United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 27, 1995 No. 123

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

On this day when we will dedicate the Korean War Veterans Memorial we recall those who served with dedication and honor over the years of the conflict and whose lives we remember with gratitude and appreciation. We pray, O gracious God, that our recollection of their devotion to duty, honor, and country will remind every person of their sacrifice and their willingness to serve at the Nation's call. May Your blessing, O God, that is new every morning and unites each person in peace, be with them who served and with their families, that Your grace will abide in their lives, now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 21. An act to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

ANOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces there will be ten 1-minutes on each side.

THE KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, all too often the war in Korea—which ended 42 years ago—is referred to as the forgotten war. That reference will end—once and for all—today as America rightfully remembers a war and its warriors who served this Nation with honor, courage, and dignity. This afternoon, thousands of veterans of that demanding and difficult conflict will gather on The Mall to dedicate an impressive memorial which is long overdue and richly deserved.

The Korean War Veterans Memorial will be a lasting tribute to the 54,246 Americans killed in Korea between 1950 and 1953. They fought with determination and valor, and in the end these brave Americans turned the tide of battle from near-certain defeat into victory.

Behind every war-related statistic there is a face, a family, a story, and a sacrifice. Those who came home deserve a place to remember those who did not. That place will be dedicated today. On this occasion, it is both fitting and appropriate to remind ourselves that we cannot live in a land of the free without first honoring the brave.

To the veterans of Korea, you are appreciated by a grateful nation.

A TRIBUTE TO BRITTANY HEUER

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 25, the life of Brittany Heuer was taken away from us. Brittany was only 18 years old.

Just a short 2 years ago, Brittany served as a page here in the people's House. Brittany's tremendous personality, her beautiful smile, and her willingness to help each and every one of us was always present here on this floor. But what makes this passing even more painful to the Members of the House, if you think carefully, Brittany's dad, Gary, doorman for the Sergeant at Arms, strong but gentle man, is also seated out here on the Republican side, friend to all of us, always working hard to take care of our interests. Now he pains deeply.

My colleagues, on behalf of all of the Members of the House, we want to extend to Gary and his beautiful wife Ginger, daughter Ashley, and all the Heuer family and friends our deepest sympathy.

The viewing will be today from 2 to 4 and from 6 to 8 p.m. in Waldorf, MD at the Huntt Funeral Home. Services will be Friday, the 28th, at 10 a.m. at the Huntt Funeral Home in Waldorf, MD.

My colleagues, may the good Lord keep Brittany and may the good Lord keep an eye on the Heuer family in this sad, sad time.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

READ THE REPORT ON MEDICARE

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Americans to read a report that was filed by the trustees of the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare trust fund. It is a short report. It is only 14 pages.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is our duty to urge senior citizens and Americans of all ages who care about Medicare for themselves but also for their children and their grandchildren, as we care about it for our parents and our grandparents, that they read this report. They can receive the report. It is 14 pages. It is a 14-page summary of the annual report to the American citizens. They can receive it by calling 202–224–3121. Ask to be connected to your Representative's office. At that number, 202–224–3121, ask for a summary of the annual report of the Medicare trustees.

It is factual. It is nonpoliticized. It is something, frankly, that many Members of the other side of the aisle do not want you to read, but it explains very clearly what is going on with Medicare.

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID IN FLORIDA

(Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House today about a very serious problem that will occur in my native State, the State of Florida. I am a fifth generation Floridian, and I dearly love my State, but they are confronted with a problem dealing with Medicare.

If the current bill that is proposed is passed, it will be a $1 billion cut over the next 5 years that will hit my constituents and all senior citizens in Florida. In my congressional district alone, they will be hit over $50 million.

To compound that, if Medicaid is block granted, we will have a catastrophic fiscal problem in Florida. Medicaid block grant will not even equal inflation. If does not even come close to the increase in growth that this State experiences, between 8 and 12 percent.

I call upon my 13 Republican colleagues from Florida to reconsider their position dealing with Medicare and Medicaid, not for political reasons but for the reason that I think they are devoted to this State as well as I.

SAVE MEDICARE

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hearing a lot these days from the liberal Democrats. The have heard terms ''tax cuts from the rich'' and ''mean spirited,'' and all the usual class warfare terminology.

But there is something the American people will not hear from the liberal Democrats. The American people will not hear the liberals talk about the report from the President's Medicare trustees. They will not hear quotes from this report saying that ''concerted action must be taken promptly to address'' the critical problems with Medicare.

There is something else the Democrats will not be talking about.

They will not be talking about the millions of Americans who would be left out in the cold if Medicare were to go bankrupt. They will not talk about the seniors who would be unable to meet their health care needs.

Mr. Speaker, the liberals should acknowledge this report and work with Republicans to save Medicare.

SUPPORT MEDICARE

(Ms. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Medicare's 30th anniversary. It was approved by this great legislative body on July 27, 1965.

We sometimes take for granted Medicare and the impact Medicare has had on our seniors. Prior to Medicare, only 46 percent of our seniors had any health insurance. While those over 65 suffered the highest poverty rate, with almost a third living in poverty, today virtually every senior has health insurance. Medicare has been enormously successfully in ameliorating the suffering of our seniors while providing them with the dignity of knowing that health care will be there when they need it.

As a freshman, I was somewhat perplexed and surprised by my Republican colleagues' attack on this program without offering real reform. I have recently studied the history of Medicare enactment. President Harry Truman first introduced Medicare legislation in 1952.

For 13 years until its signing in law by President Johnson, Republicans voted overwhelmingly and consistently against Medicare. Republican antipathy on Medicare remains. They continue to try to dismantle this very successful program. This Congress should work to preserve what has been successful in improving the lives of our seniors.

On Sunday, let us celebrate a happy 30th birthday to Medicare and pledge to our seniors our support in protecting this successful program.

STRENGTHEN MEDICARE

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago Sunday, President Johnson signed Medicare into law. There are 37 million Americans who depend upon Medicare, including my own mom and my in-laws.

According to a recent report by the Medicare trustees, the Medicare trust fund starts going bankrupt in 1996. The new congressional majority is committed to preserving, protecting, and strengthening Medicare. We need to take the best ideas from the private sector because they do a much better job at health care than the government-run system.

We should also explore other options like medical savings accounts. We need to root out the fraud and the abuse that cheats the beneficiaries out of their money. It drains the reserves of the Medicare trust fund.

Finally, we need to keep partisan politics out of the discussion of Medicare. We need to put aside our differences and all of us work together to provide the strengthening of Medicare.

STRENGTHEN MEDICARE, DO NOT GUT IT

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, in defending their indefensible cuts to Medicare, my Republican colleagues say we are increasing spending on Medicare. Only in Washington, DC can a cut be called an increase. This argument ignores the real-world implications of their so-called increases.

I challenge my colleagues to talk to real seniors who are struggling financially. They, not us, are the real experts on Medicare.

Ask them whether paying $1,000 more a year for health care is, A, an increase, or, B, a cut. Ask them if being forced into HMO's, which will limit their choice of doctors, is, A, an increase, or, B, a cut.

They will answer that they are having to pay more for less. They may have to compromise food and shelter to pay more for health care. We must hold firm on Medicare. We must strengthen it, not gut it. Medicare is the real contract with the people of America.

SAVE MEDICARE

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, good Lord, the spin control is going so crazy here, I think I am going to fall down. I mean, I cannot stand up much more with this.

We hear somebody saying as a freshman I was perplexed that the Republicans had disdain for Medicare. I am a freshman, and I am perplexed that a report comes out 2 months ago saying Medicare is going bankrupt and the Democrats are not going to do anything about it.

That is perplexing to me. Then we talked about Washington speak, and we have got the Democrats saying that a

spending increase from $4,500 this year to $6,800 7 years from now is a spending cut. Again, more spin control.

Then we get somebody coming in from my home State, Florida, saying I want to protect the senior citizens in Florida. Yet the gentleman knows it goes bankrupt 7 years from now, and every senior citizen from Florida to California is without Medicare if we follow the Democrats' path.

As a Democrat says, beam me up, Scotty, I cannot take any more. I have to hold onto this podium tight because the spin control is going crazy. Let us talk reality for a second and talk real numbers. We are willing to save Medicare, and I hope we get some help from the Democrats.

□ 1020

REPUBLICANS NOW ENGAGED IN DAMAGE CONTROL REGARDING CUTS TO MEDICARE

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is really damage control that they are engaged in. Those who are trying to cut Medicare massively are now trying to cover their tracks with deception. The majority party is now working with a group calling itself the Senior Coalition and it is passing around what they call ''the Pledge to save Medicare.''

Testimony from this group a few weeks ago before the Committee on Ways and Means came out in support of $270 billion in the Republican cuts, though they did not know what was in the cuts. This pledge says: ''Let's increase Medicare spending for beneficiaries, even though the $270 billion cut would increase copayments and deductible for seniors.'' This so-called pledge talks about maintaining the current Medicare fee-for-service system, even though the $270 billion in cuts would squeeze the option of fee-for-service for seniors. The majority party is on the run. There is no place to hide; surely not behind a cloud of deception.

NASA'S REMOTE SENSING TECHNOLOGY

(Mr. SALMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, 23,000 acres in the Scottsdale, AZ area were ravaged by terrible brush fires. The damage could have been much worse if not for a partnership between NASA and the city of Scottsdale.

