

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3322) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 427, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 3322, OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3322, the Clerk may be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the action of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BETWEEN COMMITTEES REGARDING JURISDICTION

Mr. WALKER. Mr. speaker, further, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD include the exchange of letters between the Committee on Science and the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Security regarding the respective jurisdictions of the committees.

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

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BUD: On April 24, 1996, the House Committee on Science marked up and reported out H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. Title VII of the bill contains provisions relating to the authorization and administration of the Federal Aviation Administration's Research, Engineering and Development Program.

Several sections of title VII fall within the jurisdiction of your committee and as such your committee received a sequential referral of the omnibus bill upon introduction.

Given the short time frame before the omnibus bill will be considered on the Floor of the House, I realize that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will not have sufficient time to consider those provisions within your committee's jurisdiction. In order to expedite Floor consideration of H.R. 3322, I will drop Sections 702, 703, 704, 705 and 708 of H.R. 3322 which mainly pertain to the management of the Federal Aviation Administration. I also understand that you also object to Section 706(k) of the omnibus bill, and I will therefore not include that provision when the omnibus bill is considered on the House Floor.

I appreciate your willingness to work with us to expedite the consideration of H.R. 3322. I look forward to continuing to work with you on these issues.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1996.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Science has marked up and introduced H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. The following provisions may be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security: Section 128, Science Studies Institute and Section 453, National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

The Committee on Science acknowledges the Committee on National Security's jurisdictional interest in these provisions. It is my understanding that similar language to Section 453 will be included in the FY 1997 Department of Defense Authorization bill. Nevertheless, I ask that your committee waive any request for sequential referral with respect to the provisions described above so that the House can consider H.R. 3322 without undue delay. I would of course support the inclusion of your Committee as conferees should H.R. 3322 go to a House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your cooperation and I look forward to hearing from you.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1996.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: I am writing to follow up on our conversation of May 1, 1996 about the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) title of H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996.

With one exception, the title's programmatic scope is identical to the NOAA title passed by the House last year as part of H.R. 2405, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995.

The one exception is a new section dealing with ocean research partnerships. It is my understanding that your staff has taken part in every step of the drafting process of the ocean research partnership language. In deference to your concerns, however, I will be pleased to drop the provision from the bill. Likewise, I am willing to drop language worked out between our two Committees last year, and passed by the House, on the NOAA Fleet and NOAA Corps as well as related program support accounts. I also am willing to drop language authorizing the National Sea Grant College Program as well as all National Ocean Service (NOS) programs and the Ocean and Great Lakes Programs of the office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR).

As with last year, I am pleased to work out any differences our two Committees may have over the substance of authorization language covering the NOAA programs we share. If we cannot agree, however, I will oblige your desire to strike the authorization for the programs I have outlined above.

I look forward to continuing our close working relationship on legislative matters our two Committees share.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, House Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: Thank you for your letter of May 2, 1996, concerning H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. I appreciate the work your committee is doing in this bill on matters of civil aviation research and development within the jurisdiction of the Science Committee. I look forward to working with you on these matters as we proceed to reauthorize the Airport Improvement Program and as we continue to pursue FAA reform.

Because you have agreed to drop provisions within the Transportation Committee's jurisdiction from H.R. 3322, I have no objection to its consideration in the House.

With warm personal regards, I remain

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand the Committee on Science has recently marked up H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. This legislation includes two provisions within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security—section 128, Science Studies Institute, and Section 453, National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

In recognition of your committee's desire to bring this legislation expeditiously before the House of Representatives, the Committee on National Security will waive referral of H.R. 3322, without, of course, waiving this committee's jurisdiction over the provisions in question. This committee also will seek to have conferees appointed for these provisions during any House-Senate conference.

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 3322 and as part of the record during consideration of this bill by the House.

With warm personal regards, I am
Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
*Chairman, Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 1, 1996, agreeing to delete portions of Title IV, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), of H.R. 3322, which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources.

