleman in his discussion of the importance of mid and short-term research is enunciating a policy that this kind of research is very good, because it contributes immediate value. Now, this is how we define applied research. This is how we define cooperative research, with users and industry. This is short-term applied research that helps the economy of this country.

Now, that is blasphemy from the leadership of your committee. This is not something that we want to support. It is the long-term basic research that is real research and that we ought to be devoting our energy and resources to. The gentleman has completely turned that on its head. Does that strike the gentleman as being somewhat incongruous?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this type of research has broad based benefit, rather than benefit that is aimed at one particular interest group. Usually the main thing we have complained about on this side of the aisle, I can just speak for myself, is that quite often when the government is spending money, that it ends up spending money in an area of research that benefits a specific special interest group, and, quite often, who could afford to spend that money on their own. In this case, this type of research has a broad base of benefit.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from the Reinsurance Association of America representing all the insurance companies of this great country in which they strongly urge that we continue to support this kind of long-term global warming research. Now, is it the gentleman's view that the combined insurance companies of this great country cannot afford a little money? Are they not a special interest that is benefiting from this sort of thing?

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield. I would say that if the gentleman is asking my opinion, it would be that yes, that is a special interest group, and it is benefiting from and believes it might be benefiting from global warming research.

Mr. BROWN of California. They need to know that, because it influences their estimates of losses that they will have and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can elicit some further wisdom from the chairman of the subcommittee or the full committee. The point I am trying to make here in supporting this is very simple: The chairman has already indicated that he does not intend to preclude long-term research. He does not like it, and he said so vigorously, but he is not trying to preclude it. But he objects to an amendment that says he is not trying to preclude it. I consider that to be somewhat inconsistent.

The gentleman prefers instead to support the view which previously he never supported, that short-term research is real research, because it creates value, which is applicable to a large constituency, and we should be doing that.

The gentleman has not argued that way before. As I indicated very early in this debate, I enjoy pointing these little things out, and I will continue to needle the gentleman about them. I know the gentleman understands that I do it in good spirit.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I appreciate the role the former chairman is playing.

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

Mr. Chairman, we all appreciate the gentleman from California's needling on all of this and so on. At times I do not think he exactly understands the point, but maybe he chooses not to. The fact is that there is nothing inconsistent at all about what we are doing here. What we have said is when you are doing this kind of research, NOAA, you ought to do it with regard to your mission.

I do not know at any time that we have not supported mission-oriented

research. It is one of the things that we have said should be done. In fact, we are going to get an argument here in a little while on EPA that suggests that EPA ought to be out doing things for OSHA, and doing all kinds of things all over the Government and so on. We said no, they ought to stick to their mission. We said NOAA ought to stick to its mission.

All the report language said is when you are prioritizing the use of this funding, maybe you ought to do things that really relate to the mission you are doing. That tends to be more near and midterm than long term. We do not preclude the long term. The gentleman is exactly correct in suggesting that the language would be fine if it said shall preclude NOAA, but the gentleman in her amendment puts a fascinating word in it. She says preclude or inhibit.

Now, we went to look up the word "inhibit." The word "inhibit" is a great little word, speaking of needling. It says inhibit is "consciously or unconsciously suppressing or restraining."

Now, can somebody tell me where in this act we have some unconscious action that is suppressing or restraining?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, based on the chairman of the subcommittee's earlier comments, that since there is no intention on the part of himself or apparently the committee to preclude or inhibit long-term research, based on the gentleman's comment, that the language on the bottom of page 32 and top of page 33 of the committee report that seems to indicate otherwise would have an inhibiting effect upon the agency, since apparently it is not what the gentleman intended.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there is no inhibiting factor on this. What in the world, where in the act is this? The gentleman keeps quoting from the report. The report is advisory. Reports are always advisory. Where in the act?

The gentleman refers to the act. She says, "Nothing in the act shall preclude or inhibit." She does not talk about the report. She talks about the act. Where in the act is there something that consciously or unconsciously suppresses or restraints? Can the gentleman cite me one line in the act?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the fact we have zeroed out this account, and, I would add, going back to the gentleman's earlier statement on mission-oriented science, I am also interested in whose mission it would be to pursue global warming research, since we have eliminated this active thing in EPA and NOAA and the Department of Energy.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman

totally misrepresents the situation. NSF is still capable of doing global change. A lot of the university money coming into my area is independent researchers doing work there. The Department of Energy still has the capability of doing that and still does it. EPA will still have the capability of doing this kind of research. NASA has done considerable amounts of work. Most information quoted on global change has come from NASA.

We are not taking away any of that money. In fact, in the bill, if we refer to the act, in the act there is an account for long-term climate and air quality research that is at \$26 million. Big money. In fact, in this whole area we only spent \$9 million in NOAA in 1989. Now we spend \$96.5 million, something like that. We have had over a 1,000-percent increase in about 6 years from this account.

What we said was maybe a 1,000-percent increase in the account is a little more than we can take, if we are going to balance the budget, and maybe what we ought to do is trim it down some. And the way to trim it down is not to take the money away from the researchers, but take the money away from the bureaucrats. So we consolidated some programs to take the money away from some of the bureaucracy, and we consolidated the programs, and we gave it \$26 million in just long term.

Now, how is that inhibiting? The gentleman seems to be suggesting to me that that is inhibiting. Where is that inhibiting?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me there is too much protestation for a group that says they are not opposed to long-term global research. I am not suggesting in my amendment the expenditure of a single penny more than is included in this bill. What I am suggesting, and what I am suggesting here, is that we not make the scientific judgment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, nobody is suggesting that the gentleman is suggesting more money. Nobody said that. What we suggested was that her amendment has some very confusing wording in it. The word "inhibit," the gentleman still has not told me yet where in the bill there is anything that suggests that NOAA is being inhibited. Can the gentleman cite me a line, a page anywhere in the bill? Because the gentleman says, "Nothing in this act shall inhibit." Where? Where in the act? Why is this amendment necessary? What in the world do we have? We can take the word "preclude," because we do not think there is anything in there. But the word "inhibit," it is just a superfluous, almost ridiculous word. Why in the world is that in there? Is that to tie the hands of NOAA?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, again I ask, is there anyplace the gentlewoman can cite me in the act where any language in the act inhibits this kind of research?

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to remove the words "or inhibit" from the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Ms. LOFGREN: On page 110, after line 5 insert the following new sub-section:

"(d) Nothing in this Act shall preclude the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration from carrying out studies of long term climate and global change."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEKAS: Page 109, after line 4, insert the following new sub-section:

(h) REPORT.—Section 704 of the Weather Service Modernization Act (15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall contract with the National Research Council for a review of the NEXRAD Network radar coverage pattern as indicated in the 1996 National Implementation Plan of the National Weather Service for a determination of areas of inadequate radar coverage. In conducting such a review, the National Research Council shall prepare and submit to the Secretary, no later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report which assesses the feasibility of existing and future Federal Aviation Administration Terminal Doppler Weather Radars to provide reliable weather radar data, in a cost-efficient manner, to nearby weather forecast offices.

The Secretary shall report to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, not later than 60 days after receiving the report under this subsection, on recommendations to implement the findings in such report.

Mr. GEKAS (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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I promise not to inhibit this process any longer

than is necessary. This is a very modest amendment that would cause the National Research Council, if the amendment should be passed, to look into the feasibility of using FAA existing implementation of radar for the purposes of filling in the gaps that NEXRAD may have and which has been documented across the country to exist in the various sections of our Nation.

What this would do is simply allow the Research Council to see, without having to spend anymore money for new technology or new implementation, the technology that is now part of NEXRAD for these gaps, but rather to see whether or not existing outposts of FAA can be shifted, can do double duty, for the purpose of filling the gaps that now exist because of the NEXRAD overshoot that exist in many areas.

I have talked this over with the chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and, under threat of personal punishment, he has agreed that the majority will accept the amendment. I hope that the minority feels the same.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the minority has been following a pretty reasonable rule in this connection, and we will do so again. But I would like to make this point, because I am eager to use every opportunity to make points that I think will expose the majority.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, we will not inhibit the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of California. We have had a couple of issues for our committee, the committee of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], in which we have sought National Research Council advice. One of these involves the importance of aeronautical engineering research, and another had to do with the validity of the earth observing system which is part of the global warming program on which we are spending quite a bit of money. In both cases the chairman of the committee did not like the results and went ahead and disregarded them. In fact, Mr. Chairman, whenever he does something like this, he has some derogatory things to say about these egg-headed scientists pretending to be able to advise us on important policy decisions.

Now with the understanding that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] would accept the NRC report when it is obtained, I will be glad to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I will force the gentleman to accept it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Will the gentleman force him to do that?

Mr. GEKAS. I will do my best.

Mr. BROWN of California. Then, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has met all my requirements, and I support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Speaking for the majority, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is accepted.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

The Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the "Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1995".

**SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.**

For the purposes of this title, the term—

(1) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) "Agency" means the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(3) "Assistant Administrator" means the Assistant Administrator for Research and Development of the Agency.

**SEC. 503. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator \$490,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 for the Office of Research and Development for environmental research, development, and demonstration activities, including program management and support, in the areas specified in subsection (b), of which—

(1) \$321,694,800 shall be for Research and Development; and

(2) \$109,263,400 shall be for Program and Research Operations.

(b) SPECIFIC PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Of the amount authorized in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated the following:

(1) For air related research, \$93,915,200, of which—

(A) \$67,111,400 shall be for Research and Development; and

(B) \$26,803,800 shall be for Program and Research Operations.

(2) For global change research, \$2,385,700, of which—

(A) \$2,125,400 shall be for Research and Development; and

(B) \$260,300 shall be for Program and Research Operations.

(3) For water quality related research, \$21,243,100, of which—

(A) \$9,453,100 shall be for Research and Development; and

(B) \$11,790,000 shall be for Program and Research Operations.

(4) For drinking water related research, \$20,652,400, of which—

(A) \$10,376,500 shall be for Research and Development; and

(B) \$10,275,900 shall be for Program and Research Operations.

