

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

SEC. 10. NOTICE.

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

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

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE YEAR 2000 PROBLEM.

With the year 2000 fast approaching, it is the sense of Congress that the National Institute of Standards and Technology should—

(1) give high priority to correcting all 2-digit date-related problems in its computer systems to ensure that those systems continue to operate effectively in the year 2000 and beyond;

(2) assess immediately the extent of the risk to the operations of the Institute posed by the problems referred to in paragraph (1), and plan and budget for achieving Year 2000 compliance for all of its mission-critical systems; and

(3) develop contingency plans for those systems that the Institute is unable to correct in time.

SEC. 12. BUY AMERICAN.

(a) **COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.**—No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the “Buy American Act”).

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. DREIER] having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN, 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. 1274) to authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 127, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

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

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 126 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 1273.

□ 1122

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1273) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, with Mr. DUNCAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1273, the National Science Foundation Act of 1997. It is particularly appropriate that the House consider this legislation at this time because this week is National Science and Technology Week. This House can be proud of the work of the Members on both sides of the aisle in developing the blueprint of the 105th Congress for strong support of research, development, and science education.

The National Science Foundation provides funding to over 19,000 research and education projects in science and

engineering annually. It does this through grants and cooperative agreements to more than 2,000 colleges, universities, K–12 schools, businesses and other research institutions in all parts of the United States. The foundation accounts for about 25 percent of Federal support to academic institutions for basic research.

This 2-year authorization improves our investment in America by strengthening our commitment to the National Science Foundation. The bill authorizes approximately \$3.5 billion for fiscal year 1998. The bipartisan support for this bill demonstrates the committee's belief that the support of basic research will provide America with the lead role for science in the future. It is through basic research that we will make the fundamental discoveries that will become the economic drivers in the 21st century.

H.R. 1273 provides for \$2.56 billion, or a 5.4-percent increase over fiscal year 1997, in the research and related activities account. In fiscal year 1999, the bill then further increases the RR&A account to \$2.74 billion, a 7-percent increase over fiscal year 1998. The research and related activities account is NSF's primary account. It provides the resources that allow the United States to uphold world leadership in a variety of science and engineering activities.

This legislation follows through on the committee's commitment to improve math and science education. In the Education and Human Resources Directorate, the bill incorporates the President's request of \$625 million, a 1.1-percent increase over fiscal year 1998, and then provides 3 percent growth in this program to over \$644 million in fiscal year 1999.

The major research equipment account completes funding for the construction of the Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave Observatory Program, LIGO, for short. This account provides funds for two new programs: the Millimeter Array Radio Telescope and the Polar Cap Observatory. The MMA will be the world's most sensitive, highest resolution millimeter-wavelength telescope and will provide a testing ground for theories of star birth, galaxy formation and the evolution of the universe. The Polar Cap Observatory will provide new measurement capabilities for studying and monitoring space weather, the conditions in space environment that can influence the performance of satellites, affect power grids and disrupt telecommunications.

In addition, the bill provides for the one time, full authorization of the Antarctic Rehabilitation Program. As the distinguished chairman of the NSF's External Review Panel on Antarctic Programs, Norm Augustine, testified before our committee:

It's our belief we would not send a ship to sea or a spacecraft to orbit in the condition of the facilities that we have at the pole.

I am proud to say this legislation fully authorizes the resources necessary to rebuild the facilities in Antarctica and protect the health and safety of our scientists as well as the very fragile Antarctic environment.

In our drive to hold down expenses, the salaries and expense account of NSF has been held to approximately 2-percent growth in fiscal years 1998 and 1999. The committee commends NSF for their low overhead rate and expects them to continue to maximize efficiency and productivity.

Finally, the Office of the Inspector General is funded at the President's request for fiscal year 1998 and provided a 3-percent growth in fiscal year 1999.

I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Basic Research Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA], and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], ranking minority members of the full committee, for their efforts and support in crafting a bipartisan bill that received overwhelming support in the Committee on Science. I believe that this is an outstanding bill and urge Members to support H.R. 1273.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Science Foundation authorization bill, House Resolution 1273, which was developed in a bipartisan manner by the Committee on Science. House Resolution 1273 signals the strong bipartisan support for the key role of the NSF in developing and sustaining the academic research enterprise of this Nation. NSF is the only Federal agency with the sole mission to support basic science and engineering research as well as education in our Nation's schools, colleges and universities. NSF programs support research in science and engineering, the operation of national research facilities, and science education at all levels of instruction. Such wide-ranging activities underpin the technological strength of our Nation through both the generation of new knowledge and the continued education of our scientists and engineers.

In light of NSF's important role, I am pleased that House Resolution 1273 provides real growth for those NSF research activities which support individual investigators and interdisciplinary research teams.

□ 1130

The authorization level increases in each year of the bill are above what is needed to offset inflation and, therefore, will allow NSF to pursue new initiatives in such areas as distributive intelligence and life in extreme environments, while sustaining core research activities in the major science and engineering disciplines. The re-

search investments made by NSF generate the new knowledge that fuels our Nation's technological innovation and ultimately dictates our future economic strength.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to describe some recent examples that show the breadth and potential technological value resulting from NSF-sponsored research.

Materials scientists at Cornell University, for example, have investigated the characteristics of silk fiber spun by the golden orb weaving spider, which are stronger than steel and more elastic than Kevlar. In fact, through the tools of biotechnology, it is now possible to manufacture designer materials by producing genes which can express large amounts of this super strength material. The practical applications for such technologies are simply enormous.

Power plants emit high levels of nitrogen oxides, which are health hazards and cannot be completely eliminated by using current catalysts. Researchers at Penn State University discovered a family of novel rare-earth catalysts which can remediate nitrous oxide in flue gas and thereby enable the design of a new process which support environmentally safe power plants.

At the University of Michigan the Center for Ultrafast Optical Science is working with ultrashort laser pulses in developing important applications to ophthalmology. Ultrashort laser pulses are composed of only a few optical cycles in light, and their duration is measured in femtoseconds. One femtosecond is one millionth of one billionth of a second. Ablation of material with femtosecond pulses is extremely clean in contrast to ablation performed by traditional lasers with a pulse duration 1,000 times longer. As very fine and accurate surgical cuts can be made without any collateral damage using ultrafast lasers, these devices are the perfect scalpel.

In addition to supporting basic research, NSF programs help educate the next generation of scientists, engineers and technicians as well as improve science education for all of our K-12 students. Such outcomes are realized through a wide range of NSF activities, including graduate student support, research experience for undergraduates, development of curricular materials for science courses at all levels of instruction, development of educational applications of computer and communications technologies, and in-service training for K-12 teachers.

I would particularly like to mention the NSF Advanced Technology Education Program, which is targeted for 2-year institutions. The program supports curriculum faculty development to improve the training of technicians critical to the high performance workplace. The ATE Program attains its goals through partnerships among 2-year institutions, universities, business, and industry.

House Resolution 1273 supports the President's request for the education

and human resources activities of NSF and provides sufficient growth in a second year to offset the effects of inflation. The bill will sustain existing programs while the basic research subcommittee reviews the impact of education programs during this Congress.

Finally, the bill accepts the recommendation of the distinguished panel assembled by NSF to review the facilities necessary for the U.S. Antarctic program, which has also been very eloquently and comprehensively explained by our outstanding chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], and authorization also is provided to allow for replacement, as the chairman explained, of the South Pole Station and for needed upgrades at other Antarctic stations.