Testing the applications of a new technology, called remote sensing, NASA jets flying over the blaze beamed images of the fire's hot spots via satellite to the ground. Firefighters were then able to use their limited resources more effectively and contain the blaze days sooner than they had thought possible, thus saving property, money, and lives.

Mr. Speaker, we will vote today to continue the excellent scientific research that is being conducted at NASA, and to streamline the agency by moving mature technologies toward privatization. The way Scottsdale and NASA worked together is a wonderful example of space technology being used to improve the lives of those of us here on Earth.

A SORRY BIRTHDAY GREETING FOR MEDICARE ON ITS 30TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOGGETT. It is the 30th birthday of Medicare, Mr. Speaker. What we have heard again this morning are birthday greetings for Medicare recipients from our Republican colleagues. It all boils down to a single sentence: They are saying to the older Americans of this country, ''If you will pay more for your health care, we will give you less health care.'' That is a pretty sorry birthday greeting, so they had to hire a public relations firm, and I have their report here, to tell them, ''Don't talk about improving Medicare. We can't afford to raise expectations, but keep in mind that seniors are very PAC-oriented and very susceptible to being led.'' That is what the Republican public relations firm told them to tell older Americans.

Then they came up with a Medicare pledge from a so-called Seniors Coalition. What that pledge says is, when you read between the lines, ''Raise the deductible, raise the premiums, pay more, and get less, Mr. And Mrs. Older American.'' That is a sorry birthday greeting for Medicare. When Lyndon Johnson signed Medicare into law, he signed a candle of hope, and we cannot have that candle extinguished by this Republican initiative.

THE FIRES OF MEDICARE ARE BURNING

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but notice that my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], continually wants to go with budget overruns and time overruns. The fact is this: The best way to preserve Medicare is to stand now to save it, not play the old whining game of the liberals saying, ''We need to spend more and more,'' but find a way to say ''Yes, spend more money, but spend it more effectively.''

My colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], made mention of the fire in my district and the fact that firefighters had to stand and deliver.

We have a crisis that is just as imminent as that fire. The fires of Medicare are burning. If we really want to save it, then my friends on this side, the liberals, come with us, let us work to solve the problem, and quit playing the sordid politics of the past.

REPUBLICAN PARTY DOTH PROTEST TOO MUCH CONCERNING MEDICARE

(Mr. DEUTSCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my Republican colleagues, ''Thou doth protest too much.'' Let me talk about specifics. I hope that the people of this country are watching and getting engaged in this debate, because the reality of the 30-year history of the Medicare system is it never had more than a 10-year actual life. In fact, at one point in time, it had a 2-year actuarial life.

The majority party has made adjustments, or the former majority party has made adjustments. In my first year in Congress in 1993, we had a $50 billion adjustment to the Medicare system. What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are proposing is a $270 billion cut in Medicare, astronomical by any comparison to what had ever been done before. It was not dictated by actuarial analysis. It was dictated by their budget, and they drew that. There is no doubt they can save $270 billion in Medicare, but the Medicare that will exist in America under the Republican plan will adversely affect 37 million people in this country. It will not be the Medicare that we know today.

WORKING TOGETHER TO SAVE MEDICARE

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. As we have heard, Mr. Speaker, the Medicare anniversary is July 30. Thirty years it has been in existence. This vital program, while it is only 30 years old, faces a very strong financial crisis. I think everybody on both sides of the aisle knows that. The Medicare board of trustees have concluded that Medicare part A, the hospital insurance trust fund, will be bankrupt in 7 years. We cannot say it any more simply. We will be unable to pay those bills for seniors.

The Republican majority will not let this happen and I am sure many of the Democrats do not want that to happen. We understand the importance of Medicare to seniors and stand ready to protect, preserve, and to strengthen this

program for current and future retirees. Unfortunately, many of our political opponents are trying to turn Medicare, the Medicare crisis, into a political issue. They continue to distort the idea of protecting Medicare by scaring seniors with imagined Medicare cuts, even though, as everybody knows, the benefits go per beneficiary from $4,800 to $6,700.

I would just ask the Democratic leadership and the Democrats on the other side, please help us. Join up with us, roll up your sleeves, let us achieve both better care with more choices. Let us protect and strengthen Medicare.

DO NOT REPEAL MEDICARE, THE ORIGINAL CONTRACT WITH SENIORS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, elected officials should listen more and talk less. I listened today while my Republican colleagues talked about how they intend to save Medicare. What they did not say is how they reduce expected needs of Medicare $270 billion over 7 years and still cut taxes $245 billion. Cut taxes, cut Medicare. Does that balance out?

Medicare. There is an estimated $44 billion in fraud and abuse in the Medicare system. Maybe we do have some agreement on both sides, and we can cut fraud and abuse and still provide for senior health care. However, it also appears that the new Republican majority is cutting personnel in the Health Care Financing Administration, the GAO, who investigate the fraud in Medicare. Furthermore, the account in the Labor-HHS appropriation bill is $2 million below last year for finding fraud, waste, and abuse. We need to save Medicare by cutting the fraud, but only in Washington can a $270 billion cut be said it is to save the program. We do not need to repeal the original contract with American seniors in 1965. Happy birthday—Medicare.

PRESIDENT CLINTON MUST REALIZE THERE IS NO PEACE IN BOSNIA TO KEEP

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how many times will we have to watch President Clinton flip-flop on his Bosnian policy before we lift the arms embargo?

How much more indecision and bad judgment calls, not to mention flubbed airstrikes by the United Nations will we have to endure?

How many lives are we going to have to lose before common sense wins out?

The President is upholding an embargo on a country that no longer exists that will further involve the United States and possibly our troops in a war that is not ours to fight. We do not need U.N. control, we need U.S. control.

We keep hearing that we cannot lift the embargo because President Clinton wants to do whatever he can to keep the peace. Mr. Speaker, when is he going to realize that there is no peace to keep?

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO MEDICARE

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Medicare's 30th birthday, let us remember its genesis.

It was the people of this country who asked their government to enter into a partnership with them to provide security in their later years.

It was an idea supported by Presidents Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, and even Nixon.

It was an idea that worked and continues to work.

Not one of my constituents has ever written, called, or met with me asking me to gut Medicare, eliminate it, or slash its funding.

The Republicans seem to think that they can fool the citizens of this country into thinking that their massive cuts will somehow reform the system. Cuts, I might add, that are suspiciously similar to the amount of money needed for their tax break package.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare is a trust fund, not a slush fund. It is a program whose inception began with the American people and is still overwhelmingly supported by them.

Let us celebrate Medicare's 30th birthday, Mr. Speaker, not prepare for its funeral.

REPUBLICANS' PROPOSAL CONTAINS MORE, NOT LESS, SPENDING FOR MEDICARE

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this truly is an amazing 20 minutes, and surely must be very confusing to those people who are listening. Perhaps if we simplify this a little and do a little of the things that we might have done in the fourth grade, and use some repetition.

The average spending per Medicare beneficiary today is $4,800. Under the Republican plan, Medicare spending per beneficiary in the year 2002 will be $6,700. Under this plan, Medicare spending increases by $1,900 per beneficiary. That is a 40-percent increase. Let us try again, Mr. Speaker.

The average spending per Medicare beneficiary today is $4,800. Under the Republican plan, Medicare spending per beneficiary in the year 2002 will be $6,700. Under this plan Medicare spending will increase by $1,900.

Mr. Speaker, that is a 40-percent increase.

THE WACO TRAGEDY: THE TRUTH VERSUS DAVID KORESH'S DREAM TEAM

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have been very concerned that the actions of the ATF and the FBI were inappropriate, to say the least, in that tragedy that occurred for everyone in Waco. Therefore, as one who is concerned about the ATF and the FBI action, I observed with great interest the congressional hearings that were held in the last Congress, and I have been an equally observant watcher of the congressional hearings about Waco in this Congress. I must say, the hearings this time have been politicized, and in my judgment, worse, are really an embarrassment to this House, and to the American people who seek to find out the truth.

The Republican majority on the committee are tragically acting like the defense for the Branch Davidians. They are appearing to be David Koresh's dream team. That is embarrassing. We need to get at the truth.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 201 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 201

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule, and the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as pending. That amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. If that amendment is adopted,

the provisions of the bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule. Further consideration of the bill for amendment shall proceed by title rather than by paragraph. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. All points of order against amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules are waived. During further consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 201 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2099, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and various independent agencies for fiscal year 1996. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI—prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislation in an appropriations bill—and also waives clause 6 of rule XXI—prohibiting reappropriations—against provisions of the bill.

The rule further provides that after general debate, this bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as pending. That amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. If the amendment is adopted, the provisions of the bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule. Further consideration of the bill for amendment shall proceed by title rather than by paragraph, and each title shall be considered as read.

The rule also makes in order the amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules, and waives all points of order against these amendments. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition of Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Finally, the rule allows one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to applaud subcommittee chairman, JERRY LEWIS, and ranking member, LOUIS STOKES, along with the rest of the members of the Appropriations Committee for a job well done. They've performed miracles in meeting the needs of our country's veterans as well as the housing requirements of the needy and the elderly. The bill also funds NASA and numerous other agencies, and I am especially pleased to see that almost $2 billion has been allocated for the space station, which I strongly support.