(5) For toxic chemical related research, \$11,053,900, of which—

(A) \$5,028,600 shall be for Research and Development; and

(B) \$6,025,300 shall be for Program and Research Operations.

(6) For lab and field expenses, \$73,031,600, all of which shall be for Research and Development.

(7) For headquarters expenses of the Office of Research and Development, \$9,254,800, all of which shall be for Research and Development.

(8) For multimedia related research expenses, \$158,656,800, of which—

(A) \$122,142,900 shall be for Research and Development;

(B) \$31,513,900 shall be for Program and Research Operations; and

(C) \$5,000,000 shall be for graduate student fellowships.

(9) For program management expenses, \$6,399,300, all of which shall be for Program and Research Operations.

(10) For pesticide related research, \$13,345,200, of which—

(A) \$7,192,800 shall be for Research and Development; and

(B) \$6,152,400 shall be for Program and Research Operations.

(11) For oil pollution related research, \$2,076,900.

(12) For research related to leaking underground storage tanks, \$769,400.

(13) For research related to cleanup of contaminated sites, \$56,195,500.

(14) For research related to hazardous waste, \$21,020,200, of which—

(A) \$10,977,700 shall be for Research and Development; and

(B) \$10,042,500 shall be for Program and Research Operations.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title for—

(A) the Environmental Technology Initiative;

(B) the Climate Change Action Plan; or

(C) indoor air pollution research.

(2) No sums are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1996 for the activities for which sums are authorized by this title unless such sums are specifically authorized to be appropriated by Act of Congress with respect to such fiscal year.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no sums are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1996 for the activities for which sums are authorized by this title unless such sums are specifically authorized to be appropriated by this title.

#### SEC. 504. SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall assign to the Assistant Administrator the duties of—

(1) developing a strategic plan for scientific and technical research activities throughout the Agency;

(2) integrating that strategic plan into ongoing Agency planning activities; and

(3) reviewing all Agency research to ensure the research—

(A) is of high quality; and

(B) does not duplicate any other research being conducted by the Agency.

(b) REPORT.—The Assistant Administrator shall transmit annually to the Administrator and to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) all Agency research the Assistant Administrator finds is not of sufficiently high quality; and

(2) all Agency research the Assistant Administrator finds duplicates other Agency research.

#### SEC. 505. PROHIBITION OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.

None of the funds authorized by this title shall be available for any activity whose purpose is to influence legislation pending before the Congress, except that this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

#### SEC. 506. ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall exclude from consideration for awards of financial assistance made by the Office of Research and Development after fiscal year 1995 any person who received funds, other than those described in subsection (b), appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1995, from any Federal funding source for a project that was not subjected to a competitive, merit-based award process. Any exclusion from consideration pursuant to this section shall be effective for a period of 5 years after the person receives such Federal funds.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to awards to persons who are members of a class specified by law for which assistance is awarded to members of the class according to a formula provided by law.

#### SEC. 507. GRADUATE STUDENT FELLOWSHIPS.

In carrying out the graduate student fellowship program for which funds are authorized to be appropriated by this title, the Administrator shall ensure that any fellowship award to a student selected after the date of the enactment of this Act is used only to support research that would further missions of the Office of Research and Development in fields in which there exists or is projected to exist a shortage in the number of scientists.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LOFGREN: On page 133, line 6, "(B) the Climate Change Action Plan;" and renumber accordingly.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to H.R. 2405 to enable EPA to continue to do research in assessment on climate change.

Mr. Chairman, section 503(c) of the bill prohibits EPA from doing research in certain areas that do not match the vision of science in this country held by some. The change in the climate change research areas specifically outlines the work on the climate change action plan. In the broad area of global change research the bill reduces the funding level from \$22.5 million to \$2.4 million, a 90-percent reduction. The bill directs EPA to terminate its Global Change Research Program on the grounds that it is duplicative in research in other agencies. The only problem with the logic is global change in virtually every other agency is similarly terminated or drastically reduced.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen the intensity of the view of some that environmental research is not what our country needs, but I believe that, and I think many others on the other side of the aisle do too, that we are well advised to know certain things. One of the things we need to know about is whether our climate is changing.

We recently, as I mentioned in our previous amendment, noted that the Nobel Prize committee has recognized that the ability and actually the threat of human activity can indeed have an impact on the globe and on, potentially, climate. This is something that

we need to research further so we can go well-armed for the future.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment addresses the provision of the bill which is very dangerous because it ignores a large body of scientific evidence and critical scientific research by simply shutting down this program.

The section 503 tells EPA that they can no longer spend money on an action plan that they have already developed. It says, "Take your report back, get rid of it, pretend it never existed," but that is not a message that we should give to scientists.

The EPA, as well as other agencies such as the Forest Service and DOE, was asked by President Bush to coordinate a strategy for responding to commitments made at the Rio convention several years ago. The whole idea was to make sure that the administration had a coordinated research and policy framework so that there would be no duplication of efforts or ambiguities regarding agency responsibility. There is now a plan which is continuing to be developed. The impact of the prohibition in the bill is to eradicate the plan. The EPA could not even mail the report out, much less continue the policy development process.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reinstate the climate action plan as a legitimate planning document and template for the policy actions over the next several years as the research on global changes matures. It is clear that some things can be done easily and cheaply. Others will be enormously expensive and difficult. It makes economic sense to know which is which, how long we can wait before taking any action, and indeed whether action needs to be taken at all.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's prohibition on the climate action plan is not sensible in a very literal sense. It also reveals a deeper problem that I hope we can come to grips with which is direction of scientific research on the basis of our own druthers, on what we hope is true.

The environmental problems that we face may be real. I hope they are not, but they will not go away simply by killing funding or refusing to mail out a report.

Now, hearkening back to our earlier discussion in the last amendment, I was heartened that members of the committee on both sides of the aisle do not intend to preclude long-term global research. The amendment before us would not authorize any additional funds. It would simply, as in the prior discussion, eliminate the prohibition on research in this important activity, and I would urge that we, in a show of bipartisan embrace of our future and planted in the climate, accept this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. These amendments would restore global warming programs to the Environmental Protection Agency.

Let me just state right off the bat that it is my belief and the belief of the majority that this has nothing to do with the basic mission of the EPA. I mean does really having the EPA studying what will happen to fish after 100 years of global warming, does that really go to the heart of what we want the EPA to do? Is this part of its mission?

The answer is no, it is not. The EPA badly needs to prioritize its funds and to get sound science to determine regulatory process.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that, if we put the EPA and keep the EPA involved in global warming research, what we have done has a budgetary impact on each and every other area in which the EPA is involved, some of the other things which are part of the core mission of the EPA. Keep the EPA involved in global warming research, and that means the other functions will have less money to spend, and although there is not a specific amount mentioned in the amendment, frankly it has a major impact on the funding of the various parts of EPA.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Let us be clear about what the gentlewoman's amendment would be.

EPA does not regulate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. They do regulate ozone. What we are doing is saying that they ought not be doing work in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that they do not regulate because that is not the office, but we specifically allow them to do the ozone research and do the stratospheric kind of evaluations.

So what the gentlewoman's amendment would do would be to give them the opportunity at least to divert funding away from that which they do not or do regulate toward things which they do not regulate which undermines the specific mission of the Office of Research and Development, and so we think that we are permitting them to do one of these things that has been regarded as a global warming issue, but to do it in the area where they have the regulation power, to do it related to what they are supposed to be doing over the long term, in stratospheric ozone, and for the life of me I cannot understand why, when we are spending \$1.8 billion on global warming across the whole Government, why we feel we have to have everybody doing the same thing over and over.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that targeting it toward that where the agency has expertise and regulatory power is exactly the right direction to go. That is what our bill does.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. In fact, Mr. Chairman, these programs that are spread throughout the Federal Government's budget on global warming are a product of basically the Vice President of the United States' zeal for this particular issue. Many of us believe that that zeal is what we would call environmental fanaticism.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Was it not the Vice President the other day who criticized our committee for having held a hearing where we actually allowed scientists with a diverse point of view to come in and testify? I mean, in other words, he is so committed, he is so ideologically driven on this, that he does not want any witnesses appearing on Capitol Hill that do not share his point of view and, in fact, criticized the gentleman's subcommittee for actually allowing scientists to come in and testify who did not share his point of view.

Is that not correct?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. It was astounding.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. In fact we will be holding hearings on global warming, and these hearings, I can assure all of my colleagues, will be very balanced, which again will probably raise the fur on the back of the Vice President's neck because we are permitting experts in the area of global warming who disagree with his position to actually testify and have a juxtaposed position with those scientists who agree with the Vice President's position in global warming.

Mr. Chairman, we need to make sure that we handle our appropriations and authorizations with an eye towards focusing the effort in those areas where they can be most effective. Global warming should not be handled in EPA. We have in the last debate suggested that we both agree that long-term climate research is something that should be done in NOAA. In EPA it is out of place, and the gentlewoman's amendment would take funding away from all the other areas of EPA in order to fund something that it should not be doing.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has expired.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. The Interagency Task Force on Global Change in EPA was created in 1989 by then President George Bush, as my colleagues are aware, not by Vice President GORE. I did not vote for President Bush, but he was my President, too, and I am glad he started this endeavor. The fruit of his efforts has now been completed. We have a plan that unless this amendment is passed cannot even be distributed. Talk about taking money and flushing it completely away. I think that is foolhardy indeed.

Second, we have talked a lot in this committee and in this Congress about using sound science, about cost-benefit analysis, and part of what we need to do is to have judgments that can be

made based on sound science. We have talked about ozone. How do we know the benefit of regulation of ozone if we do not know at least in part the impact on our climate? That may be part of our sound science.

□ 1500

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, global warming and ozone are two different issues. For the record, there is nothing in the language of our bill or our authorization that suggests that any work that has already been done by EPA should not be circulated or not be made available to anyone who would like to request it, or who they would like to send it to.

What we are trying to do instead is in the future we would like EPA to focus on those many environmental issues that are significant and that they hold the responsibility for, rather than having this just another one of the many global warming projects within the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully disagree with my colleague's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this debate is sometimes a little bit like Alice in Wonderland. It is quite a moving target one has to deal with along the way.