The value of research programs and the importance of the U.S. presence in Antarctica has been expressed by the administration and outside witnesses at committee hearings over the past 2 years. This bill will ensure that U.S. facilities in Antarctica are capable of supporting the most advanced research and will provide adequate safety for the scientists and support staff who must function in this very hostile environment.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Basic Research, for his efforts to develop House Resolution 1273 in a great spirit of cooperation, and also especially commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], the chair of the Committee on Science, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], an outstanding ranking Democratic member, for their leadership in moving the bill through the committee and to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support H.R. 1273 and urge its approval by the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Science in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member very much for yielding me this time, and I also want to commend him for the excellent work he is doing in his initial efforts as a ranking member of this very important subcommittee. I know that he will continue to do an excellent job in that regard.

It is hardly necessary to speak in support of the National Science Foundation, since it has long enjoyed bipartisan support and continued budgetary growth. Not always as much as I would like, but in this particular bill and under these circumstances, I think that the budgetary growth which has been set forth by the chairman of the full committee represents a very reasonable program, and I am happy to commend him for that.

I will not belabor all of the good points that I could make about the NSF, but I do want to say something about a very small line item which is in the bill that has not been in there before, and that is a provision providing for authorization of about a million dollars for international science cooperation through the funding of the United States-Mexico Foundation for Science.

This foundation contributes to the scientific and technological strength of each country through fostering research and human resource development, and promoting collaborative solutions to common problems.

Since this foundation was established in 1992, the United States-Mexico Foundation has established a proven track record of supporting high quality international research. The additional funding authorized by this bill, which will be matched by Mexico, will enable the foundation to expand its activities from its current very small base and will thereby further advance United States-Mexican scientific and technological cooperation.

We hope other U.S. agencies will likewise be able to support some of this binational research in areas that is focused on their individual missions, and we are looking forward to gradually building up a substantial base of funding for this very important binational research.

I should mention here that I had the opportunity and the pleasure to visit with the leadership of the Mexican Government and Mexican scientific establishment just a few weeks ago to discuss the progress of the binational foundation, and I found uniform support at every level, from the president, through his science adviser, through the Secretary of State, and many other agencies, and all of the leading scientific institutions in Mexico, who wanted to continue this program and have it reach a reasonable level over the next several years, and we look forward to working with them in achieving this.

I also want to conclude by not extolling again the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], but to include by reference the laudatory remarks I made previously about the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER]. It would be rather repetitious to say that on each one of these bills. But he has done a great job and we look forward to continued cooperative relationships with him.

Mr. Chairman, I urge every Member to support this excellent bill.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Anyone who followed the debate over these matters in the last Congress knows that this House took a very

short detour from our traditional and long-term path of bipartisan support for research and development and particularly for the work of the National Science Foundation. It was a path that the New York Times said would actually cripple American science.

Fortunately, we have a new day and we are now back on the path of a bipartisan commitment to research and development. While we have a few differences over certain specifics of this bill and of other legislation that is being considered today, on the whole, we have agreement; and it is a testament to the work of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA], and to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], their leadership, that we have come together once again to pursue support for science and for research and development from the Federal level.

This National Science Foundation bill represents a slight increase over what we did in the Congress last year and over what President Clinton has requested. It would appear that we have found some consensus on just how vital funding for scientific research is, its importance in fostering scientific discovery and jobs that that discovery will produce.

Our worldwide leadership in science and technology is a source of great pride and satisfaction for millions of Americans but, more importantly, it is a source of future jobs for millions of our young Americans who will be entering the job market in future years.

Now we can talk about ways that this Congress can improve the lives of Americans; and there is little that we cannot accomplish through realistic investments in science and technology to produce those high-skill, high-wage, high-tech jobs in the future.

The area that I represent in and around Austin, TX is a good example. The investment made through the National Science Foundation through related programs of Federal investment in research and technology has provided the engine for economic growth, has attracted considerable private investment, and has provided us the kind of economic problems that the rest of the country would like to have, that being that we need, we have a shortage actually of many individuals in the high-skilled area to fill jobs that are being created each month by our high-tech industries.

Clearly, our Nation is in a fight on the economic front around the world; and if we are to remain competitive and if we are to be able to produce the kind of jobs that we need for our population, it will be through the kind of investment that we are making today in this National Science Foundation bill and in other bills to place America first when it comes to research, when it comes to science and technology.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distin-

guished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SESSIONS].

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, it is with great encouragement that I stand up today to rise to commend the chairman of the House Committee on Science for working very diligently on the bill H.R. 1273. I stand today as a proud member and a supporter of the committee as an advocate for research and development on the types of things that will make a real impact and make a difference in our country.

This bill corrects years of neglect and promotes the most fiscally responsible part of our Federal budget. Research and development provides exponential returns to the taxpayer and enables our country to continue its long history of pressing the envelope of math, science, and technology.

□ 1145

As a freshman Member I was very encouraged by the hearings on this bill and others that were reported out by our Committee on Science last week. Throughout the hearings, there was a bipartisan support, not only that we have heard today from other Democrat Members of Congress, but also those on the committee who feel that if we have a competitive grant process and united feelings against specific earmarks of funds, we can make better progress. I believe both of these efforts have led to a bill that is proeconomic growth and for fiscal responsibility.

I also believe that this bill actively attacks one of the most serious problems with America in education today. According to the third international mathematics and science study, eighth grade math and science students in the United States are considerably average when compared to students in developing countries. Average students are not going to keep the United States of America ahead of our foreign competitors and other competitors around the globe. As a nation, it is imperative that we encourage students, teachers, and administrators to focus their efforts on basic math and science skills. By providing competitive incentives, we have signaled our commitment to encourage these important skills and opportunities.

Finally, our focus on competitive grants highlights a unique American way that we can solve our problems. Incentives and encouragement lead to productive answers and innovative solutions. This method is in direct conflict with many of the reforms circulating around Washington today. It seems that some of my colleagues think a Federal mandate can solve everything, but I think that really we have the answer when we talk about regulations and mandates that are put on people. I believe that a Federal mandate has never educated a student, inspired a scientist or invented the next generation in technology. However, the human desire to succeed has brought America more innovative ideas and scholastic achievements than a room of bureaucrats can think of in a lifetime.

I think what we need to do is to support H.R. 1273, and I rise in support of that and wish to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], the chairman, for not only his leadership but help in this process.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS].

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise also in favor of this bill to reauthorize the National Science Foundation. As a new Member of the Congress, I must say that the bipartisan cooperation that has brought forward this legislation has been an example for the rest of the House to follow. I want to commend and thank the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], chairman; the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Gordon], ranking member; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], chairman; and my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for their outstanding work on this legislation.

The bill before us today provides a healthy and worthy increase for the National Science Foundation. While I support the research community's call earlier this year for a 7-percent increase in science research and development, I am encouraged by the funding levels that this bill contains in these tight budgetary times.

I have spent my professional life prior to coming here engaged in teaching and research, so I have a sincere appreciation for the critical role of research and education in our society. The National Science Foundation's mission to sponsor research and encourage new thinking and education is a critical element for our economic growth as we move into the 21st century. Much is said today about the need to educate our children for our increasingly competitive economic environment. I agree with this viewpoint.

However, I also believe that education inspires individual and personal growth which inevitably leads to a more civilized and prosperous society. This is also what NSF programs achieve. The bill is evidence of the support that NSF has in the House and throughout the country. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW].

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I will take just a moment to rise to commend both the chair of the committee and the ranking member of the committee as well as the ranking member of our subcommittee dealing with the National Science Foundation for the excellent work and the bipartisanship that has come from the Committee on Science this year. As a first-term Member, I am very pleased to be a part of a committee that is focused and committed to investing in scientific research and development, technology development, environmental research, and efforts through the National Science

Foundation. Very important efforts are taking place on behalf of this country that are critical to our economic competitiveness in the future.