But there is no higher priority, Mr. Speaker, than meeting the Federal Government's obligation to honor the commitment made to the veterans of this Nation. Whether it was during World War I, World War II, where I proudly served, or in Korea or Vietnam, or even during more recent military conflicts, over 27 million men and women risked their lives for the United States of America. We owe it to them to ensure that they have an adequate standard of living, and receive the medical care and other benefits they earned through their service to this country. The committee did an excellent job in making limited funds go a long way in order to live up to our obligations to our veterans, and I commend them for their dedication and hard work.

Mr. Speaker, this open rule will allow all Members to fully participate in the amendment process, and I urge its adoption. I include the following materials for the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 25, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open [2]	46	44	39	73
Modified Closed [3]	49	47	12	23
Closed [4]	9	9	2	4
Totals:	104	100	53	100

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 25, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/2/95)

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 25, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242–190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95)
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95)
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95)
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95)
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95)
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95)
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95)
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

□ 1040

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly oppose this rule and the bill it makes in order, the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

This rule sanctions the most flagrant and wholesale violation in memory of the House rule that prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill. By protecting major legislative changes—policy changes—contained in this bill, it allows the Appropriations Committee to run roughshod over the authorizing committees.

If Democrats, when we were in the majority, had ever proposed a rule that protected by waivers so many major changes in substantive law, our Republican colleagues would have protested loudly and vehemently—and they would have been right. This rule ought to be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, up until today, we have generally accepted the need for waivers of rule XXI—the prohibition on legislation in an appropriations bill—which have been contained in the rules for consideration of appropriations bills this year. We recognize, from our years of being in the majority, that it is extremely difficult to avoid all violations of rule XXI in an appropriations bill.

There are almost always cases where it is necessary to include funds for programs or agencies that have not been reauthorized yet, or where it is necessary to provide some guidance to the agencies in the way moneys are spent. So we understand, and agree, that there are often legitimate and appropriate reasons to waive rule XXI.

However, the waiver of rule XXI provided by this rule goes far beyond the bounds of what can reasonably be considered legitimate or appropriate. This waiver is being used to allow the Appropriations Committee to substantially rewrite major environmental and housing laws. It is being used to allow the Appropriations Committee to usurp the function of the authorizing committees, and to deny the House the opportunity to have a full debate on these policy changes. That, in our view, is an egregious misuse of the waiver.

The majority defends this waiver by saying that the authorizing committee chairmen agreed to the Appropriations Committee's inclusion of legislative language in areas under their jurisdiction, which follows a policy that was established when the Democratic party was in the majority of providing rule XXI waivers only in such cases.

However, that policy worked when we were in the majority because our party's authorizing committee chairmen did not agree to major revisions to laws under their jurisdiction in appropriations bill, as the current authorizing committee chairmen apparently do. These chairmen are evidently willing to cede their responsibilities to the Appropriations Committee, rather than defend the integrity of the legislative process by insisting on their committees' right to make major policy changes the way they should be made, through authorizing legislation.

We suspect that the reason they are agreeing to this intrusion on their committees' rightful role and obligation is because they realize that these policy revisions might not withstand the scrutiny of a full-scale debate, with possible amendments, on the House floor.

To make matters worse, the rule denies rule XXI protection to amendments that would allow the House to debate these policy changes. It denies waivers for all but two amendments that Members sought protection for—amendments to be offered by Mr. KLUG of Wisconsin, and by Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. No amendments sought by Member from our side of the aisle received the protection they need in this rule.

During the Rules Committee consideration of this rule, our efforts to allow considering these amendments were rejected on a party line vote. As a result, the House will not have the opportunity to debate important amendments that were sought by Mr. STOKES of Ohio, the ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, or Mrs. ROUKEMA of New Jersey.

We believe that if we are going to rewrite policy in appropriations bills then, in the interest of fairness, and of producing the best possible legislation, we ought to protect the amendments Members want to offer so that the House can have a full debate on these policy changes. That is particularly true if the House is faced with a bill, such as this one, that makes drastic policy changes that will significantly affect virtually all of our citizens.

Consider what this bill does to the environment: It slashes funds for environmental protection by 32 percent, providing one-third less than what we are currently spending. These cuts would cripple EPA's enforcement efforts, seriously weakening the implementation of virtually every major environmental law—including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe

Drinking Water Act, and the law regulating the use of pesticides. It would prohibit EPA from initiating cleanup at new Superfund sites.

In addition, 17 legislative provisions in the bill—language protected by this rule—would prohibit EPA from enforcing or implementing most Clean Water Act programs, including wetlands protection, new effluent discharge standards, new pretreatment standards, and new water quality standards; prohibit EPA regulatory actions with respect to many Clean Air Act rules; prohibit EPA actions on pesticides which had previously been allowed to be used on raw agricultural commodities; restrict the ability of EPA to issue rules concerning the emission of toxic substances from cement kilns and other industrial furnaces; prohibit EPA from implementing the Great Lakes Water Quality Program; prohibit EPA from taking actions against polluters whose violations are uncovered through state audits; and make numerous other changes that hamper the EPA's ability to protect the health and safety of our citizens.

When the funding cuts and legislative changes contained in this bill are combined with the changes to environmental policy that have been made in other bills the House has passed this year—including the Clean Water Act revision, and the so-called regulatory reform bills—this effort amounts to nothing less than a full-scale assault on the environmental protection laws that have served our Nation so well during the past three decades.

The other area that is cut drastically by this bill is housing, where funding is reduced by 25 percent from this year's level.

Here, too, the funding cuts and the legislative changes in the bill amount to significant changes in housing policy. Among other provisions, this bill would raise the rent ceiling for families living in pubic housing; suspend the existing preference system for public housing tenants; and suspend the one-for-one replacement rule for public housing. It would also prohibit HUD from issuing or enforcing a rule to apply the Fair Housing Act to the underwriting of property insurance, and make numerous other policy changes.

On top of all that, this bill also eliminates all funding for a number of current programs, including the AmeriCorps National Service Program, the Community Development Bank initiative, and the FDIC Affordable Housing Program. In addition, it provides for the termination of the Council of Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality within the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that reason that the bill cuts spending 13 percent below current levels is because the VA–HUD Subcommittee had a much smaller spending allocation to work with than in the past. However, I would point out that the subcommittee was in that position only because of the misguided budget priorities that the Republican majority has imposed. Those priorities are forcing Congress to make deep cuts in domestic programs in order to pay for unnecessary increases in defense spending—including more weaponry than the Defense Department itself has requested—and tax cuts that will mainly benefit the wealthiest among us.

Mr. Speaker, this is a truly bad rule—one that would trash our most important procedural safeguard, that protects the most egregious violation of legislating on an appropriations bill in memory—and that does so to allow the House to make damaging changes to environmental and housing laws with only minimal debate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and on the bill.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me point out that, yes, I am the chairman of the Committee on Rules, but before that I was the senior ranking Republican on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 10 years. I was very, very proud of that service.

I rise now somewhat concerned with my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], who wants people to come over here and vote against this open rule. I just cannot believe what I am hearing. First of all, let us get the record straight once and for all. If you are listening back in your offices, Members, you had better listen up, because your political life is at stake here.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] wants you to come over here and vote against this rule. Behind the scenes, the reason they want this rule defeated is because they are concerned that there are cuts in such things as the Environmental Protection Agency, in housing, and a whole host of other things.

What they are not telling you is that we have spent days and days and days on something, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the former chairman and the ranking Democrat on that committee, myself, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and members of his committee. We have struggled for weeks to get adequate funding for the other part of this veterans and housing and independent agencies bill, and that is the veterans' medical care delivery system.

I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], but let me digress just 1 more minute before I do that.

If Members come over here and vote against this rule, then this bill does not come to the floor. And what happens? All of the issues are reopened. If you are going to increase funding for housing or the Environmental Protection Agency or all these other things, where do you think it is going to come from? It is going to come out of the only part of this bill that has an increase, and that is the veterans' portion of the budget. Think about that, ladies and gentleman. I want you to come over here and I dare you to vote against this rule.

Let us get back to the bill itself. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] came here with me 17 years ago. He has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I had an opportunity to serve on that committee when our good friend Jack Kemp stepped down and chose not to seek reelection. I did not do that because I liked the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I liked the Committee on Rules, where I thought I could be of some help.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has done an outstanding job. When we look at the budget that we had to vote for with its allocation to the 13 functional areas of Government, I guess perhaps the gentleman from California has had the toughest job of all in trying to make sure that this entire portion of the budget was treated fairly.

Let me tell you, they have treated it fairly. The Clinton administration had asked for an increase in the Veterans' Administration function, as they did with many other functions. As a matter of fact, they asked for so many increases that they would have increased the national debt by $1 trillion over the next 5 years if we had allowed that.

But we did not, because we have a deeper responsibility, and that is to balance this budget over the next 7 years. To do that, you have to cut just about everything. You have to get this spending under control, this leviathan sea monster that is literally drowning this country in a sea of red ink. Members of this Congress have done it.

In this particular bill, we have been able to scrimp and save and put together almost $300 million in additional spending over what was originally presented. In other words, we have adjusted the 602(b) allocation. That is inside-the-beltway talk, but what that means is, in other words, in the caps we have to live with, we have been able to in these last several weeks, after much negotiation, to raise that 602(b) allocation, the caps, by about $300 million, with all of it going into the veterans' medical care delivery system.

