

the same of ourselves. I wish I did not have to vote against the previous question simply to voice my opposition to the pay raise, but I do. The protection of our children is an issue that is near to my heart, but so is my commitment to the people of east Texas to balance the Federal budget. I oppose this motion to instruct in its current form only because it is incomplete.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1997

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, it appears that after a long battle this House may be close to considering campaign finance reform. It is my hope that when we do that we will have a fair, bipartisan bill that contains no poison pills and offers real reform of the system.

I have been working with fellow freshman Members to create such a bill. We agreed at the very beginning to put aside any poison pills, items that would automatically put one party at a competitive disadvantage. The result was a bill that bans soft money, increases candidate disclosure, and requires organizations making independent expenditures to reveal who they are and how much money they are spending. It was not an easy process, but we learned to work together and trust each other and in the end drafted a fair bill that will make a real difference in the system.

There may be a great temptation to kill a reform bill with partisan amendments. I hope that we can avoid that fate. The only way a campaign finance bill can become law is through bipartisan cooperation. If we can reject poison pills, reject partisan attacks and reject the temptation to pass a bill without teeth, then we can see true campaign finance reform for the first time since the 1970's.

Today we are at a crucial time in this debate, I hope we don't blow it.

EXTEND SECTION 245(i) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

HON. ROBERT A. WEYGAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1997

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of extending section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 245(i) allows immigrants who are out of status, but legally eligible for visas, to pay a \$1,000 fee to adjust their status while remaining within the borders of the United States.

These immigrants are eligible to obtain legal status in the form of permanent residence in this country based on a family relationship or an offer of employment.

What naysayers must understand is that the 245(i) program does not alter U.S. immigration policy, or make entering our country any easier. What it does is assist a pediatrician who comes to this country to help care for our kids. It helps foreign students who have been educated at American universities and have cho-

sen to utilize their new talents right here in the United States. It assists a wife who comes to America to join her husband who has built a solid career here. It allows all of these people to renew their status with a fee, rather than requiring them to take a return trip to their native country. In some cases they may not be able to return for 3 to 5 years.

But the dream of staying in the United States for many of these people may soon be just that—a dream. Next Tuesday, these people who have come here hoping to be reunited with a family member or hoping to provide their talents to the greatest nation on earth, may be forced back to their native land without a blink of an eye. On September 30, 1997, 245(i) is scheduled to sunset. If we do not extend this section, a mass deportation will occur—wives will be taken from their husbands' arms and valued workers will lose their jobs. Families will be ripped apart and businesses will be disrupted. We should not and cannot allow this to happen.

An extension of 245(i) would not only benefit immigrants currently living in the United States, their family members and their employers, but would benefit our country as a whole. For example, that fee these immigrants pay to renew their status goes straight into the U.S. State Department coffers, at a sum of \$200 million each year. 245(i) provides the Immigration and Naturalization Service with the funds necessary to carry out important enforcement and detention functions.

By allowing immigrants to change their status within the our Nation, the United States has also been able to reduce the applications at the consulate by 3 percent. This allows them to focus on their primary functions of enhancing foreign diplomacy and assisting United States citizens living or traveling abroad.

I ask you, as Members of Congress and representatives of the people, what is the benefit to our country of breaking up families and breaking down businesses? I urge my colleagues to support the extension of this necessary and beneficial provision.

THE NEED TO ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE TAX

HON. ANNE M. NORTUP

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1997

Mrs. NORTUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of eliminating the marriage tax. Although this Congress has made significant steps in reducing the tax burden on Americans we still have a long road ahead of us in restructuring our Tax Code and instill fairness to all taxpayers. As we travel down this road one of our first stops must be to eliminate the tax that penalizes the sacred institution of marriage.

My opposition to the tax on marriage is simply a question of fairness. Why should a man and woman who are married and living together be taxed more than a man and woman living together who are not married? CBO has estimated that 21 million couples have paid on average \$1,400 and some exceeding \$20,000 in surplus taxes as a result of having to change their filing status to married. This is a substantial amount of money that could be used toward a child's education, retirement

savings, a new home or a car. Furthermore, a couple should not have to consider the IRS when deciding whether to enter into marriage. The marriage penalty blatantly contradicts what this Congress has attempted to achieve in strengthening American families and providing significant tax relief.