We no longer as a country are looking at competition, business to business or State to State. It is definitely country to country. Our ability to maintain our economic advantage is only as strong as our willingness to invest in basic research and the development of technology in partnership with business. I am extremely pleased that the NIST budget has passed and that the advanced technology program and other important partnership efforts have been included this year that are critical. The National Science Foundation has a very important base that has been adopted by this committee. I would like to again commend our leadership on both sides of the aisle for a strong vision and commitment, and I am hopeful that we will be successful in maintaining this throughout the process.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

For almost 50 years, the National Science Foundation has worked to expand the core of knowledge that has broadened our horizons in almost every field of science, engineering, and mathematics. We may not always see such direct applications of most of the research, but advancements in understanding of our planet, the composition of life, and the elements of technologies enrich our lives.

Equally important in the mission of the NSF is its dedication to integrating education into its activities. Obviously, future scientific successes hinge on society's ability to train students to understand the fundamentals of current knowledge.

In conducting research, undergraduate and graduate students must have adequate opportunities to learn from direct experience. And precollege students should not be left out of the picture. I can tell you as a former educator—and I know that many of my colleagues will agree—that if our students do to learn the basics of science in their youth, we will be hard pressed to find interested and prepared students at the higher levels.

We must also remember that scientific education extends beyond the immediate research community. If our Nation's populace does not understand the issues facing our national science policies, they cannot make informed decisions that affect those policies.

I understood the rationale for keeping the education and human resources accounts in check, and I look forward to further inquiries by this body into the successes of the programs in this category. However, pending such a review, I think that we should further expand our educational programs within the NSF and other agencies.

We have an obligation to do as much as possible to support education, and in particular, the improvement of our students' math and science skills. I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1273, The National Science Foundation Act of 1997. I am proud to have introduced this legislation.

This 2-year authorization provides real growth to the National Science Foundation. To briefly summarize its provisions:

The President's fiscal year 1998 request for NSF is \$3.367 billion, a 3-percent increase over the fiscal year 1997 appropriation levels. This bill authorizes over \$3.505 billion for fiscal year 1998, a 7.2-percent increase over fiscal year 1997.

Within the individual appropriations accounts, the bill authorizes \$2.563 billion, or a 5.4-percent increase over fiscal year 1997, in the Research and Related Activities [R&RA] account. In fiscal year 1999, the bill increases the R&RA account to \$2.740 billion, a 7-percent increase over fiscal year 1998.

In the Education and Human Resources Directorate, this bill incorporates the President's request of \$625.5 million, a 1.1-percent increase over fiscal year 1998, and then provides for 3-percent growth in this program to over \$644 million in fiscal year 1999.

The major research equipment account completes funding for the Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave Observatory [LIGO] program. This account provides funds for two new programs: the Polar Cap Observatory and the Millimeter Array radio telescope. In addition, this bill provides \$115 million for the one time, full authorization, of the Antarctic rehabilitation program.

The salaries and expense account has been held to approximately 2-percent annual growth in fiscal year 1998 and fiscal year 1999. The committee commends NSF for their low overhead rate and expects them to continue to maximize efficiency and productivity.

The office of the inspector general is funded at the President's request for fiscal year 1998 and provided 3-percent growth in fiscal year 1999.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Before closing, I would like to remind my colleagues that this week is National Science and Technology Week. National Science and Technology Week is an informal and public education outreach program of the National Science Foundation, dedicated to expanding the participation by all Americans in the fields of science, technology, and engineering. Since its inception in 1985, National Science and Technology Week has gradually expanded in scope and impact, involving millions of Americans in national and local events.

National Science and Technology Week is celebrated across the country, providing special opportunities in communities throughout the Nation to notice the major impact and importance that science and technology have on all aspects of daily life. The National Science Foundation presents this full week of informal science and engineering activities annually in April. This year's celebration, April 20–26, 1997, has the theme of "Webs, Wires & Waves: The Science and Technology of Communication." This theme recognizes the price-less impact that communications has had in shrinking the world and bringing people worldwide closer together. It allows individuals to take the opportunity to explore questions about communications, both those of nature as well as technology.

The National Science Foundation attempts to reach its audience through various resources, especially the National Science and Technology Week Regional Network in 46 sites across the country, including a site in

New Mexico. The Space Center in Alamogordo, NM is very instrumental in providing training workshops for teachers and planning interactive, hands-on science events. These sites are resourceful in assisting in the distribution of education materials, which are issued annually, both in English and Spanish. These packets assist both formal and informal educators and parents in engaging children in innovative, hands-on learning activities geared to science, mathematics, and technology.

Many of the activities this year will present new opportunities to engage the curiosity of ordinary people everywhere, affected daily by new capabilities unfathomed even a generation ago. During National and Technology Week, the National Science Foundation will again offer its "Ask a Scientist or Engineer" over the Internet. Now in its third consecutive year, online access has been a popular and worthwhile tool, engaging the public's curiosity to explore and question the mysteries of science and technology. Online access will be available throughout the week at asknstw@nsf.gov.

I encourage the House and Senate to strongly support this outreach program, recognizing the importance of involving all people in the awareness that science, engineering, and technology are important in our lives today and crucial to our progress tomorrow. I hope you will join me in celebrating National Science and Technology Week.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the reauthorization of the National Science Foundation. In the years since its creation, the NSF has provided funding for research that has led to technological innovations which have improved the lives of millions of people in this country and around the world.

Many of our country's economists agree that technological innovation is responsible for between 30 and 50 percent of the United States' economic growth in the last 100 years. This has meant hundreds of thousands of jobs in every State of the Union.

Without the NSF, there would be no Internet as we know it today. As many of you know, the Defense Department first created the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA]—creating a link of defense computers around the world. In 1981, NSF created the first nondefense computer network, called CSNET, at the request of our country's universities that did not have access to DARPA. In 1987 NSF further expanded into the world with NSFnet.

Ten years later NSFnet has grown into the Internet—the latest frontier in our country's development. The uses for the Internet are still being developed. We already know it is a great research tool for our students, it is fast becoming a great place of economic activity, and the future may hold things we can't even think of.

In Massachusetts and across the country the Internet is also becoming a way to bring people together to support their schools. Twice in the last year volunteers from industry, labor, government, schools and parents, have given up time on their weekends to work on MassNetworks. It is an effort to wire every school in the Commonwealth for computer networks and the Internet. It has been a great success—and I would like to thank all those volunteers.

NSF no longer provides the backbone of the Internet. So, it has now turned its formidable

energies to developing the next generation of computer networks and supercomputers.

I am also a strong supporter of the Research Experiences for Undergraduates. This program provides funding for undergraduates to be hired by research professors. I have met students in this program, and all of them sing its praises. There are a number of students at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which is in my district, who have benefited from this program.

MIT has furthered this idea with its own called the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program. This program is very similar except that the researcher does not need to apply for a grant to hire undergraduates—instead they can use their existing research funds for that purpose.

Too often close working relationships with research professors are reserved for graduate students. This program recognizes that most undergraduates don't go to graduate school. This early interaction is vital to these kids' education. Their experiences will turn these kids into the great minds of the next century.

The NSF continues to expand the opportunities of all Americans and I urge my colleagues to support its reauthorization.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by titles and each title shall be considered read.

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

The Clerk will report section 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1997".