In addition, we have been able to adjust other functions within the Veterans' Administration to make sure that we have got adequate funding, similar to what was asked for by Secretary Brown and President Bill Clinton, of almost $480 million. That is about some 80 to 85 percent of what they were asking for.

In this particular bill, we have increases for the veterans' affairs and no increases for anything else.

I just want to say this. We are going to have amendments that are going to be offered on this floor today, and they are going to offer to cut other functions and put more money into the veterans' affairs functions. I am going to tell you this: That after all of the negotiations that we have gone through, that I am going to oppose any of those amendments that are going to try to cut other areas and put more money into veterans' affairs.

I have stood on this floor for 17 years as an advocate for the veterans, and I guess I have more plaques hanging on my wall than any other Member of this Congress, just about, for what we have tried to do for veterans. But I am going to tell you, the veterans that I represent know that we have done a good job, that it is adequately funded with the moneys that we have to work with this year.

I would just hope that every Member would not only come over here and vote for this rule, but that then they would support the gentleman from California's appropriation bill because it is an outstanding job that he has done. And I just commend the gentleman for it.

I will be here on this floor all day long. I will be glad to enter into a colloquy with anybody. I will be glad to go outside and enter into a colloquy and discuss what we have done. I think that the other Members who have worked so diligently with us to put this together will do the same thing.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief colloquy?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the pressures that the gentleman is under and the attitude with which he brings out this year's budget.

I would just point out to the gentleman that we would have about $245 billion more to play with if we were not involved in an enormous tax cut for the richest people in this country and that we could address a lot more of the veterans' needs, of the needs of the homeless and many other people in this country, the kind of capabilities they need their Government to be providing them. After the veterans of this country have served us, it seems to me that to be cutting the taxes for the richest people in the Nation is a very irresponsible act that is being undertaken at this same time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, I will be glad to continue with the gentleman on his time to say that the gentleman has a point, that there have been recommendations for tax cuts.

I personally think that a $500 tax cut for individual families in this country is not too much to ask for. I do not think that a capital gains tax cut is too much to ask for.

I am going to be speaking in Hyde Park, NY, Saturday morning, whether there is a session here or not, before many, many senior citizens who have worked all their lives. They have saved and they have scrimped, they have a little stock involved and they have held onto that stock. Now they want to sell it, but they do not want the Government to confiscate all of their profit after holding that stock for 20 or 30 years. That to me is being compassionate, and that is what we are really doing.

The gentleman's points are well taken.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SOLOMON. Why do you not get your time, then I will be glad to answer your questions. We are running out of time over here.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would much prefer to spend the time debating this than anything else the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has to say.

Mr. SOLOMON. I have to retain my time and yield back my time. Come on over here and let us talk about it.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to associate myself with the excellent statement of Mr. BEILENSON.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that in my opinion, the bill we are discussing today is badly flawed. I had hoped to be able to offer amendments to improve this legislation somewhat, but under the unfair terms of this rule, I am restricted in the amendments I will be able to offer.

This rule demonstrates—in the clearest manner possible—the lack of respect the Republican majority has for the rules of the House of Representatives and for the rights of the minority. The rule waives points of order against nearly 30 pages of pure legislative language in the bill. That is right. More than one-third of the total bill is legislation that could be struck on points of order if not protected by this rule. I am not talking about technical violations. And I am not talking about waivers for lack of authorization. What I am referring to are changes in substantive law—pages and pages of it.

The rule also makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Republican bill manager. Although it makes 20 separate changes to the bill, this amendment is not subject to amendment or to a demand for a division. In addition, two other amendments requested by Republicans are protected by the rule from points or order. By way of contrast, not one of the nine amendments Democratic Members sought to have protected under the rule received protection.

When I testified before the Rules Committee earlier in the week, I asked that the legislative provisions in the bill not be protected. If that request could not be granted, I requested waivers of certain Democratic amendments so at a minimum the House could have a debate on the merits of these very important issues. That request for fairness was also rejected.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I refer to a memorandum sent from the chairman of the Rules Committee to the Republican leadership earlier this month. The following statement was made:

> The more legislative policy debates that are injected into the appropriations process, beyond mere cutting amendments, the longer the amendment process on which bill will take. A greater effort could be made by the leadership to limit legislative provisions and amendments on appropriations bills in favor of debating and voting on these through the regular authorization process.

In my opinion, it is a grave mistake that the suggestion of the Rules Committee chairman was not followed on this bill. The debate on repealing the Brooke amendment or on repealing the Delaney amendment should be managed by the Legislative Committees after proper hearings and deliberation. It should not be accomplished on this appropriations bill.

I urge defeat of the rule.

□ 1100

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I first want to express my very sincere appreciation to both the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], my colleague on the Committee on Rules, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], for their courtesy during our effort to put this bill together and to fashion a rule that allowed us to go forward with the work that we had to do here. I would like also to express my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for his very kind remarks regarding our effort on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we will have plenty of time today to discuss the substance of this bill, so I do not intend to put us through any of that at this moment, except to mention a couple of items that may not come up in the debate and reference a bit of the discussion relative to the language that exists within this bill.

Earlier in the year, during the rescissions process, the new majority made some effort to address what the House had done relating to spending during the 1995 fiscal year. It became very obvious to all of us that we were establishing spending priorities for the future of this country.

The effort is an attempt to reduce the rate of growth of spending across

the Government. There is little doubt that all of us recognize the need, progressively, to try to make sense out of what we are doing with our budget in terms of the national debt. Whether my colleagues are supportive of balancing the budget by 2002, as we propose, or they support the idea of balancing budget in a 10-year period as the President has proposed, clearly, we are going to have to address the question of reducing spending across all those elements of Government, especially where there is discretionary spending.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those bills with the largest pools of discretionary spending. There is not any doubt that because the appropriations process is moving ahead of the authorization process, that there are implications between policy direction and what we ought to be doing with spending. Because of that, we have been working very, very closely with all of our authorizing committees. We are working with approximately six different committees, working with their chairmen with members, Democrat and Republican alike, attempting to seek new direction from those policy committees.

That has led to the addition of a good deal of language in this bill, much of which has been protected. I am a Member of the House who has long said that the appropriations process should be as separate as possible from the policy work of the authorization committees, but this is a most unusual year.

Post ''the revolution,'' our policy has implications relative to spending and the reverse is also true. So I want the House to know that while we have language in many instances that is designed to help us reduce spending, it is not the intention of this chairman to have the appropriations process become the authorization process in the years ahead. I would hope in the future that we will have very little language. But, indeed, the language in this bill is very important in terms of that overall effort to get a handle on the budget and move towards balancing the budget. We are at the same time, redirecting a long-established pattern of more spending every year by way of our appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one other subject area and that deals with the section of this bill that involves funding for NASA. Earlier in the year, we had no small amount of controversy swirl around the recommendations of this subcommittee that related to closing down some centers of NASA—three of them—and also to terminate one major program and delay a couple of others.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the Members how we came to that position, for it has had a very interesting impact upon our process. During the rescission work that I mentioned earlier, I had the opportunity to work with a number of my agencies. None was more cooperative than NASA. NASA stepped up to the plate and Administrator Goldin was most helpful in helping us examine their priorities.

Because of this, NASA did quite well in the rescissions process. We attempted to have the same kind of communication during the 1996 appropriation process, and that began with meetings between myself and Administrator Goldin.

We thought we were on a perfect pathway to effective cooperation, and then I received a phone call from the Administrator and his staff that indicated that somewhere on high, above the Administrator's office, the word had come down from the administration that they did not want communication with our committee about those priorities.

They said, ''Let the committee make its cuts itself.'' Essentially, they were saying, ''Do not cooperate.'' I suggested to the Administrator, and the people at NASA, that their bill would come forward in much different form than it might otherwise have, because I felt there was a need to consider the impact of infrastructure upon costs. We should be willing to reexamine programs in place to see if they continue to work.

It was very important that we be able to consider elements like that as we evaluated NASA's future. Clearly, I knew that we were not going to close centers, but we did need to send a message, not just to NASA but especially a message to this administration, that we need their cooperation if these bills are going to make sense for the country. Democrats and Republicans, we need to work together. Indeed, I was very disappointed in the administration's lack of willingness to cooperate.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is going to be a very controversial bill, without any question, but it does put us on a pathway that indeed gives us a real shot at balancing our budget by 2002.

We treated each account as equitably as possible. VA medical care is a very important account and we have done very well in that connection. From there, the reductions in spending that are involved treat every other agency in an equitable fashion, one against the other.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill, in my judgment. I appreciate the Members' attention, I certainly appreciate their support, and I look forward to their vote for the bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an outrage. This rule is an outrage. It makes a mockery of every promise made by the Republican leadership to run an open and democratic House.

The bill contains page after page of far-reaching and devastating legislative changes that change basic housing policy of the past 20 or 25 years.

Whether it is the suspension of the Brooke amendment, which holds down rents for the poorest people in our society, or rent increases for families and senior citizens; the micromanagement of HUD administration; or the hamstringing of the Office of Fair Housing, the bill will create more homelessness and result in more abandonment of and disinvestment from our cities and sets of policies than we have considered in the Congress since I have served here.

Worst of all, Mr. Speaker, these changes are being made with absolutely no consideration of the authorizing committees. What we have here is a complete abandonment of the responsibility of people that come here to the Congress of the United States, are assigned to the authorizing committees, and then back off, never hold a hearing, never have an up-or-down vote on policies, and cede all of their authority to the Committee on Appropriations.