Mr. Chairman, I was in support of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] an amendment that strikes language that precludes EPA from spending money on climate change research and action. I would just, at the beginning, say that it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment attempts to least to correct the wrongheadedness of the authorization bill that is the underlying legislation here.

The chairman of the subcommittee claims to be a strong fan of risk assessment, and I notice here in this document which is put out by the Environmental Protection Agency, the Science Advisory Board, dated September 1990, a document specifically related to reducing risk and setting priorities and strategies for environmental protection, 1990 being before the time under the previous administration, that on page 13 under the relatively high-risk environmental problems, specifically the EPA and the Science Advisory Board speak of global climate change as one of the high-risk areas of environmental problems that we really need science done on.

It seems to me that at least the Science Advisory Board for EPA has been quite clear on what are the high risks that we ought to be dealing with. I guess I would add that it seems to me that not all scientific issues are clarified by congressional hearings. In fact, I think that quite recently, and I think the one which has already been alluded to and which the Vice President has some unkind words about, I think that one probably mostly further muddied the water and further obfuscated the circumstances.

The chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee surely know that the Nobel Prize in chemistry was just given out in the last couple of days to three researchers doing work in ozone, the ozone later.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, is it possible that this liberal claptrap that he is complaining about is the creation of the Bush Science Advisory Committee?

Mr. OLVER. It would seem that that might be the case.

Mr. BROWN of California. They agree with that. Good.

Mr. OLVER. It is possible. They agree. In any case, I wonder, it seems to me that this global climate change is very close to the mission of the EPA, to the core mission, which is what the Science Advisory Board of the EPA the previous administration determined. I do not think we should be removing EPA's capacity to work on one of the very functions that it was created to do.

We certainly would not ask the FDA to stop researching whether drugs are safe. We certainly would not ask the Department of Agriculture, the USDA, to stop making sure that the food we eat is safe, although actually, I suppose I maybe should not be asking those questions, since it seems that all too many of the people here are quite willing to do exactly those things.

However, I would ask that this Congress recognize the need for research into our global environment. Particularly during this record-breaking hurricane season, it would be particularly ironic if the Congress were to turn its back on the research necessary to understand climate change.

Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing for some time about the need for good cost-benefit analysis. The problem seems to be the question of analysis. We have to have good data in order to do any kind of analysis at all. Whether Members disagree or agree with the concept of global warming, we ought to be willing to gather the data that are necessary, so we can debate this with an educated viewpoint.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, are there any, of the 12 agencies that are now involved with global climate change, would he eliminate any of them from that job? Is there any one that the gentleman would agree should refocus their efforts, and perhaps maybe only 11 agencies or 10 agencies should be involved? What agencies would the gentleman agree should not be involved in this?

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am not privy to the list of the 12 agencies, nor do I know exactly what the missions

are of each of them. All we have been talking here about is NOAA, and it is clearly a core function of NOAA, by its very name, it is a core function of NOAA, and in terms of environmental protection and risk analysis to environmental risks, then it seems to me it is pretty clearly a core function of EPA. It is not wrong to have some different agencies working on an issue where the core functions do not completely overlap. I am not going to try to defend each of the other 10. I do not know what the other 10 are. These, it seems to me, are core functions for EPA, by its very name, and to NOAA, by its very name.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I would be very happy to provide the gentleman a list of the 12 agencies in which global warming is a concern.

Mr. OLVER. I would be happy to study the list and give an answer as to whether one or more or several as to which the issue of global warming is not a core function, but these two agencies we have been talking about today, it is a core function.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I understand this amendment, what we are doing is elimination of or striking the clause where EPA is going to continue or start into global climate change research. It is my understanding of the EPA charter or the scope of their job, that it is to study the environment for regulatory purposes. My concern here is that we already have 12 agencies that are undergoing global warming research to the tune of about \$1.8 billion, if my information is correct. I think we probably have a shotgun approach to this already.

Some of these agencies probably, along with EPA, should not be in the business of studying this climate change, doing this research. The Department of Defense may have some arguments for it because of the nature of the business of defending the people of America. The Department of Commerce, I think, is an area where we probably should be redirecting some of this effort, and the Department of the Interior also. Certainly, there are other agencies like NASA and the National Science Foundation that have a direct tie into what we are doing in this research.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making an excellent point. I think maybe because it has been indicated that somehow this is the only money being spent in global change research, that not to allow this spending to be done would in fact decimate the global change research program, that we ought to talk a little bit about it.

The Department of Agriculture spends over \$60 million a year on global

change. The Department of Commerce spends over \$135 million a year on global change. The Department of Defense spends \$6.5 billion on global change. The Department of Energy spends over \$120 million on global change. The Department of Health and Human Services spends over \$25 million on global change. The Department of the Interior spends over \$30 million on global change. The Department of Transportation spends a little less than \$1 billion on global change. The Environmental Protection Agency spends a little over \$25 million on global change. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration spends \$1.25 billion on global change. The National Science Foundation spends \$170 million on global change. The Smithsonian Institution spends \$2.8 billion on global change, and the Tennessee Valley Authority spends \$1.2 billion on global change.

We have a lot of agencies spending a lot of money on global change. To suggest that somehow this amendment is going to do something about the global warming change program becomes somewhat ridiculous.

Mr. TIAHRT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman made a very good point. When we are trying to find a solution to a problem, often we want to have a few diversified groups looking into the problem to see exactly how we can come up with a solution. Perhaps we could get some fresh thoughts and fresh minds looking at new ideas, maybe new concepts.

However, to spread it over 12 agencies to the tune of \$1.8 billion, I think we already have that much diversity. I think it probably exceeds common sense in the realm of applying one more agency, the EPA. I think it is probably time to draw back some of the reins on studying climate change, that research, let it concentrate on areas that have a very keen interest and, I might add, a charter for such research, like NASA, perhaps even the Department of Energy, would be better suited than EPA, the Department of Defense.

I think what this amendment does is it just goes beyond the commonsense thought process here, because we already have plenty of agencies looking into climate change, global climate change. I think putting it back in EPA will serve no purpose for the taxpayers.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. LOFGREN. I would like to make a couple of comments, Mr. Chairman. I think this is sounding a little like a partisan issue, and I honestly think it should not be. We have all, on both sides of the aisle, discussed our commitment to basic research because that is important to understanding our

world, and it is important to the economic vitality of our country. Basic research is mission-driven in a whole variety of agencies throughout the country, because there is value in the diversity of different approaches in basic research. We come up with different answers. That is why we do not have a science czar that directs all scientific inquiry.

I think this is somewhat similar to that. I would just add this. All of us will be grievously distressed and our citizens will be distressed if we fail to take action in an appropriate manner and our country pays a terrible economic price. We are now on the Rs for hurricanes, the first time I think that has ever happened on names.

I am not a scientist. I notice that the Nobel Committee thinks something is going on with climate change. I think it is up to us to put aside our partisanship and to let scientists move forward into a legitimate inquiry in this.

Mr. TIAHRT. I think the gentleman made a good point about diversification, but I think 12 agencies and \$1.8 billion is excessive.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the issue of global warming is a matter of great concern. I have an editorial from the Washington Post. They said that "There are great uncertainties in how much the temperature will rise and how great any damage will be, but the case for being concerned about global warming is getting stronger. That makes it especially distressing that committees in the House and Senate are slashing funds for programs aimed at protecting the global environment."

That is what is happening in this legislation, we are cutting funds to deal with the problem of the global environment. In a few minutes we are going to have a discussion about the provision of the bill that strikes funds dealing with indoor air pollution. It is almost as if this Congress were anti-science. We act like we belong to the Flat Earth Society. Time after time we are ignoring sound science, we are ignoring sound concerns to our environment, so our response is to cut back funding in understanding the threat and how to deal with it.

Let me put this in perspective. I do think this Congress is more and more anti-science. It is very distressing. An example: this House passed a Clean Water Act, and despite the National Academy of Science's, our Nation's most prestigious scientific organization, recommendations on what would be a sound scientific definition of a wetland, the House of Representatives threw it all out and decided to adopt a scientifically indefensible definition of wetlands that wipes out most of our Nation's wetlands. That is not a decision made on good science.

Another example, ozone depletion. Yesterday Dr. Sherwood Rowland and two other scientists were given a Nobel Prize for their discovery that manmade chemicals are destroying the ozone layer. Their science has been endorsed by virtually every reputable scientific organization in the world. These are Nobel Prize winners. What happens with the House Committee on Science? They do not accept this science. Instead, the committee has been holding hearings that feature eccentric witnesses who argue that there is no ozone hole.

Today we are talking about taking another sad step into the realm of anti-science. We are debating a bill that would defund important, basic scientific research into these key environmental problems. The global warming plan at the Environmental Protection Agency was the result of the work of EPA administrator William Reilly, who was appointed by President Bush. This is not a partisan issue. This should not be a partisan issue.

When we get to indoor air pollution, it is amazing to think that we are not going to be doing the work on indoor air pollution when the EPA, when they were told to come up with some priorities of the threats to human health, put indoor air pollution right at the top.

I think we have to step back and put this all in perspective. Because some industry groups do not like the idea that maybe they are going to face regulation because some scientists have a difference of opinion, that should not mean that we will ignore scientific opinion and not conduct further research to try to implement action plans that can, in a very prudent way, protect us from the results of global warming, should the threat be as severe as we are being led to believe.

□ 1515

I have a couple of articles that I am going to put into the RECORD. One is an article from the New York Times, September 18, headlined, "Scientists Say Earth's Warming Could Set Off Wide Disruptions." The first paragraph reads, "The earth has entered a period of climactic change that is likely to cause," likely to cause, "widespread economic, social and environmental dislocation over the next century if emissions of heat-trapping gases are not reduced, according to experts advising the world's Governments." We are hearing from most of the scientists about this issue.

Another article which I will insert into the RECORD, September 10. "Experts Confirm Human Role In Global Warming." The article goes on to talk about, "In an important shift of scientific judgment, experts advising the world's governments on climate change are saying for the first time that human activity is a likely cause of the warming of the global atmosphere."

Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, how do you take the Environmental

Protection Agency out of this issue? How do you stop their action plan in its tracks from reducing some of these manmade chemicals that are causing this problem?

This is an example of this problem which has led to this amendment. To keep the funds in place, not to cut back, is it seems to me a very short-sighted move, and I believe one that ignores the overwhelming scientific opinions and denigrates it. We do not have certainty, but we ought not to denigrate the mounting evidence and wait to the point where we have a problem that cannot be fixed.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have two questions for the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN]. From what the gentleman has said, especially about the hearing on the ozone, is it the position of the gentleman that we should not have had a renowned scientist on the other side of the issue?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, absolutely not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAXMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, of course not. Scientists are reflecting different opinions. We ought to hear from them, but we ought not to make a decision to vote one way or the other based on which scientist you like and ignore what is turning out to be an overwhelming accumulation of evidence.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my colleague does know that the majority of scientists of the day thought the Earth was flat and thought that the Sun went around the Earth, and at times, the scientist order of the day was wrong.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, sometimes the politicians under those circumstances decided to punish the scientists who were coming in with some scientific opinions that they did not like. I do not want us to do the same thing today that the Neanderthals of years past have done. I think we ought to have a free and open inquiry of science. We ought not to prejudice it and defund it because we do not like what they are doing.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, just so my colleague will know, one of those scientists that was present to present another view on the ozone situation, contrary to what the current common knowledge is, had been threatened and had been told that she would not receive any more grants if she came to testify. I think the evidence is showing that people who are suppressing information are those who believe ozone is going to destroy us.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the two articles referred to earlier.

[From the New York Times, September 18, 1995]

#### GLOBAL WARMING HEATS UP

The evidence mounted last week that man-made gases are causing deterioration of the earth's atmosphere. First came news that a United Nations scientific panel believes it has found, for the first time, evidence that human activities are indeed causing a much-debated warming of the globe. The report, though preliminary, appeared to strengthen the case that governments throughout the world may need to take stronger action to head off potential damage.

Then came an announcement from the World Meteorological Organization that a worrisome hole in the earth's protective ozone shield appears to be getting even larger over Antarctica. Such enlargement had been expected because it will take a while for corrective actions already taken by many governments to exert their effect. But the report underscored that the battle to save the ozone layer is not yet safely won.

The U.N.'s global warming report, described by William K. Stevens in the Sept. 10 Times, indicates that man-made global warming is a real phenomenon. It can not be dismissed as unproved "liberal claptrap," as Representative Dana Rohrabacher, Republican of California, who heads a House environmental subcommittee, has derisively suggested.

For years now scientists have been arguing over whether the emission of "greenhouse gases," such as carbon dioxide generated by the burning of fossil fuels, has contributed to a small rise in global temperatures over the past century—and whether such emissions will drive temperatures even higher in coming decades.

Such a change in temperature might, if drastic enough, have serious consequences, as is made clear today in a second article by Mr. Stevens. Global warming could cause a rise in sea level that would flood coastal lowlands, an increase in weather extremes and damage to forests and croplands in some regions. Forestalling truly severe damage might well warrant action to slow the emission of greenhouse gases by reducing the world's reliance on fossil fuels. But that would be a wrenching, costly process that few political leaders are eager to undertake absent compelling evidence that human activities really are driving world temperatures toward dangerous levels.

Now the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the scientific panel charged with analyzing the problem, has concluded in a draft report that it is seeing signals that man-made global warming is under way. The signals are not in the form of a "smoking gun." Instead, they are found in computer patterns. The computer models that predict rising temperatures seem to be matching up more closely with some of the patterns of climate change actually observed. There are great uncertainties in how much the temperature will rise and how great any damage might be. But the case for being concerned about global warming is getting stronger.

That makes it especially distressing that committees in the House and Senate are slashing funds for programs aimed at protecting the global environment. Steep cuts have been imposed on research to study global climate change, on programs to help reduce carbon emissions and on funds to help developing countries phase out their ozone-destroying chemicals. It is perverse that, as the evidence of global atmospheric harm gets somewhat stronger, the political re-

sponse to mitigating it gets progressively weaker.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 10, 1995]  
EXPERTS CONFIRM HUMAN ROLE IN GLOBAL WARMING

(By William K. Stevens)

In an important shift of scientific judgment, experts advising the world's governments on climate change are saying for the first time that human activity is a likely cause of the warming of the global atmosphere.

While many climatologists have thought this to be the case, all but a few have held until now that the climate is so naturally variable that they could not be sure they were seeing a clear signal of the feared greenhouse effect—the heating of the atmosphere because of the carbon dioxide released by burning coal, oil and wood.

Even the string of very warm years in the 1980's and 1990's could have been just a natural swing of the climatic pendulum, the experts have said.

But a growing body of data and analysis now suggests that the warming of the last century, and especially of the last few years, "is unlikely to be entirely due to natural causes and that a pattern of climatic response to human activities is identifiable in the climatological record," says a draft summary of a new report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

The panel's role is to advise governments now negotiating reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide under the 1992 treaty on climate change.

The panel's draft summary, although intended for internal use, was recently made available on the Internet. The draft has been through at least one round of scientific review but its wording may change, since it is now being reviewed by governments. Scientists who prepared the full chapter on which the summary statement is based say they do not expect any substantial change in their basic assessment. The chapter has gone through extensive review by scientists around the world.

"I think the scientific justification for the statement is there, unequivocally," said Dr. Tom M.L. Wigley, a climatologist at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., one of the chapter's authors.

The scientific community "has discovered the smoking gun," said Dr. Michael Oppenheimer, an atmospheric scientist with the Environmental Defense Fund, who is familiar with the draft report. "This finding is of paramount importance. For many years, policy makers have asked, 'Where's the signal?'" The intergovernmental panel, he said, "is telling us that the signal is here."

But Dr. Wigley and others involved in the reassessment say it is not yet known how much of the last century's warming can be attributed to human activity and how much is part of the earth's natural fluctuation that leads to ice ages at one extreme and warm periods at the other.

Nevertheless, the panel's conclusion marks a watershed in the views of climatologists, who with the notable exception of Dr. James E. Hansen of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York have until now refused to declare publicly that they can discern the signature of the greenhouse effect.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1995]

SCIENTISTS SAY EARTH'S WARMING COULD SET OFF WIDE DISRUPTIONS

(By William K. Stevens)

The earth has entered a period of climatic change that is likely to cause widespread economic, social and environmental disloca-

tion over the next century if emissions of heat-trapping gases are not reduced, according to experts advising the world's governments.

The picture of probable disruption, including adverse changes and some that are beneficial, emerges from draft sections of a new assessment of the climate problem by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and from interviews with scientists involved in the assessment. The panel, a United Nations group of 2,500 scientists from around the world, advises parties to a 1992 treaty that are negotiating reductions in heat-trapping greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide.

The new feature of the assessment—the first in five years by the intergovernmental panel—is that the experts are now more confident than before that global climate change is indeed in progress and that at least some of the warming is due to human action, specifically the burning of coal, oil and wood, which releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Like its predecessors, the forecast depends heavily on uncertain computer simulations of the atmosphere's response to heat-trapping gases.

While some environmentalists and their allies have long believed potentially catastrophic human-induced climate change to be a fact, and some political conservatives and industry groups have been skeptical, experts in the mainstream of climate science have never confirmed either view.

So far, most governments have taken small steps to rein in emissions of greenhouse gases, with the hope of at least avoiding further contribution to the warming problem. But even before the current reassessment, parties to the 1992 treaty had agreed that these steps were inadequate and had opened talks aimed at stronger measures.

According to draft sections of the new forecast, some of the predicted effects of climate change may now be emerging for the first time or with increasing clarity. The possible early effects include these:

A continuing rise in average global sea level, which is likely to amount to more than a foot and a half by the year 2100. This, say the scientists, would inundate parts of many heavily populated river deltas and the cities on them, making them uninhabitable, and would destroy many beaches around the world. At the most likely rate of rise, some experts say, most of the beaches on the East Coast of the United States would be gone in 25 years. They are already disappearing at an average of 2 to 3 feet a year.

An increase in extremes of temperature, dryness and precipitation in some regions. A United States Government study conducted by one of the panel's scientists has shown that these extremes are increasing in America. There is a 90 to 95 percent chance, the study concluded, that climate change caused by the emission of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide is responsible. The intergovernmental panel forecasts an increase in droughts like the current one in the Northeastern United States, heat waves like the one in Chicago this summer, and more fires and floods in some regions.

A "striking" retreat of mountain glaciers around the world, accompanied in the Northern Hemisphere by as shrinking snow cover in winter. In some semi-arid regions, the panel says, runoff from melting glaciers may increase water resources. But in most places, rivers and streams could be diminished in the summer.

"While there will be some beneficial effects of climate change, there will be many adverse effects, with some being potentially irreversible," says one of the panel's draft summaries.

Beneficial effects, if the panel's forecast is right, would include, for instance, milder

winters in northern climes, an increase in rainfall in some regions that need it, and faster crop growth. Grain belts of North America and Russia could expand. Agricultural production worldwide is not expected to decrease much.

But some regions—especially sub-Saharan Africa, South and Southeast Asia and tropical Latin America—could suffer losses in their harvests. Deserts are expected to expand, and the heartlands of continents to become drier. There would be more rain throughout the world. Northern temperate regions would experience more rain and less snow in winter. In summer, water would evaporate faster, drying the soil.

Natural ecosystems, being untended, would be even more vulnerable than cropland. Forest trees could not keep up with shifting climatic zones, and some forests would disappear, the panel says.

Computerized models indicated that if atmospheric carbon dioxide levels double, "one-third of all the forest area of the earth will change," said Dr. Steven P. Hamburg, a forest ecologist at Brown University who is a member of the intergovernmental panel. "But we still don't have a good grasp of what it will look like," he added. Carbon dioxide concentrations are expected to double late in the next century if no further action is taken to limit emissions.