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the Foundation;

(2) the term "Foundation" means the National Science Foundation;

(3) the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given such term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965;

(4) the term "national research facility" means a research facility funded by the Foundation which is available, subject to appropriate policies allocating access, for use by all scientists and engineers affiliated with research institutions located in the United States; and

(5) the term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

TITLE I—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the programs of the Foundation are important for the Nation to strengthen basic research and develop human resources in science and engineering, and that those programs should be funded at an adequate level;

(2) the primary mission of the Foundation continues to be the support of basic scientific research and science education and the support of research fundamental to the engineering process and engineering education; and

(3) the Foundation's efforts to contribute to the economic competitiveness of the United States should be in accord with that primary mission.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 1998.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$3,505,630,000 for fiscal year 1998, which shall be available for the following categories:

(1) Research and Related Activities, \$2,563,330,000, of which—

(A) \$330,820,000 shall be for Biological Sciences;

(B) \$289,170,000 shall be for Computer and Information Science and Engineering;

(C) \$360,470,000 shall be for Engineering;

(D) \$452,610,000 shall be for Geosciences;

(E) \$715,710,000 shall be for Mathematical and Physical Sciences;

(F) \$130,660,000 shall be for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, including \$1,000,000 for the United States-Mexico Foundation for Science;

(G) \$165,930,000 shall be for United States Polar Research Programs;

(H) \$62,600,000 shall be for United States Antarctic Logistical Support Activities; and

(I) \$2,730,000 shall be for the Critical Technologies Institute.

(2) Education and Human Resources Activities, \$625,500,000.

(3) Major Research Equipment, \$175,000,000.

(4) Salaries and Expenses, \$136,950,000, of which \$5,200,000 shall be for Headquarters Relocation.

(5) Office of Inspector General, \$4,850,000.

(c) FISCAL YEAR 1999.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$3,613,630,000 for fiscal year 1999, which shall be available for the following categories:

(1) Research and Related Activities, \$2,740,000,000, including \$1,000,000 for the United States-Mexico Foundation for Science.

(2) Education and Human Resources Activities, \$644,245,000.

(3) Major Research Equipment, \$90,000,000, of which no funds are authorized for the Large Hadron Collider project at the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) unless the Director, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, has transmitted to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Labor and Human Resources and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the impacts of such funding on the operations and viability of United States high energy and nuclear physics facilities.

(4) Salaries and Expenses, \$134,385,000.

(5) Office of Inspector General, \$5,000,000.

SEC. 102. PROPORTIONAL REDUCTION OF RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES AMOUNTS.

If the amount appropriated pursuant to section 101 (b)(1) or (c)(1) is less than the amount

authorized under that paragraph, the amount available for each scientific directorate under that paragraph shall be reduced by the same proportion.

SEC. 103. CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION EXPENSES.

From appropriations made under authorizations provided in this Act, not more than \$10,000 may be used in each fiscal year for official consultation, representation, or other extraordinary expenses at the discretion of the Director. The determination of the Director shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. NATIONAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.

(a) **FACILITIES PLAN.**—The Director shall provide to Congress, not later than December 1 of each year, a plan for the proposed construction of, and repair and upgrades to, national research facilities. The plan shall include estimates of the cost for such construction, repairs, and upgrades, and estimates of the cost for the operation and maintenance of existing and proposed new facilities. For proposed new construction and for major upgrades to existing facilities, the plan shall include funding profiles by fiscal year and milestones for major phases of the construction. The plan shall include cost estimates in the categories of construction, repair, and upgrades for the year in which the plan is submitted to Congress and for not fewer than the succeeding 4 years.

(b) **STATUS OF FACILITIES UNDER CONSTRUCTION.**—The plan required under subsection (a) shall include a status report for each uncompleted construction project included in the current and previous plans. The status report shall include data on cumulative construction costs by project compared with estimated costs, and shall compare the current and original schedules for achievement of milestones for major phases of the construction.

(c) **LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.**—No funds appropriated for any project which involves construction of new national research facilities or construction necessary for upgrading the capabilities of existing national research facilities shall be obligated unless the funds are specifically authorized for such purpose by this Act or any other Act which is not an appropriations Act, or unless the total estimated cost to the Foundation of the construction project is less than \$50,000,000. This subsection shall not apply to construction projects approved by the National Science Board prior to June 30, 1997.

SEC. 202. ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS.

(a) **NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950 AMENDMENTS.**—The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 4 (42 U.S.C. 1863)—

(A) by striking “the appropriate rate provided for individuals in grade GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332” in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof “the maximum rate payable under section 5376”; and

(B) by redesignating the subsection (k) that was added by section 108 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1988 as subsection (l);

(2) in section 5(e) (42 U.S.C. 1864(e)) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) Any delegation of authority or imposition of conditions under paragraph (1) shall be promptly published in the Federal Register and reported to the Committees on Labor and Human Resources and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives.”;

(3) in section 14(c) (42 U.S.C. 1873(c))—

(A) by inserting “be entitled to” between “shall” and “receive”;

(B) by inserting “, including traveltime,” after “Foundation”;

(C) by striking “the rate specified for the daily rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule

under section 5332” and inserting in lieu thereof “the maximum rate payable under section 5376”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Members of the Board and special commissions may waive compensation and reimbursement for travel expenses.”; and

(4) by striking “Atomic Energy Commission” in section 15(a) (42 U.S.C. 1874(a)) and inserting in lieu thereof “Secretary of Energy”.

(b) **NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1976 AMENDMENTS.**—Section 6(a) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, 1976 (42 U.S.C. 1881a(a)) is amended by striking “social,” the first place it appears.

(c) **NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1988 AMENDMENTS.**—(1) Section 117(a)(1)(B)(v) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1881b(1)(B)(v)) is amended to read as follows:

“(v) from schools established outside the several States and the District of Columbia by any agency of the Federal Government for dependents of its employees.”.

(2) Section 117(a)(3)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1881b(3)(A)) is amended by striking “Science and Engineering Education” and inserting in lieu thereof “Education and Human Resources”.

(d) **SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT AMENDMENTS.**—The Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act is amended—

(1) in section 34 (42 U.S.C. 1885b)—

(A) by amending the section heading to read as follows: “PARTICIPATION IN SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING OF MINORITIES AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES”; and

(B) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) The Foundation is authorized to undertake or support programs and activities to encourage the participation of persons with disabilities in the science and engineering professions.”; and

(2) in section 36 (42 U.S.C. 1885c)—

(A) by striking “minorities,” and all that follows through “in scientific” in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof “minorities, and persons with disabilities in scientific”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “with the concurrence of the National Science Board”; and

(ii) by amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows: “In addition, the Chairman of the National Science Board may designate a member of the Board as a member of the Committee.”;

(C) by striking subsections (c) and (d);

(D) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(E) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and evaluating all Foundation matters relating to participation in, opportunities for, and advancement in education, training, and research in science and engineering of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities.”; and

(F) in subsection (d), as so redesignated by subparagraph (D) of this paragraph, by striking “additional”.

(e) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—The second subsection (g) of section 3 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is repealed.

SEC. 203. INDIRECT COSTS.

(a) **MATCHING FUNDS.**—Matching funds required pursuant to section 204(a)(2)(C) of the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1862c(a)(2)(C)) shall not be considered facilities costs for purposes of determining indirect cost rates.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in consultation with other relevant agencies, shall prepare a report analyzing what steps would be needed to—

(1) reduce by 10 percent the proportion of Federal assistance to institutions of higher education that are allocated for indirect costs; and

(2) reduce the variance among indirect cost rates of different institutions of higher education, including an evaluation of the relative benefits and burdens of each option on institutions of higher education. Such report shall be transmitted to the Congress no later than December 31, 1997.

SEC. 204. FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE.

Persons temporarily employed by or at the Foundation shall be subject to the same financial disclosure requirements and related sanctions under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 as are permanent employees of the Foundation in equivalent positions.

SEC. 205. EDUCATIONAL LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR ACTIVE DUTY.

In order to be eligible to receive funds from the Foundation after September 30, 1997, an institution of higher education must provide that whenever any student of the institution who is a member of the National Guard, or other reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States, is called or ordered to active duty, other than active duty for training, the institution shall grant the member a military leave of absence from their education. Persons on military leave of absence from their institution shall be entitled, upon release from military duty, to be restored to the educational status they had attained prior to their being ordered to military duty without loss of academic credits earned, scholarships or grants awarded, or tuition and other fees paid prior to the commencement of the military duty. It shall be the duty of the institution to refund tuition or fees paid or to credit the tuition and fees to the next semester or term after the termination of the educational military leave of absence at the option of the student.