The appropriations, because they want to achieve not only a balanced budget but they want to provide a $250 billion tax cut to the richest Americans, not to senior citizens as was described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, but to the richest people in this country. That is where those tax breaks are going and that is why these cuts are being made and they are made without ever anyone standing up and having a debate about it.

So what happens is the authorizing committee takes a powder. We have a bunch of brain-dead people around here; flatliners who are not even taking the fundamental responsibility of holding a hearing and asking the real questions about how we should be making our priorities.

So, it is ceded to the appropriators. The appropriators take that authority and they say, ''Let us have at it.'' They make the chops wherever they want and have no idea what the impacts of these cuts are actually going to be the poorest and most vulnerable people in the society.

The Committee on Rules, which is supposed to allow any Member of this House the opportunity to come and offer an amendment on the floor of this Congress to be able to change what the appropriators have done, and they stifle every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage. If we look at what they have done to this HUD administration, at what they are going to do to create homelessness in this country, the people that look at these issues will be outraged.

If my colleagues look at the fact that we saw in this bill $5 billion cut overnight with the stroke of a pen, more homelessness will be created by the stroke of that pen than any policy in the history of this country.

We see 23 percent of the budget cut. We see things like the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], who tried to offer an amendment to put back the

Drug Elimination Program, a program I visited twice this week in my own district. That program is providing tenant action groups with the capability of eliminating drug dealers from public housing; stricken from this bill without so much as a minute of debate and not even an attempt to be able to have that debate on the floor of the Congress of the United States.

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD], and I, have an alternative that would provide least-cost housing. Let us have your cost benefit analysis. Let us have it.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, we will give it to him.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will give it to us?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me point out, this is an open rule. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been here quite a while and he knows what that means. First of all, this is an appropriation bill put on the floor under an open rule. Now, that means the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] or the gentleman from Massachusetts or any other Member are treated the same. Let me explain, because the gentleman needs to know this. It will ensure to his benefit. This is an open rule. I am going to show the gentleman how to do what he wants to do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am listening.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can offer any germane amendment that he wants to under the rules of the House and under this rule.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not have that much time, but let me explain to the gentleman from New York the problem with what his premise is.

The problem is because the authorizing committee has never held a hearing, because we never passed a bill, which is way beyond my capacity because the chairman is now a Republican, none of these bills, none of these changes, the Drug Elimination Grant Program is not authorized, thus, it is subject to a point of order.

So the gentleman from New York can tell me that I can offer the amendment, but the first thing that happens is a Member pops up on the other side and say that I am out of order or the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is out of order because the program is not authorized.

The gentleman says it is an open rule; we can offer any amendment that we want. But the gentleman knows that hidden behind that are a series of procedural changes that the Republicans have offered time and time again that knock out our capability of offering and having a legitimate debate on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman, is that not true?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, no, it is not true.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, can I offer the Drug Elimination Grant Program?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has rights to offer limitation amendments, cutting amendments, and transfer amendments under the Rules of the House. The gentleman is trying to say that we are trying to prevent him from doing something, and I am telling the gentleman that he can do anything he wants to under the rules of the House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York knows that is not true. The gentleman knows those are not the rules that we are operating under.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The Chair cautions Members to refrain from using first names and should refer to Members in the third person.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I was listening very carefully to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, just said. As the chairman knows, I came before the Committee on Rules in an attempt to get my amendment in order on this floor to have a full debate on the Drug Elimination Program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill eliminates the Drug Elimination Program, which I think is absolutely wrong for this country. It affects the town of the gentleman from New York, my town, every city and town in this country. I was denied the ability to bring that amendment up on the basis that this rule waived points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to get an answer to my question. I listened and the gentleman from New York said the rule provides that we can offer amendments to cut. My amendment is not a cutting amendment, Mr. Speaker, my amendment is an amendment to transfer money from FEMA to the Drug Elimination Program.

□ 1115

But I am not made in order on this floor. I would like the chairman, whom I have great respect for, to please explain to me whether under the rule I will be allowed an opportunity to have a full debate on that amendment as approved by the committee.

I have been told I cannot offer this amendment. I have a right to know that. He said I could offer this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentlewoman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry which the Chair can respond to. It is not the Chair's responsibility to interpret pending special orders, but to interpret them once adopted at the appropriate time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Now, wait a minute. I am not sitting down. I have served in this Chamber for 13 years. I want to know from the Chair if the rule provides me the right to offer my amendment to restore the funds for the drug elimination program.

My amendment transfers those funds from FEMA, which is in the same bill, to the account at HUD for drug elimination.

I just heard the chairman say amendments in order are cutting amendments. My amendment is not a cutting amendment. It is a transfer amendment. I have a right to know the answer to that question.

There are lives at stake all over this country on this amendment. It is important for me to know the answer. That is, I would expect the Chair could answer that question for me, with all due respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot answer the gentlewoman's question. It is not a parliamentary inquiry the Chair can answer. The Chair cannot interpret the intent of the rule while pending. It can only rule on the enforcement of that rule.

Ms. KAPTUR. But the Chair obviously knows what the rule is. Does the Chair not know?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is engaging in legitimate debate, but has not made a parliamentary inquiry the Chair can respond to.

Ms. KAPTUR. How about if I ask the Chair under what part of the rule could I bring up this amendment? It is my understanding that I am barred from bringing up this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is something that the gentlewoman can direct, if the manager of the time would yield you time for a question or a colloquy; the gentlewoman may do that. The Chair cannot rule on this as a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], would he yield and answer my question, please, sir?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield time?

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the time. I think she has been speaking on the rule rather than making a parliamentary inquiry, and I will be happy to yield her 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield the gentlewoman 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

It is my understanding that the amendment that I came before the committee to offer, which proposed

that we transfer $290 million from FEMA to the drug elimination program in order to restore it because it was zeroed out in the committee, which I think is backward policy for this country, is not in order on this floor.

If the chairman could, please, explain to me, based on what you have just said on the floor, is my amendment now in order?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me say something to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], for whom I have a great deal of respect. I have served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with her for years. We have not done anything to prevent you from doing anything that is allowed under the rules of this House.

Now, we have allowed cutting amendments. We allow limitation amendments. And we allow——

Ms. KAPTUR. Mine is not a cutting amendment, sir.

Mr. SOLOMON. You did not let me finish. Just a moment. We allow cutting amendments. We allow limiting amendments, saying none of these funds can be used for this purpose. We allow transfer amendments. If your amendment is in order under the rules of the House, you can offer it.

My suggestion is that you go to the Parliamentarian and let him advise you as to whether or not your amendment is in order.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I understand my colleague's question and concern.

Her amendment is a very special category for, as you may recall in the rescissions process, we eliminated the money for this program. As a result of that, there is nothing in the bill to transfer moneys to, and above and beyond that the program is not authorized by the authorizing committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I appreciate and I have great respect for the chairman.

This is exactly where the rules process fails us, simply because the program has been operating since 1988, but because the House in committee has not acted, that program is not authorized. Therefore, if I try to offer this amendment, even though it is operating, I will be called on a point of order on the floor, Mr. Speaker. This is why I came before the committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If I could say to the gentlewoman, this program has existed for some time. The people in charge of the authorizing committee during that time chose, for one reason or another, not to reauthorize it. As a result of that and because there is no money in the bill, it does not qualify under the rules of the House. It has nothing to do with this rule. It has to do with the rules of the House. I am sorry to say that. That is the reality we are dealing with.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield, you know, I feel sorry that the committee cannot conduct its business, but simply because that committee, under its so-called new leadership, cannot conduct its business, they have no right to eliminate these drug elimination programs around this country which are so successful.

It would seem to me the Republican leadership of this House could find a way for me to offer this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I must say, indeed, the new leadership has had 3 months to consider these problems. They have not been able to change the world yet, but the gentlewoman should know we are working on it.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the distinguished ranking member.

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. H.R. 2099 is a bad bill, and since the rule protects that bill, this is a bad rule and should be defeated.

H.R. 2099 is replete with legislative provisions, funding restrictions and riders which go to the very heart of our Nation's environmental protection. The bill eliminates EPA's role in the wetlands program, it prohibits EPA from addressing stormwater pollution, it stops EPA from assuring the control of raw sewage through combined sewers and sanitary sewers, it halts all advancement in controlling industrial pollution, it prohibits efforts to clean up the Great Lakes, and it denies badly needed funding to our cities and States.

The result will be less environmental protection and increased risk to the health and safety of our constituents. This appropriations bill will single-handedly cause a major rollback of the protections of the Clean Water Act, Superfund, and the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

What does the rule do about the underlying bill? It waives all points of order against the legislative provisions, funding restrictions and riders which gut environmental protection. This is a clear abuse of the legislative process, and an affront to the citizens and communities we represent.

The people of this country are calling for responsive, responsible legislation. Yet, this rule protects provisions in H.R. 2099 which are totally irresponsible. H.R. 2099 rolls back environmental protection and denies financial assistance to communities, all in a misguided effort to pressure the Senate into gutting environmental laws.

My colleagues, this is not some game of legislative poker. We should not be playing fast and loose with the health and safety of our constituents. We should not be denying desperately needed funding to States and cities to create leverage in securing waivers, loopholes and rollbacks which benefit industry's bottom line, but which cause harm to the general population.