I have memorialized our agreement in the form of an amendment to the bill. As you can see, it deletes authorization sections for the National Ocean Service (NOS) and the Ocean and Great Lakes Programs of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR). It also removes provisions affecting the NOAA Corps, NOAA Fleet, the National Sea Grant College Program and the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The amendment also eliminates from the program termination list contained in Subtitle D those programs funded under the programs and offices listed above.

In addition, the amendment removes a limitation contained in section 442, Limitations on Appropriations, which could foreclose the Resources Committee (or any other Committee) from authorizing funds for the many NOAA programs not authorized under H.R. 3322, like the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act.

Finally, the amendment makes technical conforming changes to the remaining text of Title IV.

If the Science Committee plans to make a manager's amendment for H.R. 3322 in order, I ask that these changes be contained in that amendment. If no such amendment is contemplated, I ask that you request the Rules Committee to make this amendment self-executing upon the adoption of the Rule for consideration of H.R. 3322. Of course, I assume that you would not offer or support any amendments adding back the provisions deleted per our agreement.

I also look forward to continuing our close working relationship on legislative matters over our two Committees share during the remainder of this Congress.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

Amendments to H.R. 3322

Page 90, line 11, through page 93, line 13, strike subtitle B.

Page 93, line 14, redesignate subtitle C as subtitle B.

Page 94, line 4, through page 97, line 13, strike subsections (c) and (d).

Page 97, lines 14 and 21, redesignate subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (c) and (d) respectively.

Page 98, line 1, redesignate subtitle D as subtitle C.

Page 98, lines 6 through 11, strike paragraphs (1) through (4).

Page 98, lines 16 through 21, strike paragraphs (8) through (12).

Page 99, lines 5 through 9, strike paragraphs (17) and (18).

Page 98, line 12, through page 99, line 10, redesignate paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (13), (14), (15), (16), and (19) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively.

Page 99, line 19, through page 100, line 7, strike subsections (c) and (d).

Page 100, lines 11 and 12, strike "and any other Act".

Page 100, line 20, through page 103, line 24, strike section 443.

Page 104, line 1, redesignate subtitle E as subtitle D.

Page 106, line 9, through page 116, line 9, strike section 453.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on H.R. 3322, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McNULTY. Last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, I was attending my daughter's graduation back home, and I missed rollcall No. 195 on the minimum wage bill, which I strongly support, and I want the RECORD to reflect my support for that bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 178, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX, and at the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res 178) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the House and Senate on H. Con. Res 178, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1997 through 2002, be instructed—

(1) to agree to the Senate-passed levels of discretionary spending, as set by the amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI;

(2) to agree to section 325 of the Senate-passed resolution, relating to "balance billing" of Medicare patients by health care providers;

(3) to agree to section 326 of the Senate-passed resolution, relating to Federal nursing home quality standards; and

(4) to agree to section 327 of the Senate-passed resolution, relating to protection

under the Medicaid program against spousal impoverishment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in light of the fact that there are some flights at 9:30, that we limit debate on each side to 15 minutes. I have talked to the gentleman from Minnesota. It is okay with him. I would hope it would be okay with the gentleman from Ohio, too.

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether this would then be a standing rule against the generally long-winded exhortations of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], but if he wants to set a precedent here for brevity, I would be more than happy to accept this recommendation.

Still reserving the right to object, I have not heard the gentleman respond to that.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I will try to be as brief as I can.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. For the sake of my friend from Ohio, the gentleman from New York is not scheduled to speak.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, we will accept that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Members, the motion to instruct does four very important things: It asks the House to agree to the Senate discretionary levels as set by an amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI in the Senate and agreed to by a 3-to-1 vote in the Senate. This is to insure that we do not head to another Government shutdown in a long, dragged-out fight over appropriation bills. It is also about making sure that we adequately fund our programs for education, environmental and safety protection, research and development, and vital programs such as in agriculture.

We also instruct the House to agree to three Senate sense of the Senate or sense of the Congress resolutions. Budget resolutions are about numbers,