SEC. 206. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY INSTITUTE.

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (42 U.S.C. 6686) is amended—

(1) by striking “Critical Technologies Institute” in the section heading and in subsection (a), and inserting in lieu thereof “Science and Technology Policy Institute”;

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “As determined by the chairman of the committee referred to in subsection (c), the” and inserting in lieu thereof “The”;

(3) by striking subsection (c), and redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively;

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection—

(A) by inserting “science and” after “developments and trends in” in paragraph (1);

(B) by striking “with particular emphasis” in paragraph (1) and all that follows through the end of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof “and developing and maintaining relevant informational and analytical tools.”;

(C) by striking “to determine” and all that follows through “technology policies” in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof “with particular attention to the scope and content of the Federal science and technology research and develop portfolio as it affects interagency and national issues”;

(D) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) Initiation of studies and analysis of alternatives available for ensuring the long-term strength of the United States in the development and application of science and technology, including appropriate roles for the Federal Government, State governments, private industry, and institutions of higher education in the development and application of science and technology.”;

(E) by inserting “science and” after “Executive branch on” in paragraph (4)(A); and

(F) by amending paragraph (4)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) to the interagency committees and panels of the Federal Government concerned with science and technology.”;

(5) in subsection (d), as so redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection, by striking "subsection (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c)"; and

(6) by amending subsection (f), as so redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection, to read as follows:

"(f) SPONSORSHIP.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall be the sponsor of the Institute."

(b) CONFORMING USAGE.—All references in Federal law or regulations to the Critical Technologies Institute shall be considered to be references to the Science and Technology Policy Institute.

SEC. 207. NEXT GENERATION INTERNET.

None of the funds authorized by this Act, or any other Act enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act, may be used for the Next Generation Internet. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, funds may be used for the continuation of programs and activities that were funded and carried out during fiscal year 1997.

SEC. 208. LIMITATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—None of the funds authorized by this Act shall be available for any activity whose purpose is to influence legislation pending before the Congress, except that this subsection 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.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.—No sums are authorized to be appropriated to the Director for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for the activities for which sums are authorized by this Act, unless such sums are specifically authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

(c) ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall exclude from consideration for grant agreements made by the Foundation after fiscal year 1997 any person who received funds, other than those described in paragraph (2), appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1997, under a grant agreement 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 subsection shall be effective for a period of 5 years after the person receives such Federal funds.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the receipt of Federal funds by a person due to the membership of that person in a class specified by law for which assistance is awarded to members of the class according to a formula provided by law.

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

SEC. 209. NOTICE.

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

(b) NOTICE OF REORGANIZATION.—The Director shall provide notice to the Committees on Science and Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Labor and Human Resources, Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and Appropriations of the Senate, not later than 15 days before any major reorganization of any program, project, or activity of the Foundation.

SEC. 210. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE YEAR 2000 PROBLEM.

With the year 2000 fast approaching, it is the sense of Congress that the Foundation should—

(1) give high priority to correcting all 2-digit date-related problems in its computer systems to ensure that those systems continue to operate effectively in the year 2000 and beyond;

(2) assess immediately the extent of the risk to the operations of the Foundation posed by the problems referred to in paragraph (1), and plan and budget for achieving Year 2000 compliance for all of its mission-critical systems; and

(3) develop contingency plans for those systems that the Foundation is unable to correct in time.

SEC. 211. NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

The National Science Foundation is authorized to participate in the National Oceanic Partnership Program established by the National Oceanic Partnership Act (Public Law 104-201).

SEC. 212. BUY AMERICAN.

(a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 6, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 104. UNITED STATES MAN AND THE BIOSPHERE PROGRAM LIMITATION.

No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be used for the United States Man and Biosphere Program, or related projects.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. What it does is limit the amount of money that the NSF can spend for the United States Man and Biosphere Program and related projects.

It is important that the people recognize that the Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage sites are under the guidance of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization also known as UNESCO. The United States withdrew from that Organization in 1984 because of gross financial mismanagement.

Over 68 percent of our national parks, preserves, and monuments have been designated as United Nations World Heritage sites, Biosphere Reserve or both. There are currently 47 of those sites in the United States, covering an area the size of Colorado. Under the relative agreements, the United States is promising to manage lands in accordance with international guidelines. Many times local government, private properties are never consulted in these management plans. This is a clear violation of private property rights. The biosphere programs, including the United States Man and Biosphere Program, have never been authorized by any Congress, never been authorized, but still received this past year and this year will receive over \$700,000 of taxpayers' money.

The National Science Foundation distributed more than \$400,000 in grants to this unauthorized program despite the fact that the program has never had a consideration or vote in Congress and has never been approved by a body of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to recognize that if we are going to balance our budget, the one thing that has to happen is that the Congress has to decide whether or not we are going to authorize programs. If we are going to authorize programs, then we ought to fund them. But if we are not going to authorize programs, we should not let other agencies do our job instead.

The fact is, there are over 15 different Government agencies that are contributing moneys for other purposes to the biosphere program. It is my feeling and many others that this should not happen, that it gives away a responsibility of Congress, that in fact being unauthorized, and also invades the personal property rights of those people who own land around these parks and reserves.

The Committee on Science, it also should be noted that we did vote to take out money out of NASA that was used for this very purpose on a voice vote in the Committee on Science markup. All we are doing is extending the same guidance to the National Science Foundation as was given to NASA.

It would be my request that this body consider this amendment in the spirit in which it is given: No. 1, in terms of fiscal responsibility we should not be giving moneys to unauthorized programs; No. 2, especially programs that violate the very spirit of freedom and control of personal property rights that our citizens enjoy.

I would ask concurrence from other Members in this body on this.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

I would just like to make a few brief points. I would like to point out that the NSF's contribution to the Man and Biosphere Program is \$50,000 a year, provided through an interagency transfer to the State Department. NSF

funds pooled with other agency funds are used to support five to six projects at about \$200,000 each. Research grants are peer reviewed and then approved by the executive committee of the Man and Biosphere Program comprised of about 15 agency officials, including a person from the NSF.

I would like to also point out that all NSF moneys are used only for research purposes, not to acquire additional land. The issue of the United Nations perhaps having influence or control or authority over U.S. lands, private and public, is completely false. Neither the United Nations nor any other international body has any authority over any public or private U.S. lands which have received recognition as a biosphere reserve. Only voluntary guidelines exist for biosphere reserves. No international biosphere reserve treaty or biosphere reserve convention exists.

In 1995, many managers from biosphere reserves around the world, representatives of conservation groups and scholars met in Seville, Spain, to set some voluntary framework for international science and conservation cooperation. Among those documents were the Seville Strategy for Biosphere Reserves and the statutory framework for the World Network for Biosphere Reserves. No statutory law or treaty exists, nor is any being contemplated or proposed for this network.

□ 1200

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN]. I think there are two reasons why we should do this.

First, the NSF contributes \$50,000 for this program. It is a controversial program, it is a program that has been set up by the United Nations, and as the gentleman from Oklahoma has stated, it has never been voted on by the Congress. The question is whether or not we can spend \$50,000 on better research than this. I think we can. There is the secretariat in the State Department that is supposed to coordinate all of this money. It seems to me that there are a lot of people on the payroll, there is an awful lot of traveling around. That is not research in my mind. What is research is the type of stuff that the NSF can do inhouse with peer review grants to our universities, to our high schools, to our research institutions in the United States of America.

So it is a question of whether we want to spend the money on Man and the Biosphere or whether we want to spend the money on the other very worthwhile NSF research projects. I vote for spending the money on the other worthwhile NSF research projects.