H.R. 2099 is a bad bill, and this is a bad rule. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to just correct some of the misperception that I think was left on this floor with respect to the authorization.

I chair the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity. Of course, as most people realize, for the first time in 40 years, the Republicans have the ability to chair and control the agenda on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the subcommittees, including the subcommittee that I chair.

For the last 7 years, there has been an opportunity certainly to authorize the drug elimination program, and despite the fact that the opposition party, the Democratic Party, controlled both the House and the Senate for every one of those 7 years, there is a failure to reauthorize.

To suggest now that the new majority, who has been in control of that subcommittee for just a few months, is somehow responsible for not reauthorizing the program when they have had control for 40 years both on the House side, most of those 40 years on the Senate side, is a farce.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, this bill, and this process. In my tenure here in Congress, this is among the most heartless legislation I have seen.

To begin with, the Appropriations Committee has vastly exceeded its legislative authority in this bill. This bill legislates across the board. It infringes on the Banking Committee's authority by legislating in the area of housing. It enters the Commerce Committee's jurisdiction by legislating with respect to the environment. It is bad enough that the actual appropriations figures contained in this bill represent a virtual abandonment of this country's poor and moderate-income families. But the overt encroachment into authorization committee territory compounds this disaster.

I do not understand. We had a bipartisan effort with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] and myself where we did rent reform that encourages people to work so that when they go to work their earnings are not taken up by the housing authorities

and public housing charging them more rent, encouraging people to work. That is done away with.

Mr. Speaker, this bill raises rents on poor people—it prohibits HUD from enforcing the Fair Housing Act with respect to property insurance. It prohibits HUD from implementing the final RESPA rules.

This bill targets its deepest cuts at vulnerable populations—the poorest residents in public and assisted housing, the homeless, the poor, working families, and the elderly.

These cuts are unwise, unworkable, and unfair. We should reject this rule and bring up an entirely new bill. I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding me time, although I did not get an answer to my question. I thank you for your gentlemanly comportment and also to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], our very capable Chair, who fully understands that I am barred under this rule from offering my amendment on the floor, and to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], I will not be allowed to offer this amendment to continue the drug eradication programs in our public housing neighborhoods around this country, because I will be called on a point of order.

It is not an open rule, because the Committee on Banking and Financial Services did not complete its business, sir, and I only have a minute and three-quarters under the rule.

So if you would be kind enough, I would just like to say every mayor in this country, every citizen in this country, every person who lives in and around public housing understands what it is like to have these projects controlled by snipers and drug lords. I was in Chicago; you could not even walk from building to building, because there were snipers on the roofs who were controlling the drug trade.

When I am not allowed to offer my amendment, what it means is that this Congress is going on record as saying that hundreds and hundreds of communities across this country can go it alone.

□ 1130

I think it is absolutely wrong for us to return our backs on the scourge of the drug trade that is eating away at the hearts of our communities, and I think it is absolutely wrong, I think it is wrong from a public policy standpoint. I think it is politically wrong for me to be denied the ability to offer this amendment on a program that has worked from the time that Jack Kemp started it in 1988. The city of Albany will be affected. The city of Los Angeles will be affected. Every single major community and minor community in this country will be affected, and I think it is absolutely unfair, unfair that we are denied the opportunity to offer the amendment and the money. The proof in the pudding is the money that is used for this program. Rather than being spent on drug elimination, it is going to be bankrolled into a little account over in the Committee on Ways and Means to give tax breaks to the privileged few in this country. It is absolutely wrong.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to remark that I, too, have been in Chicago, I, too, have visited State Street, Cabrini-Green. I have seen the distress in that community. I want to assure the gentlewoman that there will be other vehicles which use the same concept, the drug elimination, including CDBG, which is fully funded in this bill, as well as modernization funds which will be, by virtue of some new language that is offered, will be able to be fungible, be able to be used.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAZIO of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the gentleman that the funds in the bill at HUD have been cut by nearly 25 percent. Every mayor, including my own mayors in my district, and I represent several of them, do not have the luxury of being able to use money for this because they are so stressed out in the other accounts, sir. My colleague is going to make a lot of seniors pay more on their section 8 in their housing projects——

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I do want to reemphasize again the Community Development Block Grant Program, which is a very large program, is fully funded in this bill, fully funded, and that is well more than most other programs authorized all throughout the rest of this bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to a rule that is unfair, obviously, in its application. One-third of this bill before us is made up of legislative language, and then we have the sponsors and advocates of this rule suggesting that we are only going to play by the rules; that is, the rules they make. In other words, they protect their policy advances and from any type of debate, any application from being stricken in terms of points of order, but will not permit the long-term programs, programs that have a proven track record, to even be considered on this floor because of there application of technical points. That is what is going on here.

But I think the effect of this is, as my colleagues know, we can wrap this in the virtue of deficit reduction and the new majority. The fact is we all know that authorization bills sometimes fall short.

But I am not concerned about it because of myself. I am concerned because of people I represent, because poor people, because working families that I represent in my district, are going to be hurt by this particular program and legislation, those that are trying to strive to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, that are living in public housing, in assisted housing, that need some guidance for their kids in terms of drug programs. They need to have hope.

As my colleagues knows, former Secretary Kemp, when he was Secretary, at least favored housing. Since then, of course, I think that that has changed a little bit, but the fact is he favored it, and he had programs called HOPE, and what my colleagues are doing is taking hope away from people, increasing the number of people and families that are vulnerable in our urban centers, in our rural areas, where they need help with housing.

Look at what is happening in this country in terms of the working families that are getting less income, they have less ability to afford housing. We have more of them families that are vulnerable. They do not have the resources, and the fact is of course this bill, what we have done, and why I wrote a homeless program in the 1980's, and I thank my colleagues for supporting it then; even those funds are cut in this program by 50 percent. We had to write that program because there are 600,000 people on the street. In other words, we are failing in terms of the policies we have, for housing both as Democrats and Republicans, and the people I represent are going to be hurt by this further reduction of HUD.

I say to my colleagues, ''You cut modernization funds, Representative LAZIO, and the fact is that the authorizing committee just didn't fail to get the bill through the House. We really didn't even initiate the process in the last 6 months. I certainly understand that we have new leadership here, a new majority but we have got to have elemental fairness, we've got to look at what the impact is, and above all we should support and protect the vulnerable in this society, the working families that are trying to make it.''

This rule deserves to be defeated, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule, and it is a bad bill. Talk about an opportunity to dishonor our commitment to veterans, to environmental programs, to housing. This is the bill to do it. Talk about raising

havoc with jurisdictions in the House. I have served on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, all the environmental laws that for years that great committee worked to achieve on Superfund, on toxic pollution. Because of the gutting of some of the safeguards in this bill, who knows if we can recuperate?

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a bill that for veterans this rule is going to mean 22,000 fewer veterans in this country will have hospital visits, and 500,000 fewer people will receive outpatient treatments. Again, for the environment this rule will mean cuts of $500 million for the safe drinking water State revolving fund and $500 million for the clean water State revolving fund. Why have a Clean Water Act? Why have a Safe Drinking Water Act?

What we have also is legislation that means that over 1,000 native-American families will not have a home to live in this year, and, if this is not bad enough, this rule also supports legislation that slashes funding for housing, for persons with AIDS, the elderly, and the disabled by 46 percent.

Mr. Speaker, AmeriCorps, the President's national service program, goes by the wayside in this bill. The Council on Environmental Quality, the enforcers, the watchdog of a lot of the Federal pollution issues in environment within the bureaucracy: slashed.

Mr. Speaker, what we have is an opportunity to defeat this rule and allow amendments, and let us face it. There are no Democratic amendments allowed to protect legislation that is important and to change the direction of this bill. Every authorizing committee should rise up against this legislation.

If you want to vote for a rule that destroys our commitments to veterans, housing, and environmental programs—this is it.

For veterans this rule will mean 22,000 fewer people will have hospital visits and 500,000 fewer people will receive outpatient treatments.

For the environment this rule will mean cuts of $500 million for the safe drinking water State revolving fund and $500 million for the clean water State revolving fund.

Passage of this rule means we will consider a bill that cuts assistance for homeless programs by 50 percent.

Supporting this rule means over 1,000 native-American families will not have a home to live in this year.

And as if that's not bad enough, this rule also supports legislation that slashes funding for housing for persons with AIDS, the elderly and the disabled by 46 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we are playing politics with people's lives. Attacking the deficit should not be partisan and mean, but that's exactly what the bill we're about to consider is.

I urge my colleagues to stop this cruel trick on the American people by defeating this rule.

This rule protects a lot of bad legislation in an appropriations bill and denies every single Democratic amendment to change that legislation.

Democrats are opposed to this Republican assault on housing and environmental programs that Republicans refuse to give us a chance to fix.

This bill weakens environmental laws, destroys housing programs, and raises rents on the elderly all to pay for a Republican tax break for the very rich.

Housing cuts to pay for tax breaks: The provisions in this bill will lead to rent increases for the elderly and the poor all to pay for a Republican tax break for the richest people in this country.