Climate forecasting is a difficult and often controversial science. One major subject of dissension are the computer models on which the intergovernmental panel's report largely depends. The climate experts on the panel believe their models have become increasingly reliable. But skeptics continue to assert that the models fail to simulate the present climate realistically and hence are an unsure guide to future climates.

There is wide agreement among scientists that the average surface temperature of the globe has already risen by about 1 degree Fahrenheit over the last century, with the steepest rise taking place in the last 40 years. But given the natural variability of the earth's climate and the wide fluctuations in temperature known to have occurred in the distant past, climate experts have until now been almost unanimous in saying they could not prove that human emission of greenhouse gases was playing in part in the warming.

Scientific opinion among climatologists is now shifting, and more are prepared to say that human activity is a likely cause of at least part of the climatic change experienced so far.

The human contribution to global warming could range from highly significant to trivial. The scientists say it is not yet possible to measure how much of the warming has been caused by human activity and how much is a result of natural causes.

Computer models are the principal basis for the draft report's forecast that the world's average surface temperature will rise by about 1.5 to 6 degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100 if no further action is taken to rein in greenhouse gas emissions. Further warming—50 to 70 percent more than what took place by 2100—would take place after that year, the report says. The warming would be somewhat larger if, as appears possible, industry stops emitting sulfate aerosols, which exert a cooling effect by reflecting sunlight and are air pollutants in their own right.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lofgren amendment. Again, I take this time not because of my concern with what will happen to this legislation, because I have already said it is not going anywhere, but to support some

issues here, to explore some issues. Some of them involve the views of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] who I would characterize as an original member of the Flat Earth Society, except that he is on a space committee, so he could not be part of that any more.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] has made his position so clear with regard to long-range climate research and other things of that sort, global warming, that we need to explore this. Frankly, I want the gentleman to be the clear leader of those who think that the Reagan-Bush position announced by their Science Advisory Committee was liberal clap trap.

Mr. Chairman, that is going to divide the Republicans on this issue. Of course the true believers like the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] hope they will prevail, and I hope that the liberals like Bush and Reagan will prevail on these kinds of issues.

Now, the gentleman may or may not recall that the Committee on Science in its earlier incarnation first established an environmental subcommittee in 1975. I was the chairman of the subcommittee at that time. Global warming was an issue before us at that time. We did not know what to believe, so we had extensive hearings.

We had scientists who said, there is clear indication of global warming. We had scientists who said, that is malarkey, there is clear indication of global cooling. Then we had scientists in the middle, who said, it is an open question at this point. We need more research. That is a favorite ploy of all scientists. We need more research. The issue was important enough that we funded more research, and we continued to fund it for 20 years.

Today, that curve of those who think it is warming, those who think it is cooling, and those who think we need more information has changed substantially. There are very few who think it is cooling, a lot more who think it is warming, and of course the majority still think we need more information, which is why we fund long-term global climate research. It is important, and we need to continue funding it. I hope that we will continue to do that, although the majority view has gradually grown larger and larger, that global warming is a serious problem.

Now, a point has been made by a number of gentlemen on the other side that we have too many agencies doing global warming research. We have a dozen or so, I think the number was. The Defense Department is studying global warming because it has something to do with our defense posture: If all of the ice caps in the North and South Pole melt, it will affect our strategies. It will affect submarine detection, it will affect other things of that sort.

The Coast Guard is worried, because if it raises the level of the ocean, they

have a whole new problem. Where is the coast that they used to be concerned about? It will have changed substantially.

Other agencies like the Energy Department, for example, are interested because it has to do with the energy mix that we use in this country, and what its effects will be. These are legitimate. These relate to the core mission of these agencies.

Now, should we scrap them all and say, we will just have one agency do it, the Weather Service? No. We recognize the complexity of this, and many other issues of a research nature, and in the office of the President, we have a science adviser and we have a Presidential Science Advisory Committee.

We used to have something called a FCCSET Committee, which is an interesting name. It meant the Federal Coordinating Council on Science Engineering and Technology, which was aimed at resolving the respective jurisdictions of the various agencies, cabinet level agencies on complex, inter-agency science problems.

The problem is not putting everything in one basket and say, nobody else does it. Defense is going to want to do it if it relates to defense and Energy if it relates to energy. The problem is making sure they do not waste money on it. That does not necessarily mean they do not lose similar research, but they do not lose money on it, and they get the best science that is possible.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, am I incorrect in my assumption that the impact of the amendment would be that all of the other areas of Environmental Protection Agency research would suffer as a result of this amendment because the funds that would have to be spent according to this amendment would be coming from all of those other areas? Is that not what we are talking about here?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises an interesting point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the EPA's research function has already suffered. The gentleman on your side spent the first part of this year emasculating EPA, making sure they went through a lot of hurdles in getting the proper science to justify their regulation. They have so many restrictions on the regulatory process that they are going through, and so many injunctions by using good science, they cannot possibly do it with the seriously eroded budget that you have given them. So they are in real trouble.

Yes, they will be in trouble, they will have to redistribute funding here, but

that is a very small part of the total problems that they face at the present time, which will grow greater if you have your way.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been enlightened by the discussion a little bit here too. We had the gentlewoman presenting her amendment telling us about the Nobel Prize winners. They got their money out of the Department of Energy and out of NSF; none of it came out of EPA or NOAA that related to the amendment of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN]. That talks about the diversity and the multiplicity of places at which this kind of research is being done. So when we cite the Noble Prize winners, the fact is that they are in accounts where the gentlewoman is not touching.

Mr. Chairman, I was also fascinated by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] lecturing us about the Flat Earth Society. The gentleman lectures us about the Flat Earth Society and then criticized this committee for having the audacity to allow scientists to come in who do not agree with his point of view.

Now, the fact is, the reason why the Flat Earth Society was able to stay in place for so long is because there was a consensus among all of the scientists that the Earth was flat. So for centuries we belabored under the opinion, the scientifically confirmed opinion that the Earth was flat, and it was a few nutty scientists who said, no, maybe it is round. Maybe it is round. They were regarded as nuts, they were thrown out of the academy. They were not listened to.

Well, the fact is, diversity is a very important part of science. It is a very good thing to have diverse points of view in science, just as it is a very good thing to have a diverse point of view in politics.

Now, the fact that this committee has made a determination that we are not going to do one-directional scientists, just because there is a consensus, just because everybody believes the earth is flat, we do not think that that is the only people we have to listen to. We think that maybe we ought to listen to people who have differing points of view.

We do not have to agree with them. We do not have to agree with anybody that comes before the committee to testify, but it sure does help to have all of the points of view available to us before we make determinations, particularly policy determinations that can affect us for years to come.

When we are trying to balance a budget, we are looking out 7 years. The decisions that we make here look out 7 years. We would like to know whether or not the things that we are doing are based upon sound science, which gets us to the amendment of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

The gentlewoman's amendment is about an agency, the Office of Research

and Development at EPA that was designed for one purpose. The one purpose of that particular research agency, its mission, is to assure that EPA regulations follow good science. That is what it is all about. The idea is the fact that what they are supposed to do is give us the good science so that we have good science behind our regulations.

Now, sometimes we ignore that science. Sometimes we spend \$100 million to look at clean air and then because we are worried about what the report may look like, we pass a clean air bill before we get the study. We do that around here. Normally we think it is maybe a good idea to look at some good science before we regulate.

Now, that is what we said in our bill. We said that in the whole area that is called global warming, one of the issues that we are looking at is ocean depletion. The fact is, EPA has the jurisdiction to regulate ozone. So, what we have done under our bill is given them the authority to continue their research in this area, this large area known as global change, we have given them the authority to continue to do research in those areas that they regulate; namely, the ozone depletion.

What we have said, however, is, there are other areas that they have been looking at where they have no jurisdiction to regulate. We think it would be better for them to focus their mission, use their money the way it was intended to be used at their agency and let other people with other missions that fit more with the process do the other work.

Now, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] would have us think, as others have had us think, that somehow there is no other money anywhere in the Government to do this, that the EPA has to do it because there is no other money. The fact is, we are spending \$1.8 billion on global change, and at 12 different agencies that I just read off here, spending tens of millions, even hundreds of millions of dollars, this work is going on.

The Nobel Prize winners to which the gentlewoman referred got their money out of the DOE and NSF. We have not done anything to stop DOE and NSF from doing global change.

□ 1530

That is an appropriate place for some of this long-term basic research she talked about. She said there ought to be a consensus on basic research. There should be.

But the fact is the EPA's ORD office is not a basic research office. It is an office designed to do mission-oriented research. It is an office designed to supply the EPA the good science it needs to back up its regulation.

That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to make certain we prioritize moneys in ways that they do the job that they were intended to do. You cannot get to a balanced budget any other way. I would suggest that

the right way to proceed here is to reject the gentlewoman's amendment and support the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Once again we find ourselves in the position of cutting and eliminating programs prior to having any hearings to consider their merits and shortcomings. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to raise some important issues and to challenge what I believe is a fundamentally flawed assumption providing the underlying actions that are being taken.

The global climate change research has been singled out for significant cuts or outright elimination in all departmental research budgets this year. In Interior it was cut by 7 percent, NASA by 37 percent, NOAA by 21 percent, the Department of Energy, by 57 percent, USDA by 6 percent, and the EPA by 100 percent.

We are told that this is for the purposes of efficiency and to eliminate redundancies in the program. However, there have been little if any examples provided to assure us that only duplicative global research programs are being eliminated or that in fact duplication exists.

USDA has a global change research program so that experts in agriculture and forestry science can determine what, if any, effects changes in temperature, moisture, and regional weather patterns will have on our agriculture and forest systems. The Department of the Interior manages Federal land, such as forests and rangeland and wildlife refuges. They also manage vital water distribution networks in cooperation with Western States. It seems to me we might want to understand what effects the climate might have on these resources as well.

The Department of Energy has responsibility for energy research, fossil fuel energy as well as alternative energy. No one disputes that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas, that its atmospheric concentration has increased and continues to do so, and that fossil fuel burning is a primary source for that increase. Understanding the global carbon balance from the perspective of fossil fuel consumption as well as other sources is a role that DOE is best suited to play.