Second, the gentleman from Oklahoma raises a very good point. The committee did offer, or did adopt, an amendment that he offered to the NASA bill that prohibits NASA funds from being contributed into this pot.

The same arguments that I gave against using NSF funds for this pot are valid for NASA funds. I think it was probably an oversight that he was not able to offer the similar amendment to the NSF bill. This simply corrects the oversight, makes the Congress consistent in both NSF and NASA, and I would urge support of the gentleman from Oklahoma's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that we would not get involved in a lengthy debate over this amendment, and I would only like to make a few brief statements to amplify on some of the things that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] has already said. I really would like to urge the author of this amendment to spend a little more time in becoming acquainted with the research purposes of this program. I think that as a professional who understand the importance of research, he would be able to understand the significance of this international network of preserves which maintain in a condition that can be used for study and research areas around the globe which have a unique ecosystem niche or which protect a unique ecosystem niche of one sort or another. This means that in these protected areas over periods of time we can observe the impact of what human beings are doing on a global basis to specific kinds of areas, particular specific environments, which may have great value to us over the years.

That is the reason that we have this voluntary program and whose only purpose really is to establish a basis for scientific research to study impacts over time of what is happening. Now I honestly believe that the gentleman, if he would observe the program in more detail, would be impressed by the long-term value which this program contributes.

Now I understand that it has become controversial. I regret that that has been the case. But the controversy is not in my opinion over the merits of the program. The controversy is over the fact that some people, and I mean no disrespect to these people, feel that this is a conspiracy or a plot by the United Nations to take over the United States or something of that sort. Now, if one believes in this fantasy, then one of course wants to strike out at anything involving the U.N., and this is one of those programs which is a U.N.-sponsored program which they might want to do.

But as has already been mentioned, there is nothing here which provides the U.N. any authority whatsoever over any territory of the United States. These biosphere reserves are offered voluntarily as study sites within the framework of this U.N. program. They can withdraw at any time, any time. There is no loss of local, State or Federal control over these biospheres, no part of the law is changed in any

way, shape or form. The amount of money involved is minuscule. The \$50,000, for example, that may be spent by the National Science Foundation is so ridiculously small that it would be normally unobservable. The money spent, adding up as I understand it to less than a million dollars by other agencies, is research money either for the agency or by a university research group or some other group that wants to use these reserves to establish certain environmental research findings that would be useful to everybody in the world over a period of time.

So I very strongly urge that this amendment be defeated, and I even more strongly urge that the individual who authored it, the gentleman for whom I have great respect, would take the time to understand the full implications of this program and the value that it contributes on a global basis to research that will benefit all of us in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would gut one of our most successful international environmental programs. I would like to briefly describe what the Man and the Biosphere Program does and what it does not do.

The Man and the Biosphere Program is a coordinated research mainly carried out by university research grants. The objective is to study representative ecological systems and compare regional results with studies elsewhere both in the United States and worldwide. In order to carry out the program, study areas called biosphere reserves have been designated within the United States and in other participating countries that reflect the unique ecological systems that need to be examined.

As is described by the Congressional Research Service, "Biosphere Reserve recognition does not convey any control or jurisdiction over such sites to the United Nations or to any other entity. The United States and/or State and local communities where biosphere reserves are located continue to exercise the same jurisdiction as that in place before the designation." Thus there is no question that this is not a property rights issue, nor an international plot to take over U.S. lands.

Yet, sadly, there remains a uniformed opinion among some that has transformed itself into an irrational fear over the loss of U.S. sovereignty. There has been a great many inaccurate and groundless anecdotes about this program that I am certain could be corrected given enough time today.

This would not be a very wise use of our time however. I will just make a few general comments about this issue.

The idea that the United Nations is taking over U.S. lands, public and private, is completely false. No international treaty or convention exists that even remotely affects U.S. sovereignty.

The designation of a biosphere reserve does not have any effect on the status, use, or value of non-Federal lands. There is absolutely no evidence that any restrictions have been placed on any private lands in the vicinity of a biosphere reserve because it was a reserve. For an area to be nominated as a reserve, such an area must already have legal protection as a protected area, area of managed use, wilderness area, or research natural

area. There have been no new restrictions placed on such lands.

Biosphere reserves will not circumvent the Constitution or infringe on the laws enacted by Congress. The Federal or State agencies responsible for biosphere protected areas are all the agencies we have jurisdiction over, there is no new authority conveyed by the Man and the Biosphere Program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, opponents of the Man and the Biosphere Program have asserted that U.N. troops have had a firsthand role in establishing control over these biosphere reserves, U.N. roadblocks have been set up, that some secret international conspiracy called Agenda 21 exists for seizing control, and so on. These charges would be laughable if it were not for the tragic consequences that this type of paranoia has bred over the past year.

I hope that we take a rational and moderate view toward this issue today and defeat this amendment. The opponents of the Man and the Biosphere Program simply have not met the burden of proof that it is part of a conspiracy or that it in any way has affected property rights. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the amendment.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman I have read everything available to use on this program. The people I represent wholeheartedly disagree with this program. Even though it does have benefits they still disagree, and that even though a ridiculously small amount like \$700,000 in terms of what we spend does seem small, but when the average family income in the district is \$13,000, that is a tremendous amount of money, and when we are trying to balance a budget and not take money from our grandchildren, \$700,000 on an unauthorized project is a tremendous amount of money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to put my strength or my convictions or my words behind my colleague from Oklahoma who is watching out for the taxpayers' interests. As my colleagues know, sometimes we get so involved with the big picture that we miss some of the details, and when talking about the details in Washington, DC, we are talking about hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars that slip right on by and end up being spent on what most Americans would think are looney programs. And I have to say that I honestly believe that this biosphere program is one of those looney programs for which we could have better spending in other NSF research programs, and it would be much better to have this money that is being spent for what I consider also to be.

As my colleagues know, one of the things when I came up here, and I will just be very honest about it, is, yes, we have a situation where all political people, we are all elected, and some-

times people are attracted to projects that have a lot of publicity and are trendy projects, and I hate to say this, but it appears to be from what I read about the biosphere program that it is a trendy project, but it does not make any sense to me what I read about it, and I think that there are other ways that we could spend taxpayers' dollars that would be much more beneficial, like making sure no money is spent on this sort of looney program. We are ensuring that those dollars will be spent on something a little bit more substantive.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just thought I would give us a rundown of where the \$700,000 came from last year so we can all know where it came from since none of this was authorized and it came from several different agencies.

The Air Force gave \$50,000. That is really defense of our country. The Bureau of Land Management gave \$20,000; the EPA gave \$18,000; the Forest Service gave \$75,000; the National Biologic Service gave \$30,000; the National Park Service, \$60,000; NASA, \$50,000; NOAA, \$50,000; the National Science Foundation, \$50,000; the Peace Corps gave \$11,000 of their budget to the Project Man and Biosphere. The State Department gave \$240,000 of their money to the biosphere program last year. The State Department; I am having trouble connecting what that has to do with the State Department in terms of protecting that. USAID, which is not quite biosphere, it gave \$60,000. We spent \$7,000 in Denmark out of this money, we spent \$11,000 on the European market, we spent \$11,000 in the Mexican biosphere project, and we spent \$23,000 in the Russian biodiversity information project.