Gutting environmental laws for tax breaks: This Republican attack on American families guts Federal safeguards that protect our air, water, land, and public health from toxic pollution—it also cuts Superfund by more than $500 million and cuts State revolving funds for clean water and safe drinking water by more than $1 billion below the President's request.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, we yield our final 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy discussing rules and praising and saluting my dear friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], one of the finest and most able men up here. He presides over his committee with extraordinary grace and dignity. It is always a privilege for me to appear before him. He has, however, presented to the House a bad rule. It is a bad rule on a bad bill, and it enhances his reputation as ''Closed Rule SOLOMON.''

What has he done? He slashes, the bill slashes, EPA funding. It is crammed full of legislative riders that are designed to eviscerate the environmental statutes that currently protect our lands, our waters, and air.

It is also interesting to note that these legislative riders which eviscerate the environmental laws are protected by points of order. As I stated in my testimony before the Committee on Rules, I strongly object to a rollback in the Nation's environmental protections without public debate and without concurrence of the legislative committees.

My good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], announced that he had had the concurrence of the legislative committees. I know of no concurrence that was given by our Committee on Energy and Commerce. Nor do I know of any concurrence given by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. Now, while I do not dispute those words, the complete lack of even a minute of discussion of waivers provided by this rule of any authorizing committee leads me to question the process. It is at best curious, it is certainly outrageous, and it is very clearly antienvironment and anti-the-public interests. The rule allows dramatic changes in the environmental laws of the United States using the back door of an appropriations bill, something which is prohibited in the rules unless waived by the Committee on Rules. There has been little or no public discussion of better than two dozen riders that are attached. Some totally stop implementation and enforcement of the Clean Water Act. Others create unprecedent new privileges allowing States to shield companies from Federal enforcement actions and from criminal prosecution. Image that. Others arbitrarily create special exemptions from various provisions for oil and gas industries. Not only do these change policy, but they do it in a manner which is, frankly, incompetent and sloppy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the colloquy on the floor on the rule itself has been to ignore the veterans of this country. They have picked out items in HUD and others as primary. Let us not forget that this is a VA appropriation bill along with the problems that HUD has experienced over the years, along with the other independent agencies. Single out one thing, if my colleagues must, but do not forget that we are here to consider the whole picture. Look at the forest, not just a tree.

So I urge the Members of this body to support this rule, and support the bill, and support the veterans of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, to close the debate I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a very valuable member of the House Committee on Rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 6 minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Rules, my friend from Kingsport, TN, for yielding this time to me, and I rise in very strong support of this rule. I have been listening for the last few minutes to the statements which have been coming from our friends on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and others who are in some way implying that this is less than an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], has made it very clear this is an open rule. Any of these Members, any of these Members who are complaining about this process, have an opportunity to offer striking amendments. They can do that under the open amendment process.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I look forward to his remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague can the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] offer her amendment to put money back into the drug elimination program?

Mr. DREIER. What I said, if I can reclaim my time, what I said is under an open amendment process we are all allowed the chance to offer striking amendments.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. She has a striking amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Yes, to transfer money into a program that does not even exist.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The program most certainly does exist——

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time—if I could reclaim my time, we had a very healthy exchange that took place between the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee that deals with this issue, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], and it seems to me that there needs to be recognition that an opportunity to deal with this is on the horizon.

Now my friend has raised the issue which I was not even going to talk about in my remarks, but let us look at the issue of drugs as it has existed over the past several years, and, as has been pointed out time and time again, we have seen during the Reagan and Bush administrations a decline in drug use in this country, but since we have seen the election of President Clinton there has been an increase in drug use in this country.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. If I can continue to hold onto the time——

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am just asking the gentleman to yield.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say that we have seen that increase. We are working to deal with the issue of authorization. We are trying to deal with this question head-on.

□ 1145

But the fact of the matter is, there have been tremendous chances for Members of the formerly-in-the-majority-party to deal with this issue through authorization, and it has not been dealt with. So in any way to claim the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is denied her opportunity to offer striking language is way off base.

Let me just say I want to compliment the gentleman from California, Chairman LEWIS, for the superb job he has done in dealing with the veterans, as the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN, has raised this, and I know the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, has, and also with an issue that is very important to me, and that happens to be the science question. I believe as we charge towards the millennium, we have to recognize our responsibility in further research and development in the area of the sciences.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has done a superb job in dealing with that. This is an open rule. It is one that deserves the support of the full membership in a bipartisan way. We complained on our side of the aisle in the past when we did not have an open amendment process. Frankly, we have brought that forward. We hope very much we can move ahead with this extremely important piece of legislation.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 586]

YEAS—230

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—189

Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie
Bateman
Brewster
Collins (MI)
Hall (OH)
Hinchey
Hunter
Jefferson
McDade
Meyers
Moakley
Reynolds
Tauzin
Towns
Volkmer

□ 1205

Mr. PETERSON of Florida changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WALKER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments concerning the national emergency with respect to organizations that threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order No. 12947 of January 23, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c).

1. On January 23, 1995, I signed Executive Order No. 12947, ''Prohibiting Transactions with Terrorists Who Threaten to Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process'' (the ''order'') (60 *Fed. Reg.* 5079, January 25, 1995). The order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of 12 terrorist organizations that threaten the Middle East peace process as identified in an Annex to the order. The order also blocks the property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons designated by the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, who are found (1) to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process, or (2) to assist in, sponsor, or provide financial, material, or technological support for, or services in support of, such acts of violence. In addition, the order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, any other person designated pursuant to the order (collectively ''Specially Designated Terrorists'' of ''SDTs'').

The order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDTs, including the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or services to or for the benefit of such persons. This prohibition includes donations that are intended to relieve human suffering.

Designations of persons blocked pursuant to the order are effective upon the date of determination by the Secretary of State or his delegate, or the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the *Federal Register*, or upon prior actual notice.

2. On January 25, 1995, FAC issued a notice listing persons blocked pursuant to Executive Order No. 12947 who have been designated by the President as terrorist organizations threatening the Middle East peace process or who have been found to be owned or controlled by, or to be acting for or on behalf of, these terrorist organizations (60 *Fed. Reg.* 5084, January 25, 1995). The notice identifies 31 entities that act for or on behalf of the 12 Middle East terrorist organizations listed in the Annex to Executive Order No. 12947, as well as 18 individuals who are leaders or representatives of these groups. In addition the notice provides 9 name variations or pseudonyms used by the 18 individuals identified. The FAC, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, will continue to expand the list of terrorist organizations as additional information is developed. A copy of the notice is attached to this report.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from January 23 through July 21, 1995, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to organizations that disrupt the Middle East peace process are estimated at approximately $55,000. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Justice.

4. Executive Order No. 12947 provides this Administration with a new tool for combating fundraising in this country on behalf of organizations that use terror to undermine the Middle East peace process. The order makes it harder for such groups to finance these criminal activities by cutting off their access to sources of support in the United States and to U.S. financial facilities. It is also intended to reach charitable contributions to designated organizations to preclude diversion of such donations to terrorist activities.

In addition, I have sent to the Congress new comprehensive counter-terrorism legislation that would strengthen our ability to prevent terrorist acts, identify those who carry them out, and bring them to justice. The combination of Executive Order No. 12947 and the proposed legislation demonstrate the United States' determination to confront and combat those who would seek to destroy the Middle East peace process, and our commitment to the global fight against terrorism.

I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against extremists seeking to destroy the hopes of peaceful coexistence between Arabs and Israelis as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 27, 1995.*

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday, due to illness, and missed rollcall votes No. 572 through 585. I would like the RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

I would vote ''no'' on rollcall vote 585; ''yes'' on rollcall 584; ''no'' on rollcall 583; ''yes'' on rollcall 582; ''no'' on rollcall 581; ''no'' on rollcall 580; ''yes'' on rollcall 579; ''yes'' on rollcall 578; ''no'' on rollcall 577; ''no'' on rollcall 575; ''no'' on rollcall 574; ''no'' on rollcall 573; and ''no'' on rollcall 572.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership has been consulted and has no objection to this request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

POSTPONING VOTES DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of H.R. 2099 pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 201, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would mention that we have a gap in time today of 2 hours between 2 and 4 when Members want to go to the Korean Memorial ceremonies.

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

Mr. STOKES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get further clarification with respect to rolling the amendments. If we can agree that not more than three or four would be rolled at a time, I do not think there would be any problem at all from our side.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there is no problem with that on this side at all. I expect that we may have a series of amendments, five or six or seven, some of which will not request votes, and if there are three or four, I think that is very workable.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. MINETA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from California. A number of us who are Korean war veterans would like to be going down to the dedication of the Korean War Veterans Memorial dedication.

There was some thought that maybe between the hours of 2 and 4 that there may be some opportunity so that some of us may be able to get away for the dedication of the Korean War Veterans Memorial. I would hope that we would be able to cluster some of those votes outside that 2 to 4.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for raising the question. We mentioned it earlier. It is very important that Members know that we will be trying to structure votes so that there will be free time between 2 and 4 for the Korean Memorial ceremony.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2099, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 201 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. 2099.

