

ensured more accountability for the launch program of the National Reconnaissance Office and the Air Force, promoting better acquisition practices.

A series of meetings, hearings, and briefings on the severity of these problems, with the help of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SANFORD), has made it obvious that our failures and problems were rooted in the morass of contracts used in the launch program and exacerbated by a tangle of bureaucratic turf concerns.

The Senate's refusal to acknowledge that these reforms are needed is short-sighted and risk more problems in the satellite launch program. Unfortunately, the Senate Intelligence Committee did not see fit to include this provision. It stripped the measure out without debate or justification.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman, is it his understanding that the National Reconnaissance Office provision would greatly help streamline the satellite launch process, and that the Senate's refusal to acknowledge that these reforms are needed is short-sighted and risks more problems in our satellite launch program?

1800

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

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, as I stated in conference, as I stated earlier, and as I would state again, I believe the provisions would have improved greatly the management and performance of the NRO's launch program. I, too, am extremely disappointed in the Senate's action, which I also concur is short-sighted.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS). I am glad we agree on this. As the gentleman from Florida is aware, while I am disappointed in the Senate's action on this, I have agreed to let this bill pass today and move the process forward.

Mr. Speaker, can we agree that the committee will, early next year, begin to look into this matter more closely with the National Reconnaissance Office so that we can place good reforms into our launch program and pursue what is best for our national security, let alone our taxpayers' best interests?

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

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Delaware has my commitment that, early in the 107th Congress, the committee will study and draft such reforms based upon the good work of the gentleman from Delaware, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), and others on the committee, which have been reflected in the bill. In fact, we have already done this. We have passed it, as the gentleman has said, both in the House and the Senate. I

think we had good product, I think we had good process, and I am sorry we find ourselves in this predicament.

However, I think the best resolution, as has been outlined, is to go forward with the vital bill. The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has my commitment that we will go back, and perhaps we can improve even more on the improvements the gentleman has already recommended to us.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida. I also would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), who spoke in favor of this, too. It is a shame we cannot get it done this year, but we do have to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. 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 H.R. 5630, the bill just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2000

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. December 13, 2000.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE JULIAN C. DIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, when I had returned to my Dis-

trict, I received word of the death of JULIAN DIXON, and so I called this morning our cloakroom to set aside 5 minutes so I could make a few remarks. I was not here on Friday, and I know a number of Members did take the time to acknowledge the great work of JULIAN. I know that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) subsequently had an hour set aside this evening to do that also.

I really got to know JULIAN when I was a staffer working for Mr. Michel. He did extraordinary work as the chairman of the Committee on Ethics and worked so hard to bring a lot of, I think, civility and order and fairness to a process that was mired in controversy.

Then after having been elected to this House in 1994, I had the great honor serving with JULIAN as the co-chair of one of our seminars at the first bipartisan retreat that was held in Hershey, Pennsylvania. JULIAN attended that bipartisan retreat, and he and I co-chaired or co-hosted a seminar with Members. Again, I got the opportunity to work closely with him.

As I had known before, I realized what an outstanding human being JULIAN DIXON really has been throughout his life, and I also learned of his ability to really bring people together and get people to understand the importance of working together.

Then I had the great opportunity 2 years ago to be appointed to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by the Speaker of the House. JULIAN has been the ranking member of that committee during the 2 years that I have been on, and one of the most distinguished members of the committee, one of the most bipartisan members of the committee. He was a very, very thoughtful individual who cared very much about the importance of having a good intelligence-gathering capability in this country and worked very hard on the committee, worked in a very bipartisan way with the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS).

So like all Members who have had the chance to work with JULIAN and to know his great talents, his wonderful talents, to know as importantly the fact that he is a marvelous human being, the House will miss him greatly. I know that all Members extend their sympathy to his family and to those who have worked with him, including his staff.

I know that he will be missed greatly, not only on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, but in the whole House, because he is truly someone who brings to this House the importance of working together, of cooperation, of civility, of decency.

So I am delighted to have this chance to pay my special tribute to a tremendous human being, someone who will be greatly missed, always admired, and really missed in the House and on the committee.

So it is with great sadness that I say my fond farewells to JULIAN DIXON. I

intend, along with I know a host of other Members, to attend the service for JULIAN on Wednesday in California and to personally offer my sympathy to his family.

So I appreciate the opportunity to say my farewells to a wonderful human being, a great Member, someone who brought great distinction to this House of Representatives.

CONTINUING RESOLUTIONS SPIRALING BEYOND SCOPE OF COMMON SENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on an issue which has simply spiraled completely beyond the scope of common sense. I am referring to the continuing resolution which we just voice-voted, the 20th continuing resolution since the new fiscal year began October 1, 2000.

Today is the 11th of December. For the last 72 days, we have been unable to negotiate and work out individual spending bills for a number of departments and agencies because of policy differences primarily over ergonomics rules and education funding. From time to time, we were led to believe that agreement had been reached on these issues only to be right back right here today, voting on yet another continuing resolution.