So I guess the question comes is if this is a legitimate project, let us bring it through the Congress, let us bring it through the Committee on Science, let us authorize it and then put the money there. Let us not let bureaucrats decide how we are going to fund something that we may think is right, and all we are asking with this amendment is that we not fund money for an unauthorized project, and if it has merits, let it stand on its own merit and go through the process that any other thing in this Congress is supposed to do. That means come through the committee process, be authorized and be voted on by both Houses of Congress, and get the money.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would compliment my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN]. While a short time here, he has become a champion of the taxpayers and watching for these little things that might sneak by the rest of us, and we really appreciate his diligence on this issue and other issues, I might add as well.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of

words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Coburn amendment would prohibit the National Science Foundation from distributing grants from the U.S. Man and Biosphere Program which is the mechanism the United Nations uses to study and designate biosphere reserves in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, few Americans really realize that over the last 25 years increasingly large amounts of Federal land have been designated for international land use programs such as the biosphere reserves. I would like to lay out some facts about this program.

Here in the United States a total of 47 sites in the United States have been designated already as U.N. biosphere reserves with virtually no congressional oversight and no congressional hearings. The Biosphere Reserve Program is under the jurisdiction of the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, commonly referred to as Unesco. Now it is very, very important to note that the United States actually pulled out of Unesco in the mid-1980's because of gross financial mismanagement, at the urging of our President, Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Chairman, in addition, there is no formal international agreement concerning biosphere reserves, and I think that is very important to note when we are trying to appropriate several hundred thousand dollars. The U.S. program operates without legislative direction and is not authorized by Congress. The U.S. biosphere reserves now proximate an area the size of the State of Colorado, the eighth largest State in the Nation. A biosphere reserve is a federally zoned and coordinated region consisting of three areas or zones that meet certain minimum requirements established by the United Nations. The inner or most protected area, the core zone, is usually Federal lands, but the outer two zones contain non-Federal property, and that means an encroachment, an imposition, of rules and regulations again into private property. By allowing these international land use designations, the United States promises to protect designated areas and regulate surrounding lands if necessary to protect the designated areas. Honoring these agreements forces the Federal Government to prohibit or limit some uses of private lands outside the internationally designated area unless our country wants to break a pledge to other nations. The Federal regulatory actions that result have a potential of causing a significant adverse impact on the value of private property and on the local and regional economy surrounding these areas. Also disturbing is that the designation of biosphere reserves rarely involves consulting the public and the local government. In fact, Unesco policy apparently discourages an open nomination process for the designation of these lands for biosphere reserves.

□ 1215

In their operational guidelines, in UNESCO's own operational guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, it states, and I quote, "in all cases, as to maintain the objectivity of the evaluation process and to avoid possible embarrassment to those concerned. The State national party," they refer to the United States as the State, "the State party should refrain from giving undue publicity to the fact that a property has been nominated inscription pending the final decision of the committee of the nomination in question."

Now, participation of the local people in the nomination process is essential to make them feel a shared responsibility with the State party in the maintenance of the site but should not prejudice further decisionmaking by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I think that says it all. Last year, when the Committee on Resources held a hearing on this issue, our suspicions about the lack of local involvement were confirmed. We heard testimony from local officials all around the country who felt that their role in the land management process had been significantly diminished by these designations. Many of these people did not even know that their property and surrounding lands were even being considered for designation until final decisions were made.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear to me that biosphere reserve designations give the international community an open invitation to interfere in domestic land use decisions. More seriously, the underlying international land use agreements potentially have several significant adverse effects on the American system of government. The policymaking authority is further centralized at the Federal executive branch level, and the role that the ordinary citizen has in the making of this policy through their elected representatives is totally diminished. The executive branch may also invoke these agreements in an attempt to administratively achieve an action within the jurisdiction of the Congress but without consulting Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge strong support for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in looking at these facts, it is particularly distressing that the National Science Foundation has contributed more than \$40,000 tax dollars to this unauthorized and sovereignty threatening program.

With that in mind, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment, which will not only stop the expenditure of unauthorized Federal funds, but will also help keep the sovereignty of our lands where it belongs; in the people's house.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think there is paranoia going on here having to do with a fear about Unesco, the United Nations and various things; and I think it is completely overblown. The research has already been authorized, that is

point No. 1, and the research that has been authorized does not infringe upon property rights. I think that this ought to be emphasized.

The biosphere reserve designation does not convey any control or jurisdiction over such sites of the United Nations or to any other entity. The United States and/or State and local communities where biosphere reserves are located continue to exercise the same jurisdiction as that in place before the designation, and areas are listed only at the request of the country in which they are located. These areas can be removed from the biosphere reserve list at any time by a request from that country.

Mr. Chairman, I am reading from a CRS report for Congress. I want to add to that that CRS is not known to lie to Congress. I am opposed to the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one point. I believe it was a mistake in language, but I would like to ask the gentleman a question. This program has never been authorized by any Congress of the United States; is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, it was before I got here, but I understand that we authorized the research. We did not designate whether the research would take place.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] to please clarify that for me.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, we do have reference to the concept of the biosphere reserves. That is a U.N. designation. We do not authorize that. All of the research done within those biospheres is conducted with Federal money. That research is authorized, however.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. That is exactly my point. We have never as a body in this Congress authorized the U.S. Man and Biosphere project. We have, in fact, authorized moneys that then have been spent on it for an unauthorized program. That is exactly why we should support this amendment and not allow agencies to spend money on unauthorized projects.

Again, I would reemphasize, if this program has good merits, it should come before the appropriate committees of Congress, receive its authorization and receive its funding. To fund it any other way is, first of all, inappropriate and is deceitful. Yes, there is in the far Western States certain para-

noia about this, but why should there not be if we are funding it and not bringing it for authorization?

So I would say we understand that it does not have anything to do with about whether we are environmentally friendly or not. The fact is that, if it is a legitimate program, then let us bring it before the committees, let us authorize it and then let us fund it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I want to indicate that there are some things that we should agree on. If the gentleman is willing to admit that there is a little paranoia out there, and I have some of it in my district, I can assure him, I would be willing to admit that we should authorize specifically our participation, even though it is a voluntary participation, in the U.N. Biosphere Program. There is no reason why we should not put that into suitable legislation, and I will commit myself to making an effort to do that as soon as possible.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] to prohibit National Science Foundation funds to be used for purposes relating to the U.S. Man and Biosphere Program. On behalf of many of my constituents in southern Missouri, I commend Mr. COBURN's efforts to prevent future funding for this program.

Mr. Chairman, large portions of my district in southern Missouri have been designated by the Man and Biosphere Program as a proposed site. Fortunately, after a groundswell of opposition and strong grassroots on the part of property owners throughout our region, the proposed Ozark Highlands Man and Biosphere has been dropped. However, that is not to say that future proposals will not emerge that could again potentially pose problems for private land owners throughout my congressional district and the Nation.

It is important to understand that Congress has no direct oversight, input, or direction over this program. It has never been authorized by Congress and therefore should not be funded. Just as important, the public and local governments are rarely consulted. This is wrong and should not be funded with taxpayers' dollars.

The U.S. Man and Biosphere Program goes to the heart of a larger problem in this country—that is land management restrictions for both our Nation's public and private lands. In fact, many folks would be surprised to know that within the last 25 years, more and more of our Nation's land has become subject to international land-use restrictions. Right now, a total of 67 sites in the United States have been designated as United Nations Biosphere Reserves or World Heritage sites. While there is no current U.N. involvement in our domestic land management decisions, we should not be establishing additional forums that could eventually lead to international input in our own domestic decisions regarding this country's public and private lands.

I want to, again, reiterate my strong support of the amendment by Mr. COBURN to prohibit funding for this unauthorized program and appreciate his efforts on behalf of private property owners throughout this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas: Page 20, insert after line 18 the following:

SEC. 213. ENHANCEMENT OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Director shall, to the greatest extent practicable and using existing authority, donate surplus computers and other research equipment to elementary and secondary education schools to enhance their science and mathematics programs. The Director shall report annually to the appropriate Committees of Congress on the Director's activity under this section.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). The gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as a relatively new Member of this body, I have been very proud of the work of the House Committee on Science, both under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], my ranking member, and the chairmanship of the majority.