NASA oversees the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of our satellites and it compiles data gathered from them. Without measurements, we are reduced to hand-waving. Perhaps that is all fine in some people's opinion but it seems to me that when we pump billions of dollars into these agencies, we ought to find out what the impact is going to be.

The EPA is the Agency that is charged with the responsibility of protecting our environment. Their role

should be to use our knowledge of emission sources and technology to suggest options for mitigating and controlling those greenhouse emissions.

These programs are not duplicative. They are intended to make the best use of the expertise and knowledge base of each agency to ensure that we have comprehensive approaches and assessments of a complex global phenomenon.

I realize that many of my colleagues remain unconvinced that global climate change is a problem, just an example of environmental hysteria. If you are so confident of that, then why stop the research that can prove your point?

Ignorance is not bliss, it is just ignorance. We should support this comprehensive research effort so that if these climate changes create the problems that some believe they will, we will be able to approach the problem with the best possible information. If it is not a problem, we will have proof of that, and we will have extended our knowledge on climate and its impacts on the natural systems on which we depend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

(On request, of Mr. BROWN of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge the excellence of the gentleman's statement. I was trying in my own inadequate way to make some of these points that he has made so well in indicating the core interest of many departments in this overall issue of global warming.

I also want to take just a moment to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, who earlier made the statement, and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] has repeated it, I think, that EPA's Office of Research and Development only has a mandate to do research in the areas in which it regulates. That does not happen to be the case, and if the gentleman thinks that I am wrong, I would invite him to substantiate his statement, because under both Reagan and Bush ORD was mandated to do research in areas in which they had no regulatory authority, and that has continued under Mr. Clinton. If he has some other understanding, I would like to have that put forward in the record so that the House as a whole can understand the basis for that kind of a statement.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman simply is going back to the original intent of the EPA. There is no doubt that they have been mandated to

do things beyond what was the original intent of the agency, and have done things well beyond the scope of doing regulation. It is one of the reasons why we have had bad regulation, because we have not had good science. One of the things that we are attempting to do is to assure that we do good science pursuant to regulation and use their limited resources in the proper way. That is the point this gentleman is making.

Mr. BROWN of California. The gentleman's actions contradict his words because he has drastically cut in this bill research, basic research, which he would agree is basic research, which would contribute to the good science that is necessary. In fact, that is my main objection to this bill. It guts the science—

Mr. ROHRBACHER. If the gentleman will yield, what are the basic research cuts in this bill?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, the fact of the matter is, just to repeat the cuts, you have a 7-percent cut in the Interior Department, a 37-percent cut in the NASA, 21 percent in NOAA, 57 percent in the Department of Energy, USDA by 6 percent, and EPA by 100 percent. The truth of the matter is you are gutting the research capabilities of this country so you can stick your head in the sand. You want to fight the notion that somehow you are in the flat earth society. You are not in the flat earth society, you have got your head stuck in the sand. You are in the ostrich society.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BROWN of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I continue to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania voted for in 1990 the Global Change Research Act which authorized EPA to do global change research. Now he is arguing that they have no mandate to do so because it does not involve regulation. I have just asserted that there is no mandate that they only do research that has relationships to regulation. I further state that the gentleman has cut basic research, which he denies, because he has stated over and over that the actual figures are that there is a 1.1-percent increase.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following table which shows that we in the area of basic research, there has been a decrease of 1.3 percent in the budget that the gentleman is proposing:

	Fiscal year		H.R. 2405	Percent change from 1995
	1995	1996		
DOE .....	\$1,648	\$1,773	\$1,699	+3.1
NSF .....	1,958	2,107	1,911	-2.4

	Fiscal year		H.R. 2405	Percent change from 1995
	1995	1996		
NASA .....	1,850	1,822	1,784	-3.6
NIST .....	40	48	42	+5
EPA .....	107	120	92	-14
Total .....	5,603	5,870	5,528	-1.3

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think we ought to have an answer from the other side about these important charges, but I want to use this opportunity to say that we do all want a diversification of scientific opinion but if we do not fund the research, we are not going to have researchers doing the work to give those considered opinions.

On the ozone depletion hearings, I do not want us in that area or any other area to find science that is politically correct. It seemed to me that from what I understand about those hearings, scientists who had never published peer review articles were given an elevated status to argue against what hundreds of other scientists around the world had found as a genuine threat in the ozone depletion problem.

I have a history with this issue because in 1977 when we enacted a change in the Clean Air Act, we first started to hear about the hole in the ozone. Of course a lot of people said, "Let's study it, let's study it, let's don't take action." This is one of those rare examples of a scientific issue that moved so quickly that it moved from the theoretical to the measurable.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would be courteous enough to yield to a question, I held the hearing, the hearings the gentleman was referring to, you were invited to, and I seem to remember you were supposed to be at those hearings. You did not show up. Now you are on the floor complaining about the hearings.

Mr. WAXMAN. I am complaining about a trend in this House and I think those hearings exemplify it, where there is a politically popular, politically correct point of view that seems to be given a spotlight, and I have no problems with having diverse opinions. But let us give spotlights and elevation to views of people that do not have the scientific standing of the hundreds of other scientists that have studied this problem and have raised concerns about it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, I think when all is said and done on this debate, there is a very simple thing that is going on, which is that there is an attempt to protect ordinary citizens from the devastating impact of global warming, and there is a recognition by some that that is going to take an increase in funds for companies to invest in the kinds of technologies to be able to

withstand that protection that the ordinary people of this country need. We want to protect the American people. You once again want to protect the wealthy and powerful interests of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, this is chapter 10 in the effort to explore a few more of the issues here and this is the one having to do with whether we are cutting or not cutting basic research. We can also call this the battle of the dueling charts because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has his chart and I have my chart here.

This is the trend in basic R&D. The authorization bill cuts basic R&D. It indicates the agency and the amount of the cuts below the zero baseline.

It does show that there are increases in two areas of R&D. One is defense, basic R&D, and the other is in NIST.

I have the actual numbers here, and I do not ask you to accept these as my word against the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has had his staff use his definitions of basic research and to come up with some figures that show that he is right, that there has been an increase. I am going to use the data which the Federal agencies supplied to OMB pursuant to OMB circular A-11, and the actual numbers for basic research as submitted to OMB by the agencies in accordance with A-11 are as follows:

DOE will have an increase of plus 3.1, that is indicated over here; National Science Foundation, which I think the number of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] shows an increase, the OMB is minus 2.4 percent; NASA, minus 3.6 percent; NIST, plus 5 percent, and that is because they have eliminated all of the applied research and left just the basic; EPA, minus 14 percent; and the total is minus 1.3 percent according to OMB.

I do not know why sometimes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is willing to rely on OMB when it agrees with him, sometimes he is not. I am just presenting these as the figures that are the official Government tally of what is happening to basic research under the scenario that we have before us.

□ 1545

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 215, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 709]

AYES—199

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Gillmor

Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Horn  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Klecza  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowe  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Mink  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Morella

NOES—215

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Bilbray  
Bibley  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brewster  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton

Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambless  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cremeans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Deal  
DeLay

Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Pryce  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
Laughlin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo

McCollum  
McCrary  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Moorhead  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Klug  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford

Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souders  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stump  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Traficant  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—18

Bilirakis  
Chapman  
Dornan  
Emerson  
Fields (LA)  
Gibbons

Green  
Kennelly  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Murtha  
Roth

Stark  
Stockman  
Tejeda  
Torkildsen  
Tucker  
Volkmer

□ 1604

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Stark for, with Mr. Dornan against.

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Bilirakis against.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi and Mr. GILCHREST changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present for roll-call vote No. 709, I would have voted "aye." I was tied up in traffic and could not make it here in the 17 minutes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, during the last vote I was inadvertently detained while coming from a committee markup. I ask that the RECORD reflect that I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 709 had I been present.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts: Page 133, line 5, insert "or" after "Technology Initiative,".

Page 133, lines 6 and 7, strike "; or" and all that follows through "pollution research".

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, take a deep breath—fill up your lungs—but do not assume that you are breathing clean air. The air that is now in your lungs passed through several hundred feet of dark, dusty, dirty ductwork before reaching this room. Nearly 30 different species of fungus have been found to grow in the dank recesses of building ventilation systems.

Viruses and bacteria that thrive in air ducts have been proven to cause influenza, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and dozens of other diseases. In addition to those living dangers, the air we breathe indoors can also contain high concentrations of radon, asbestos, formaldehyde, benzene, carbon monoxide, tobacco smoke, lead, and chlorine.

Every breath you take puts you at risk of exposure to these contaminants. Americans spend an average of 90 percent of their time indoors, and the air we breathe in schools and workplaces can be 1,000 times more toxic than the outdoor air. The right to breathe clean air should not end the moment we walk indoors.

Yet today, the Republicans are telling us that sound science is no science. Yes, folks, believe it or not, the bill that is before us today would eliminate the EPA's nonregulatory indoor air research program. The research that this bill intends to kill is the research that would fuel future discoveries enabling us to prevent illnesses related to indoor air contamination. My amendment would strike out this prohibitive language.

I find this effort to limit research to be an ironic one, as the Congress last year passed the Indoor Air Act—a bill that I have introduced every year since the 100th Congress—with bipartisan support on the suspension calendar. We adjourned at the end of the session before the bill could be signed into law, but support for the concept of increasing indoor air pollution research was clearly validated by this chamber.

So why now retreat from this commitment? The Republican leadership on the Science Committee would have you believe that the EPA indoor air research dollars are duplicative because the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] oversees issues of indoor air pollution as well.

This argument is faulted on several accounts; among them is the fact that exposure to hazardous indoor air pollutants pose significant threats that reach beyond the OSHA-regulated

workplace environment. Indoor air quality is also a problem in residential buildings and other institutional settings, such as nursing homes, schools, and hospitals.

This retreat is also odd, considering the fact that the Science Committee explicitly gave EPA the responsibility for carrying out indoor air quality research in title IV of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act in 1986.