Married couples are faced with numerous challenges and burdens. Let us not forget that married couples frequently are in the process of raising children—a wonderful and very expensive experience—and should therefore be afforded as much financial relief as possible. Let's not punish these couples for their love and commitment for one another, let's reward them for their willingness to strengthen our society through the sacred bond of marriage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1997

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber on Rollcall votes Nos. 410 through 415.

Had I been present, I would have voted no on Roll No. 410, no on Roll No. 411, aye on Roll No. 412, aye on Roll No. 413, no on Roll No. 414, and aye on Roll No. 415.

THE OCEANS ACT OF 1997

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1997

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Oceans Act of 1997. I am pleased to be able to offer this bill with the support of the chairman of Resources' Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, Representative JIM SAXTON; the ranking Democrat of that subcommittee, Representative NEIL ABERCROMBIE; and the ranking Democrat on the Resources Committee, Representative GEORGE MILLER, as well as Representatives GILCREST, PALLONE, GEORGE BROWN, PORTER GOSS, PATRICK KENNEDY, and SOLOMON ORTIZ.

This is an exciting time in the history of man's relationship with the oceans. With this year as the International Year of the Reef, and next year as the International Year of the Ocean, more focus is being directed on the state of the world's coasts and oceans than ever before. And rightly so.

We are critically dependent on the oceans, and the resources we derive from them. Commercial and recreational fishing provides 1.5 million jobs and an estimated \$111 billion annually to the Nation's economy, and more than 30 percent of the United States GNP is produced in coastal counties. Americans love the ocean and beaches: they are our leading tourist destination, with 85 percent of tourist revenues being spent in coastal States. In 1993 more than 180 million Americans visited coastal waters nationwide, and in California alone the revenue generated by tourism is approximately \$38 billion annually. The beautiful coasts and ocean in my district are key to the areas's \$1.5 billion travel and tourism industry.

Yet we cannot ignore the evidence that our oceans and coasts are imperiled. Since 1950 production from world fisheries and aquaculture has increased by a factor of five. Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] analysis of the world's fishing resources in 1995 concluded that most of the major fish stocks in the world can be classified as fully fished, overfished, depleted, or recovering. Approximately 45 percent of the Nation's threatened and endangered species inhabit coastal areas, and almost 75 percent of the endangered and threatened mammals and birds rely on these coastal habitats.

We are inundated every day with stories of marine, estuarine and riverine pollution, wetlands loss, algal blooms, coastal and marine habitat degradation, fishery over-harvesting, and the looming threat of sea-level rise. With all of the legislation, regulations, and Federal, State and local programs and policies, we somehow still seem to be failing in our mission to have healthy, sustainable oceans and coasts.

The situation will only get worse as coastal populations increase: Two-thirds of the world's cities with populations over 1.6 million are located in the coastal zone. By the year 2010 it is estimated that at least 75 percent of the United States population will live within 50 miles of the coast, with all of the attendant potential environmental consequences of having so many people concentrated in areas of diverse and fragile ecosystems.

Part of the problem is that we are not investing enough in learning about our oceans; for all of the money we have spent in space exploration, we know woefully little about the amazing characteristics of the 71 percent of our planet's surface that is the world's oceans. The fact is, we know less about the surface of our own planet than we do about that of Mars, Venus, or the Moon. I believe that we need to put our national ocean exploration programs on par with the space program, and our efforts to conserve the marine environment at least equal to that provided to the land portion of our country. Our efforts to protect our marine environment through our national marine sanctuary system provide only 0.7 percent of the funding we give just to our national parks.

The legislation I am introducing is patterned after the law which was enacted in 1966 to establish the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, known as the Stratton Commission, after its chairman, Julius Stratton of the Ford Foundation. The Commission was given the task of examining the Nation's stake in the development, utilization, and preservation of the marine environment, to assess the Nation's current and anticipated marine activities; and, on the basis of this information, to formulate a comprehensive, long-term, national program for marine affairs with the goal of meeting current and future needs in the most efficient manner possible. In January of 1969, the Stratton Commission released its report "Our Nation and the Sea: A Plan for National Action."

The report and recommendations of the Commission led to the creation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, supported the impetus for the enactment of the Coastal Zone Management Act in 1972, and provided the vision and structure for ocean and coastal policy for the past thirty years. Today, however, U.S. population has grown from 196.5 million in 1966 to 265.6 million in

1996, over half of whom lives within 50 miles of our shores; ocean and coastal resources once thought inexhaustible are now seriously depleted; and wetlands and other marine habitats are threatened by pollution and human activities.