One of the issues that we have raised as we confront this whole story of the 21st century is, will we be prepared and will our children be prepared? With that in mind, I am very concerned that our schools in the Nation continue to encourage our young people to be involved expertly, if you will, in science and mathematics programs. There is not one of us who has not talked to a 5th grader, a 6th grader, a 9th grader, and then maybe an 11th grader or 12th grader, and we see the progress of change on the issues of science and math; the sparkling eyes of the 3rd grader and 4th grader and 5th grader and then the waning interest of maybe those in middle school and high school. It is extremely important, I believe, that we in the Government lend ourselves to encouraging the study of math and science.

This amendment responds to that interest. In 1997, the number of children in the United States that enrolled in public schools between K through eighth grades are 33,226,000. The number of children enrolled in public schools between grades 9 and 12 are 13,299,000. The number of children enrolled in private schools between K to 8th grades are 4,547,000, and the number of children between grades 9 and 12 are 1,329,000, for a total of 51 million children. We have the responsibility to educate our children.

Science has value and importance because of the beneficial applications of scientific finds in the overall economy. It was of great excitement for me to join one of my elementary schools

where a teacher single handedly opened up a science lab with all kinds of trinkets, if you will, that she had gathered from the parents of children, parents who are involved in the science arena who brought different items to her attention and she created a touch-and-see laboratory. Because of that, that will instill in those children the opportunity and the desire to be proficient in science and in math, helping us explore our world and space in the 21st century.

Further, the benefits have tangible results and a better educated citizenry graduating from our Nation's schools, universities and graduate schools. Because of the work done by the National Science Foundation, America will be better able to compete in the global economy of tomorrow.

This amendment complements the National Science Foundation by allowing them to donate surplus computers and other research equipment to elementary and secondary educational schools to enhance their science and mathematics programs. What better source of this kind of equipment than the cutting-edge agency that deals with science research on a continuous basis? If we are to prepare our children for the demands of science and mathematics in the future, they should be allowed to receive the benefits of federally funded programs which are revenue-neutral by using surplus equipment that may be of benefit to strengthening science and mathematics programs.

This amendment would direct the National Science Foundation to look at its equipment and be able to ensure that our schools, rural and urban throughout the Nation, have access to this very valuable and current scientific equipment. Math and science are key, Mr. Chairman, and I believe anywhere and anyhow this Congress can help our children be excited about math and science and being prepared for the 21st century, we should engage in whatever way possible.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support me in this amendment. Most of all, I ask them to support our children by allowing them and giving them encouragement to participate in science and mathematics throughout this Nation.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say of the amendment which has been offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] that the majority is willing to accept the amendment. It is clear that we need in our elementary and secondary educational schools greater computing ability as well as a better means of instructing students in the use of computers, and to the extent that we can assist in the Federal Government with surplus computers and other research equipment, it is a great step forward.

My only comment is that this action should also extend to higher education

because they can also make particularly good use of surplus research equipment and, to a certain extent, computers.

My hope is that we will donate good equipment and not junk equipment. And I think the schools may have to be a bit discriminating as to what they accept, because they may accept greater maintenance liabilities than they think if they are not careful. But there is certainly a noble intent behind the amendment. I am pleased on behalf of the majority to say that we appreciate it and are willing to accept it.

□ 1230

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as one of the individuals on the committee, being a scientist that I admire along with the other scientists that are there, let me thank the gentleman for that.

Let me say that I look forward to having the opportunity in the future to work on institutions of higher learning. One of the aspects of this amendment is that we ask the agency to report back to the committee. In that, I hope that we can be assured that no junk has been given, and work with the agency to ensure that that would not happen.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do this not to belabor the amendment, which obviously on both sides we agree to. I would like to just indicate how important I think it is. It moves us a long way forward in making sure that all of our schools do have access to the kind of equipment that will help them to cross this bridge into the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I specifically want to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from Texas, who, despite the fact that she is not a scientist, is taking the leadership role in this whole area of adequate communication, networks, advanced computing equipment, and other things that are so important to education in today's world.

It is remarkable that someone who does not claim to be a scientist and have a background in the information revolution should be as assiduous as she has been in making sure that at every opportunity we make some contribution to enhancing our progress in this vital area. I want to commend the gentlewoman for that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE]. The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) having assumed the chair, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1273) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 126, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN SPACE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 128 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1275.

□ 1234

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1275) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. DIAZ-BALART in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time and defer to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1275, the Civilian Space Authorization Act for fiscal years 1998 and 1999. I believe this is a good bill and that it is the result of a bipartisan effort by members of the Committee on Science.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE BROWN] for their work in crafting this important piece of legislation.

This provides for a balanced NASA program, fully funding its critical missions, and I am pleased that the bill maintains the Congress' commitment to the Space Shuttle and Space Station Programs. These programs are critical to our Nation's future in space and are the heart of the human space flight endeavor.

I am sure we will hear a little more about the Space Station Program when we likely debate what I believe is an ill-considered amendment to cancel the station program. I believe the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] will consider offering that amendment again here.

I want to focus on many more of the positive provisions of H.R. 1275. This bill ensures that the taxpayers' investment in the space station is protected. We have erected a firewall between the funding for the Space Station science payloads and the funding for the space station's hardware development. We need to make sure that the station program that we are building is a productive world-class research laboratory, and I believe this bill goes a long way toward ensuring that that goal is attained.

We heard through the committee hearing process from many different points of view. We heard loudly from the medical research community that they need the Space Station Program in order to continue to build on the highly effective life and microgravity science research that we are already conducting on the space shuttle program.

We heard from many witnesses about advances that are being made with infectious disease, combatting that, advances that are being made in treating particular kinds of cancers, diabetes, other issues as well, that cannot go much further here on Earth, they need the Space Station Program in order to get there.

This research has real potential for commercial development, and I hope those new Members of Congress that may be somewhat reserved about our investment in the Space Station Program will listen during this debate to

the advances that we have made over those issues.

H.R. 1275 provides funding in fiscal year 1998 to allow NASA to continue flight research activities on the shuttle until the Space Station Program becomes operational. H.R. 1275 also contains a number of tough provisions regarding the Russian participation in the Space Station Program. Cooperation with Russia in space offers many benefits to America, but that cooperation has to be based on each party living up to its commitments. The Space Station Program that is funded through the authorization of this bill sends a strong signal to Russia that we expect them to deliver on their promises.

Turning to space science, I think we do an outstanding job in this piece of legislation to fully fund the President's request for space science. For example, the bill funds the continued operation of the Hubble space telescope, which is making exciting scientific discoveries that are rewriting science textbooks.

In all, H.R. 1275 is a strong bill, and I urge my colleagues to consider this bill. I have more to say, but I want to make sure that I give the chairman of the committee the opportunity to discuss this.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 1275, the Civilian Space Authorization Act, which the Committee on Science recommends to the House by a wide bipartisan margin.

In fiscal year 1998, this bill provides a modest 1-percent increase for NASA over its fiscal 1997 appropriated level. For fiscal year 1999 we provide a 1½-percent increase over the 1997 level.

As most of the Members will recognize, these increases do not keep pace with inflation, so NASA's real budget continues to fall. Nevertheless, H.R. 1275 provides NASA with the stability it requires to achieve our national space goals during this period of declining budgets.

The bill fully funds NASA's programs and scientific research and includes modest increases in space science data analysis to correct NASA's failures to adequately fund its science investigations.

The bill also contains funding to take our reusable launch vehicle programs to the next level, a generation beyond the X-33 program. X-33 remains our first priority, but this new investment in another X plane concept ensures that the Nation has options for the future of its space transportation capabilities.

I would like to turn now to the bill's international space station provisions.