The EPA rightly plays an important role in safeguarding public health—especially for our school children and senior citizens. Our Federal research dollars spent on indoor air pollution have proven to be a successful investment as a result of the coordination of information between the agencies that have jurisdiction over this issue. The EPA works closely with both OSHA and the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH] to coordinate research efforts.

The indoor air research conducted at the EPA provides the crucial link needed to solve this problem in a more global sense: by addressing risks outside of the workplace. Though without EPA involvement, not even the workplace is guaranteed to be protected. OSHA's jurisdiction over indoor air quality standards only covers the private sector workplace. Public sector workplace buildings are covered only in the 23 States that have adopted OSHA regulations. Massachusetts, for example, is not an OSHA State and would not be covered. And we certainly have had our share of indoor air quality problems in Massachusetts.

Recently, the registry of motor vehicles in Boston was shut down, and all employees relocated to another site, because of the building's indoor air pollution problems.

Employees in my district at the Suffolk County courthouse suffered ailments connected to indoor air quality problems during building renovation, and a number of offices in the building have been closed.

Students, faculty, and staff at the University of Massachusetts-Boston Harvard campus have suffered nausea, eye irritation, and other illnesses traced to indoor air pollution at the main campus building.

One of the hospitals in my district, Brigham & Women's Hospital, has been plagued by environmental hazards connected to poor indoor air quality. They were forced to shut down the eight floor, and are doing a floor-by-floor safety review study.

But problems with indoor air quality are not unique to my district. Having sponsored the Indoor Air Quality Act each of the last four Congresses, I regularly receive information from workers, students, parents, and concerned citizens about the problems they are facing with indoor air pollution all over the country—from New York to California. This issue affects us all.

At any moment, 21.2 million Americans are working in 1.4 million offices,

schools, factories, and other structures where indoor air quality is a problem. How can we ignore these numbers?

The cost of indoor air pollution is staggering as well. Americans spend an extra \$1.5 billion each year in medical bills, and the loss in productivity for businesses translates into tens of billions of dollars more.

Some may say that the argument is centered around limiting unnecessary regulatory burdens. But we are voting today on funds for EPA's research office. This office has no regulatory function.

I can find no reason why this research should be eliminated.

Through this research, the EPA works with private standard-setting bodies to develop ventilation standards and works with industries to develop and test building products which reduce potentially toxic emissions. This program is a voluntary exchange of information for the betterment of consumer health.

Unfortunately, the bill that we have before us today reflects the decision that the best policy is to leave consumers, homeowners, and builders without the scientific information they need to make informed decisions.

While much is known about some indoor air pollutants, scientists know little about sources and exposures in different indoor environments and more research is needed to understand the impact and severity of various health risks.

The health of our citizens mandates that we guard against the irresponsible and foolish choice to eliminate the EPA's ability to conduct indoor air pollution research.

I urge my colleagues to take a deep breath when the yeas and nays are ordered on this amendment—and think hard and fast about the need for clean indoor air before you toss away an invaluable resource for public health protection.

Confirm the need for clean indoor air standards. Vote "yes" on the Kennedy amendment.

□ 1615

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, at the risk of becoming repetitious I would like to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. Chairman, we have in the bill this one section which puts three limits on what the EPA can do. One was the one which we just dealt with, the elimination of EPA's right to do a climate action plan, a second one is the indoor air pollution research, and a third one, which I will offer an amendment to eliminate, has to do with environmental technology initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that most Members recognize that these are

key environmental votes. These represent a step backward which is going to be recorded and reported throughout this country.

On the last vote, Mr. Chairman, a couple dozen Republicans apparently were aware of this and chose to vote in support of the amendment. I hope that by calling attention to the matter, pointing out that this represents a concentrated effort that is emasculating this particular paragraph three significant opportunities for EPA to perform a great public service, we may be able to successfully pass the next two of these amendments.

Now the gentleman from Massachusetts has offered the amendment to eliminate the prohibition against doing indoor air pollution research. Again I point to the report that was referenced earlier in debate, some more of that liberal claptrap offered by the Science Advisory Board to President Bush in 1990, in which it points out, and I will read this paragraph.

Risks to human health, pollution indoors:

Building occupants may be exposed to radon and its decay products as well as to many airborne combustion products, including nitrogen dioxide and environmental tobacco smoke. Indoor exposure to toxic agents in consumer products (e.g., solvents, pesticides, formaldehyde) also can cause cancer and a range of non-cancer health effects. Due to the large population directly exposed to a number of agents, some of which are highly toxic, this problem poses relatively high human health risks.

Now that has been said over and over, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] said it with great eloquence, and this is what the Bush administration science advisory panel said, presumably the body charged with identifying the areas of most critical research.

Now of course, as we know and as I delight in pointing out, on their side there is a slight division of opinion as to whether this is respectable or not respectable, and I am glad to accentuate that in any way that I can, and I think that my colleagues should all be aware that it was diseases like Legionnaires' disease, for example, which is the result of indoor air pollution coming from the kinds of sources that the gentleman from Massachusetts described so eloquently, fungal products, unknown toxins that come through the air conditioning system. I ask my colleagues, do you want to not have any more information about this? You want to not know what these agents are? Do you prefer to remain ignorant of how to control them? That is what my colleagues are doing with their prohibition against indoor air research.

Now I honestly do not think my colleagues understood that. I think in good faith they felt that this was something that us liberals invented to provide for more government regulation and greater funding. I see some affirmative nods over here. I would like them to stand up and reflect that because I think this is what the American people

are going to want to weigh, and I have faith that the American people will make the right decision when it comes to affirming whether or not they want to abdicate any responsibility for protecting the health of the American people, and that is exactly the position they are putting themselves in, and they are making it very easy for me.

Mr. Chairman, I just delight in pointing this out, and I hope that my colleagues will stand up and offer a rebuttal.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts. The chairman has repeatedly stated that this bill provides adequate funds for research. The provision of the bill that my colleague is seeking to change with his amendment is a glaring example that this is not true. Indoor air pollution has consistently been identified as a significant health risk and as an area that needs additional research by EPA's Science Advisory Panel.

The concerns that were expressed in committee by the chairman were regulatory in nature. This program is strictly a research program. It was authorized by the Science Committee under title IV of the Superfund amendments of 1986. For nearly 10 years this program has generated information that has been used to disseminate information to State indoor air programs and to building owners and managers on how to avoid and mitigate indoor air quality problems. EPA also works in conjunction with industry to develop voluntary methods to reduce the health risks associated with indoor air pollution.

This program is not about regulating indoor air in private homes. It is not about regulating at all. This program performs necessary research which has beneficial impacts on human health through non-regulatory means. The question is do we want to have the facts about indoor air quality or not. I urge my colleagues to support knowledge over ignorance by supporting the Kennedy amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rose reluctantly because I wanted to give the chance for the Republicans to comment on this amendment, and I do not see them rising to their feet, so I want to take this opportunity to strike the last word and speak out in support of the amendment.

It just makes no sense at all to zero out EPA funding for indoor air, and I think my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] was most eloquent, as was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], in arguing that we have got to continue funding the research on indoor air pollution. Health experts consistently rank this air pollution problem as one of the greatest environmental threats.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] indicated it was the Bush administration that set out its priorities for those environmental problems which are the greatest threat to human health, and they ranked the problems of indoor air pollution as one of the highest. EPA research is crucial to understanding this problem, and

EPA has already made enormous contributions in the area of indoor air research.

For example, Mr. Chairman, they have done ground-breaking work on environmental tobacco smoke, an issue that we did not know was as serious as it is turning out to be, or radon toxic emissions from carpets, toxic substances from carpets.

Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress this House voted overwhelmingly, recognizing that indoor air pollution is a serious health matter. We passed legislation overwhelmingly with bipartisan support that directed EPA to conduct more studies on indoor air so that we would have the science needed to address these problems.

I cannot believe that the election last November would change the view of almost all the Democrats and Republicans who served in the last Congress to support this research, to now change it to deny the funding to have EPA do this research. I do not think we ought to turn our back on science and on the consensus we had in the last Congress. It would be a terrible mistake. It would certainly be short-sighted.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get this straight.

As I understand it, this bill says in essence that EPA can do no research on indoor air.

Mr. WAXMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. OBEY. And the argument for that is that OSHA does that research?

Mr. WAXMAN. I have not heard an argument.

If I can reclaim my time, we have not heard an argument. I have waited for the Republicans to stand up and respond to this amendment. Maybe they are going to support it. Maybe they see they are in error.

I further yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. My understanding is that the rationale for this is that for instance OSHA does this research, but OSHA relies on NIOSH to do its research, and the NIOSH budget, if anyone will bother to look, has been cut drastically in the Labor-HEW bill which has passed this House. I mean it would seem to me that this provision makes about as much sense as, say, passing a new Federal mandate saying people cannot breath indoors.

Mr. WAXMAN. Reclaiming my time, to rely on OSHA is not sensible when OSHA would have jurisdiction over acting to deal with workplace hazards. Cutting funds on the research at EPA, we are not going to understand the hazards. I guess if we do not know about it, we would not have to take any actions to deal with it.

□ 1630

That does not eliminate the threat, and it does not eliminate the fact that

some of the exposures indoors, in the air we breathe, can cause cancer. The cancer rates in this country are at an extraordinarily high level. I cannot fathom how this in any way could be a partisan issue. I do not think it makes sense to take the position that what we do not know will not hurt us, because it certainly will come back to cause serious health threats.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, as a Member in Congress from Florida, in a fairly subtropical type environment, we have come to know a number of hazards, ranging from simple molds all the way to Radon that may be hazardous to individuals. In that sense, I find it absurd that we are here debating something that has not been concluded scientifically, and that is the safety of indoor air. I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], I think I have finally figured out why the Republicans are not responding. What has happened here, I think, they have figured out if we actually banned indoor air pollution in this building they would not be able to talk.

The fact of the matter, what we hear from the other side of the aisle is a lot of pollution in this Chamber, a lot of pollution for this country, and a lot of pollution that is going to affect future generations of this land.