I did support the continuing resolution we voted on today. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to support any more continuing resolutions which are used to fund the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education through next year.

Certainly there are policy differences. There are always policy differences. That is the very foundation of our democratic system. However, these highly partisan protracted delays have serious and far-reaching consequences for millions of innocent victims. I am referring specifically to the millions of Americans who are dependent upon the National Institutes of Health to find new understanding and ultimate treatment of Alzheimer's disease, other brain illnesses, better treatment of spinal cord injuries and greater knowledge of the causes of cancer, heart disease, diabetes, HIV and AIDS, rheumatoid arthritis, and mental illness. Additionally, the human genome project supported by NIH holds the prospect of far-reaching advances in gene therapy to treat many illnesses.

Until this continuing resolution roller coaster started, the budget of the National Institutes of Health seemed about to experience its third consecutive annual increase of 15 percent following a bipartisan path to doubling the budget over 5 years. Under the scenario we are faced with today, despite strong support from both sides of the aisle and approval by a House-Senate conference committee, this increase appears to be under serious threat.

Funding for the National Institutes of Health is included in the Labor, Health and Human Services conference report, H.R. 4577. Without immediate enactment of this bill, funding increases are in peril. This fiscal year 2001 funding bill must move forward. To delay or to roll NIH funding into another continuing resolution would be a loss of an additional \$2.7 billion in medical research and a real setback and a loss of hope to the millions of Americans afflicted with serious diseases. Congress cannot, must not, let progress stall at year 3 on the 5-year plan to double NIH's budget.

Fiscal year 2001 funding is vitally important to allow our Nation's scientists and clinicians to enhance the health of the American people by exploiting the tremendous opportunities offered by the current revolution in biomedical research.

Last year, NIH was able to support 8,900 new research grants at universities across the Nation. Now, with a 15 percent increase, it anticipated supporting up to 9,500 in the current fiscal year. If the budget does not reflect the 15 percent increase and, instead, stays at the level of fiscal year 2000, only 5,000 new grants will be given out. A number of projects will be zero-funded. This could include initiatives in neurodegenerative diseases, including Parkinson's, and clinical trials for new treatments for childhood cancer and diabetes.

Not only would NIH lose its 15 percent increase, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention would lose a proposed increase of \$886 million. That includes an \$88 million increase for HIV prevention, \$36 million for childhood immunizations, and \$85 million for infectious disease control.

Another negative consequence of extending the current level funding in a continuing resolution is that the Center for Information Technology would be significantly restricted from providing necessary support of the NIH scientific and business communities. For example, the Center for Scientific Review would need to defer all purchases of computers and other equipment necessary to utilize the core data systems for the National Institutes of Health.

If our Nation is to sustain the momentum and continue to translate scientific discovery into better health and an improved quality of life for all Americans, then we just have to continue our commitment to double the NIH budget by 2003. Volatility and dramatic fluctuations in funding can be as harmful to the research community as inadequate growth. We risk wasting the investment that has been made for the past 2 years if scientists do not have those resources. So the bottom line is we cannot freeze the budget of the National Institutes of Health.

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE JULIAN C. DIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the flags on this building are flying at half mast, recognizing the departure of one of this body's most respected and best loved Members. JULIAN DIXON was a kind of gentleman that engendered the kind of respect that all of us would like to have as Members of this august body. So it was no wonder that, when I arrived here 8 years ago, he was one of the first people that I sought out to sit down with.

I had heard of JULIAN DIXON before coming here. I had read a whole lot about him and was particularly impressed with the fact that, at one of this body's most crucial times, JULIAN DIXON was called upon to chair the Committee on Ethics. It was his performance in that chairmanship that I believe maintained the stability that needed to be maintained in order to get the House of Representatives through that particular juncture.

1815

He was admired for his work there, but also admired for the work he performed as Chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations. That is one of the most difficult positions that one could be in because, as all of us know, the District of Columbia has a problem of taxation without representation. And of course that is a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and the person who chairs that subcommittee has probably more to say about the well-being or the ways and means of the District of Columbia than any other single person. JULIAN's performance on that subcommittee endeared him to all of the people in the District.

And then, of course, at the time of his death he was serving as the ranking member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. JULIAN DIXON's performance there had to be admirable because, as all of us know, that is a special committee, one that requires a special kind of person. And of course everyone who knew JULIAN knew that he had within him the capacity to do well as ranking member on that committee. Many of us had looked forward to the day when JULIAN would be chair of that committee. But as the omnipotent and omnipresent being willed it, such would not be the case.

JULIAN DIXON was the former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. As its current chair, it is with great respect that I requested this time this evening so those members of the Congressional Black Caucus who were not here on Friday, when we received news of his death and of course then entered into a spontaneous special tribute to him, so