As the 30-year anniversary of the Stratton Commission's report approaches, it is of great importance that we again do a thorough assessment of the current state of our Nation's coastal and marine resources, programs, and policies, and that we create a new national ocean plan to lead us into the 21st century. The Oceans Act of 1997 contains similar provisions to the 1966 act. It calls for the creation of a Stratton-type commission, called the Commission on Ocean Policy, to examine ocean and coastal activities and to report within 18 months its recommendations for a national policy. In developing the report, the Commission would assess Federal programs and funding priorities, infrastructure requirements, conflicts among marine users, and technological opportunities. The Commission would then meet at a minimum of once every 5 years to assess the Nation's progress in meeting the purposes and objectives of the act. An appropriation of \$6 million over the course of fiscal years 1998 and 1999 would be authorized for the Commission to complete its work. In addition, such sums as necessary would be authorized for the Commission to meet in the 10 years following the submission of the report.

It would also call for the President, with the assistance of the heads of relevant agencies and departments, and on the advice of the Commission, to develop and implement a coherent national ocean and coastal policy that provides for protection against natural hazards; responsible stewardship of fisheries and other ocean and coastal resources; protection of the marine environment; resolution of conflicts among users of the marine environment; advancement of research, education and training in fields related to marine activities; continued investment in marine technologies; coordination and cooperation within and among governments; and preservation of U.S. leadership on ocean and coastal issues.

I believe that a comprehensive ocean and coastal conservation and management plan for our country is absolutely necessary. Our efforts have got to be coordinated, and we've got to act now to increase our knowledge of this critical area of our planet, and to ensure proper management of marine resources, and healthy, vibrant coastal and ocean ecosystems we all can enjoy.

H.R. 2544, THE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER COMMERCIALIZATION ACT OF 1997

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1997

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 2544, the Technology Transfer Commercialization Act of 1997, a bill which promotes technology transfer by facilitating licenses for federally owned inventions.

Each day research and development programs at our Nation's over 700 Federal laboratories produce new knowledge, processes,

and products. Often, technologies and techniques generated in these Federal laboratories have commercial applications, if further developed by the industrial community.

As a result, Federal laboratories are working closely with U.S. business, industry, and State and local governments to help them apply these new capabilities to their own particular needs. Through this technology transfer process our Federal laboratories are sharing the benefits of our national investment in scientific progress with all segments of our society.

It seems clear that the economic advances of the 21st century will be rooted in the research and development performed in our Nation's laboratories. These advances are becoming even more dependent upon the continuous transfer of technology into commercial goods and services. By spinning-off and commercializing federally developed technology, the results of our Federal research and development enterprise are being used today to enhance our Nation's ability to compete in the global marketplace.

For over a decade and a half, Congress, led by the Science Committee, has embraced the use of technology transfer from our Federal laboratories to help boost our international competitiveness. We have enacted legislation establishing a system to facilitate this transfer of technology to the private sector and to State and local governments.

The primary law to promote the transfer of technology from Federal laboratories is the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980. The Stevenson-Wydler Act, Public Law 96-480, makes it easier to transfer technology from the laboratories and provides a means for private sector researchers to access laboratory development.

In addition, Congress has enacted additional laws to foster technology transfer, including the Federal Technology Transfer Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-502); the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-418); the National Competitiveness Technology Transfer Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-189); and the American Technology Pre-eminence Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-245), among others. In addition, Congress enacted the amendments to the Patent and Trademark Laws, also known as the Bayh-Dole of 1980 (Public Law 96-517).

Most recently, in the past Congress, the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-113), which I introduced, was enacted into law. Public Law 104-113 amends the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 and the Federal Technology Transfer Act of 1986 to improve U.S. competitiveness by speeding commercialization of inventions developed through collaborative agreements between the Government and industry. The law also promotes partnership ventures with Federal laboratories and the private-sector and creates incentives to laboratory personnel for new inventions.

As the chair of the House Science Committee's Technology Subcommittee, I am pleased to continue this tradition of advancing technology transfer and encouraging research and development partnerships between Government and industry with the introduction of H.R. 2544, the Technology Transfer Commercialization Act. H.R. 2544 seeks to remove the legal obstacles to effectively license federally owned inventions, created in Government-owned, Government-operated laboratories, by