All we are trying to do here is that while some people are afraid that this is going to mean that somehow we are going to find out that smoking a cigarette might be hazardous to other people's health, when they are going to find out that the glue on the floor could possibly affect you, when you sit next to a copying machine, that the fumes that come off the copying machine might make you sick. It is no secret to the American people that in many, many buildings that we live and work in, that you get headaches, you get red eyes, you feel bad.

What does your fellow worker, your mother, tell you to do? To go outside, take a walk, get some fresh air. The air we breathe is a thousand times more polluted indoors than it is outdoors. Why do we not research and find out what kinds of contaminants are causing that illness? Why do we not find out what is wrong, and let the American people know?

We have worked with the floor manufacturers, we have worked with the building owners. We got a much tough-

er bill passed in this Congress last year to try to deal with actually fixing what was broke. Now all we are trying to do is get the basic research done which was a fundamental and important component of the legislation that was passed last year.

Have a heart. Let us just find out what is wrong in this country, find out and do the research, so we can fix and protect our American citizens. That is what this bill will do. That is what I think we ought to have the guts and the courage to go out and find.

I would hope that the people of this Chamber would support the Kennedy amendment and vote for knowledge, vote against the prohibition on gaining more knowledge in research from the EPA for the purposes of indoor air pollution.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Massachusetts keep referring to last year's Congress. The American people made a fundamental change in Congress because of some of the lousy policies we passed in the past Congress, and in fact, mandated us to do something towards balancing the budget. We are moving in that kind of direction. We think that one of the ways to do that is by rationalizing what agencies do.

EPA is in fact not the place that regulates indoor air; OSHA is. NIOSH is the place that does the research relative to OSHA research, so the fact is that the appropriate place to prioritize this research is in that agency.

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

Mr. Chairman, the last statement I just heard is the greatest exercise in circular logic I have seen in at least an hour in this place. Let me simply say that the gentleman just said, "Well, we do not have to have EPA do this research, because OSHA does it and OSHA I going to be able to use NIOSH." Yet, the Republicans went after NIOSH with a vengeance when it was before this House in the Labor-HEW bill. They have had a longstanding history of trying to chain NIOSH and preventing it from doing much in the way of significant research.

It seems to me it is absolutely ludicrous to use a budget justification for saying that an agency cannot do research which is crucial to public health. There is no area in this country that costs us more dollars each year than preventable diseases, and an awful lot of them are caused by air borne pollutants. The tiny, tiny pittance that EPA would spend on research on indoor air is a tiny fraction of 1 percent of the cost of human diseases caused by polluted air each year.

I have never in my life heard such a Flat Earth justification for an idiotic piece of legislation as I heard just 3 minutes ago.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has added substantially to the debate in pointing out the issues that he did, but let me broaden this just a little bit. Actually, this entire bill is intended to implement a 5-year plan to cut one-third or more from all research. The committee does not have jurisdiction over OSHA or NIOSH, so I cannot speak as the gentleman can with regard to what is happening there. But there are cuts within the research areas in our jurisdiction that extend all the way from total elimination of substantial areas to 75 percent cuts, even with agencies which enjoy the public support. And I know that the gentleman does not support it, but NASA is taking a one-third cut in that Republican budget. I hope the gentleman will not support it just because of that.

The point that I am making here is that the Administration, and I will put this in the RECORD, feels that this emasculates our efforts to provide the seed corn, the knowledge necessary to expand the opportunities for our children and our grandchildren; that it is the greatest reduction in U.S. investments in research and development that we have ever had.

Then we get to the point where the other side argues, as they have on several occasions in this bill, that they cannot afford to find it. This is the defense of the teenager who shot his mother and father and then pleaded to the judge that he was an orphan and should not be penalized. They have eliminated the money and then pleaded that they cannot do the research that needs to be done.

Mr. Chairman, we have to face this problem. This is a real problem. We need to understand that R&D can be cut, but should it be cut more on health and safety, like indoor air pollution, than we are cutting in military weapons systems, which are relatively uncut? It is a priority matter. This Congress has to decide what its priorities are, and obviously, this bill reflects one rather restricted set of priorities which I hope will be rejected by the adoption of some of these amendments.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 218, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 710]

AYES—195

Abercrombie	Gillmor	Neal
Ackerman	Gilman	Oberstar
Allard	Gonzalez	Obey
Baldacci	Gordon	Olver
Barcia	Green	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Greenwood	Orton
Becerra	Gutierrez	Owens
Beilenson	Hall (OH)	Pallone
Bentson	Hamilton	Pastor
Bereuter	Hastings (FL)	Payne (NJ)
Berman	Hayes	Payne (VA)
Bishop	Hefner	Pelosi
Blute	Hilliard	Peterson (FL)
Boehlert	Hinchev	Pomeroy
Bonior	Holden	Porter
Borski	Horn	Portman
Brewster	Hoyer	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Ramstad
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rangel
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Canady	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Cardin	Johnston	Rivers
Castle	Kanjorski	Roemer
Clay	Kaptur	Rose
Clayton	Kelly	Roukema
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Coburn	Kildee	Sabo
Coleman	King	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Kleczka	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Klink	Schroeder
Conyers	LaFalce	Schumer
Costello	LaHood	Scott
Coyne	Lantos	Serrano
Davis	Lazio	Skaggs
de la Garza	Leach	Slaughter
DeFazio	Levin	Spratt
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Dellums	Lipinski	Stokes
Deutsch	LoBiondo	Studds
Dicks	Lofgren	Stupak
Dingell	Longley	Tanner
Dixon	Lowe	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	Luther	Thompson
Doyle	Maloney	Thornton
Durbin	Manton	Thurman
Edwards	Markey	Torkildsen
Engel	Martinez	Torres
English	Mascara	Towns
Eshoo	Matsui	Velazquez
Evans	McCarthy	Vento
Farr	McDermott	Visclosky
Fattah	McHale	Ward
Filner	McKinney	Waters
Flake	McNulty	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Meehan	Waxman
Foley	Meek	Williams
Forbes	Menendez	Wilson
Ford	Miller (CA)	Wise
Frank (MA)	Minge	Woolsey
Frost	Mink	Wyden
Furse	Molinari	Wynn
Gejdenson	Moran	Yates
Gilchrest	Nadler	Zimmer

NOES—218

Archer	Calvert	Dunn
Armey	Camp	Ehlers
Bachus	Chabot	Ehrlich
Baesler	Chambless	Ensign
Baker (CA)	Chenoweth	Everett
Baker (LA)	Christensen	Ewing
Ballenger	Chrysler	Fawell
Barr	Clinger	Fields (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Coble	Flanagan
Bartlett	Collins (GA)	Fowler
Barton	Combest	Fox
Bass	Condit	Franks (CT)
Bateman	Cooley	Franks (NJ)
Bevill	Cox	Frelinghuysen
Bilbray	Cramer	Frisa
Bliley	Crane	Funderburk
Boehner	Crapo	Galleghy
Bonilla	Creameans	Ganske
Bono	Cubin	Gekas
Boucher	Cunningham	Geren
Browder	Danner	Goodlatte
Brownback	Deal	Goodling
Bryant (TN)	DeLay	Goss
Bunn	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Bunning	Dickey	Gunderson
Burr	Dooley	Gutknecht
Burton	Doollittle	Hall (TX)
Buyer	Dreier	Hancock
Callahan	Duncan	Hansen

Harman	McInnis	Shaw
Hastert	McKeon	Shays
Hastings (WA)	Metcalf	Shuster
Hayworth	Meyers	Sisisky
Hefley	Mica	Skeen
Heineman	Miller (FL)	Skelton
Herger	Montgomery	Smith (MI)
Hilleary	Moorhead	Smith (NJ)
Hobson	Morella	Smith (TX)
Hoekstra	Myers	Smith (WA)
Hoke	Myrick	Solomon
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Souder
Houghton	Neumann	Spence
Hunter	Ney	Stearns
Hutchinson	Norwood	Stenholm
Hyde	Nussle	Stockman
Inglis	Oxley	Stump
Istook	Packard	Talent
Johnson (CT)	Parker	Tate
Johnson, Sam	Paxon	Tauzin
Jones	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (NC)
Kasich	Petri	Thomas
Kim	Pickett	Thornberry
Kingston	Pombo	Tiahrt
Klug	Pryce	Traficant
Knollenberg	Quillen	Upton
Kolbe	Quinn	Volkmer
Largent	Radanovich	Vucanovich
Latham	Regula	Waldholtz
LaTourette	Riggs	Walker
Laughlin	Roberts	Walsh
Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher	Watts (OK)
Lightfoot	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (FL)
Lincoln	Royce	Weldon (PA)
Linder	Salmon	Weller
Livingston	Sanford	White
Lucas	Saxton	Whitfield
Manzullo	Scarborough	Wicker
Martini	Schaefer	Wolf
McCollum	Schiff	Young (AK)
McCreery	Seastrand	Young (FL)
McDade	Sensenbrenner	Zeliff
McHugh	Shadegg	

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	Gephardt	Murtha
Bilirakis	Gibbons	Roth
Chapman	Kennelly	Tejeda
Dornan	McIntosh	Torricelli
Emerson	Mfume	Tucker
Fazio	Moakley	
Fields (LA)	Mollohan	

□ 1701

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. McIntosh against.

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

Mr. SPRATT and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the Chair, Mr. KINGSTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2405) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 1868, be instructed to disagree to any Senate amendment that would require the Executive Branch to spend more in fiscal year 1996 than fiscal year 1995 for assistance to any country or project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I doubt that this will take very much time at all.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment simply instructs the conferees to refuse to agree to any Senate amendment that would require the executive branch to spend more in fiscal year 1996 than it did in fiscal year 1995 for assistance to any country or project.

When this bill left this House under the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], we had very few earmarks. The Senate added some 40. This simply indicates that in an era of declining budgets, we should not be requiring an additional amount of money be spent anywhere.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I want to say during this past year it has been a pleasure to work with the gentleman. His vast knowledge of this very complicated foreign policy and foreign operations of this country has been invaluable to me, both from him and from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

With respect to the earmarks as mentioned in your bill or your desire to