□ 1211

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. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. COMBEST 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 California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, colleagues, I am pleased to present H.R. 2099—the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal 1996. Let me get right to the bottom line. This bill, as it now stands, provides $60.045 in discretionary budget authority and $19.361 billion for mandatory accounts. This represents an overall reduction of $10.006 billion—or minus 14.3 percent—in domestic discretionary authority from last year's levels. It is $10.482 billion less than President Clinton requested for the 22 agencies, boards, and commissions that fall within the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

Following directly from our recent success in the rescissions package, this bill represents the urgent need to put Uncle Sam on a diet. We are doing what many said could never be done. We are making the tough decisions required to balance the Federal budget in 7 years. The bill reflects real cuts in each and every agency, except the VA's medical care account. These cuts, in this bill, at this time, are absolutely required if we are to keep our commitment to the American people regarding changing the way their Government in Washington operates with their hard earned tax dollars. We do not have the luxury of postponing these decisions to the outyears. We have tightened Uncle Sam's belt a notch or two, but this is the beginning, not the end, of identifying real savings.

At this point, I want to move away from the numbers for just a moment in order to share a few observations about the many people who have made it possible for the subcommittee to bring this bill to the floor today. I know that you will understand when I say this—the chairmanship of the VA–HUD subcommittee is not a lonely job. The Members should know how fortunate I feel to be working so directly with Mr. STOKES of Ohio who chaired the subcommittee in the 103d Congress.

Mr. STOKES is much more than a friend. Time and again, he has been someone on whom I can absolutely count when it comes to understanding the impact of the fundamental changes which we are making. The gentleman from Ohio never stops listening or working with me regardless of how much he may disagree with the substance of any matter under negotiation. And we appreciate the help we get from his able staff—particularly Leslie Atkinson and Del Davis.

Throughout our hearings this year as the subcommittee developed the bill, I encountered reactions ranging from amazement to amusement among our subcommittee's 11 other members. But I have always known that I could count on each and every one of those members to work with me to improve the direction, substance, and purpose of this bill. Indeed, it is a very special privilege to work on such a close basis with all who serve on the VA–HUD subcommittee. To a person, they are men and women of uncommon intelligence and conviction. This bill reflects their bipartisan participation and cooperation.

Last, I want to say how much I value and appreciate the work of the staff. With the exception of Paul Thomson who has long worked with us on appropriations matters, ours is a brand new

partnership. The work of the staff—beginning with our staff director Frank Cushing and including Jon Gauthier, Tim Peterson, and Todd Weber has been first rate. Their attention to detail has been nothing short of essential and I just want each and every one of them to know of our appreciation.

In keeping with the Speaker's guidance, the subcommittee has made every effort to work with all of the committees of jurisdiction that authorize the various programs affected by this bill. Though there will be continuing controversy over the numerous housing and environmental administrative provisions contained in this bill, the membership should know that we have worked diligently at both the member and staff level to develop the language with the knowledge and expertise of the various chairs in the Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Veterans, Banking, Judiciary, Science, and Agriculture Committees.

When we have completed general debate, I will offer an amendment that increases the total dollars already provided for VA medical care, VA health professional scholarships, special needs housing, homeless assistance, and FHA multifamily credit subsidies. This amendment culminates the prolonged negotiations which we have had with our leadership and many of our authorizing partners. I share their desire to see much less legislation in this bill next year and I hope the coalitions which we have formed in working together this year will be lasting ones.

Let me move now to summarizing just a few of the many difficult choices and positive highlights that make up this complex piece of legislation.

DIFFICULT CHOICES

Four agencies are terminated for a savings of $703 million in discretionary authority from 1995 enacted levels: The Corporation for National and Community Service, Community Development Financial Institutions, the Chemical Safety and Hazards Investigation Board, and the Council on Environmental Quality. It's possible that we may get an amendment contemplating the elimination of yet another—the Selective Service System.

The bill does not provide requested funding for the construction of two additional VA hospitals in Florida and California which would have resulted in major construction costs of $343.2 million this year. We hope to continue working with Members from the affected regions to provide state of the art outpatient facilities that are consistent with the direction that Veterans Secretary Jesse Brown suggested last year when the VA was participating in the national health care reform debate.

NASA, too, will make a major contribution to deficit reduction. Their budget has been reduced by $705 million from last year's level. And we have gone much farther than I think Administrator Goldin would be comfortable with. This bill begins the process of reducing the size of NASA's plate. It makes real and painful program changes which will reduce fiscal year 1996 and outyear pressures. Two major NASA programs, the Space Infrared Telescope Facility and EOS will be substantially altered in order to help reduce the pressures on the overall bill.

This bill provides $4.88 billion for the EPA—a reduction of $2.4 billion or 33 percent from the fiscal year 1995 level. Frankly, our bill is an urgent plea to Administrator Browner. If you believe that Superfund is broken, help us fix it. If you believe that command and control is the wrong approach, act now to make EPA a facilitator of progressive environmental policy rather than an enforcer of excessive and inflexible Federal mandates. If you believe that EPA should base decisions on proven sound science, risk assessment, and thorough cost-benefit analysis, by all means join with us in perfecting this bill.

The EPA is a regulatory agency completely out of control, an agency that until now has delighted in routinely redefining its mission without proper congressonal oversight. The legislative provisions in this bill reflect the need and desire to restore some common sense and flexibility to the challenges of environmental protection in our country. The EPA should be a facilitator of progressive environmental policy rather than an enforcer of excessive and inflexible Federal mandates.

With regard to Superfund, I understand that my colleague from Ohio, Mr. OXLEY, the chairman of the authorizing Commerce Subcommittee, is set to move a reauthorization bill this fall. It is my hope that Administrator Browner will work with the authorizing committee in addressing the difficulties of this task. The issuance and funding of new records of decision [RODS] by potentially responsible parties is one area that should be analyzed during the reauthorization process.

EMPHASIZING THE POSITIVES

The subcommittee has provided a funding level of $38.1 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs. The VA stands alone among the agencies in our jurisdiction. It's funding is not significantly reduced. Every requested dollar for mandatory spending is provided. If my conforming amendment is adopted in a few moments, an increase of $562 million will be provided for medical care—over and above last year's funding level of $16.2 billion.

We have also taken great care to provide every available dollar for the basic research mission of the National Science Foundation. NSF would receive $3.1 billion in this bill—a reduction of 6.5 percent or $200 million from last year's level.

The subcommittee's overall funding level for HUD, if my manager's amendment is adopted, would be $19.4 billion. The mark recognizes that two of HUD's largest and most cost effective programs—community development block grants—$4.6 billion—and the home investments partnership program—$1.4 billion—are working largely as intended. Neither program will absorb reduction's from last year's level.

The subcommittee has been mindful of the guidance from those who receive HUD dollars—nonprofits, local public housing authorities, and resident groups—that reductions in their funding should not proceed this year absent substantial legislative reform that maximizes flexibility in how they administer Federal housing dollars. And, even though HUD's comprehensive reform bill is far from final action in the authorizing process, we have provided $862 million for a section 8 replacement assistance fund.

In all of these matters, I have had the privilege of working with Mr. LAZIO—the chairman of the Banking Subcommittee on Housing. He has reminded me more than once that there is great need for thoughtfulness when one wields the machete. Numbers drive policy. Policy drives perception. And before we know it, we can have real change in the broken delivery mechanism that we all know as HUD.

The section 8 replacement assistance funds will provide for nearly 77,000 units of tenant based housing, thus allowing the Secretary to proceed with two of his most important initiatives—tearing down the worst of the low vacancy high rises in public housing and targeting assistance to individuals rather than properties. These vouchers will be available to anyone who loses their unit if these long overdue changes are undertaken by the Secretary. No one will be thrown out on the street and many of the individuals who could receive assistance under this fund will be in decent housing for the first time in years.

Mr. Speaker, these are the challenges and highlights presented with the fiscal year 1996 VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill. I hope that the members will see fit to accept the difficult tradeoffs reflected here. I urge you to support the bill when we get to final passage.

□ 1215

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2099, the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill for Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies. As a member of this subcommittee for more than 20 years, it is a difficult position for me today to stand here in opposition to this measure.

Let me first acknowledge and recognize the work and leadership of our chairman and colleague from California, JERRY LEWIS. No one knows better than I, having previously served as chairman of this subcommittee, the complexities of this bill. As it stands, we must provide funding for critical

veterans, housing, environmental, science, and research and development programs. The increasing Federal deficit and call for Government reform has heightened the problems of meeting these essential needs. So Chairman LEWIS' task has not been an easy one.

Nonetheless, within the allocation that this subcommittee received, we have considerable opportunity to try and meet the basic and pressing priorities upon which veterans, the elderly, and low-income and working Americans depend. Unfortunately, instead, the subcommittee launches a wholesale assault on these individuals and those critical programs that provide safety net and human service programs, not to mention programs that are designed to ensure a safer and cleaner environment for our children and our communities.

Now we have heard our colleagues on the other side represent this bill as fair, given the adverse allocation of the subcommittee. But I don't think that our veterans, our elderly, our children, and our poor would agree. In fact, the President does not agree and has already indicated that he will veto this bill if it is presented to him in its present form. In his statement on H.R. 2099, the President says and I quote:

> The fiscal year 1996 VA/HUD appropriations bill passed by the House Appropriations Committee is unacceptable. I call on the Congress to correct the appropriations bills now under consideration before they reach my desk, not after.

Let me take a moment to explain to you why this bill is so unacceptable to the President and those of us who care about people.

For our veterans, this bill reduces by nearly $1 billion the level of spending that the President has requested for veterans including medical care, general expenses, and construction projects. These cuts seem especially callous. Certainly, individuals who have given the ultimate sacrifice and risked their lives for our collective safety and well being deserve to have the full level of security for themselves and their families to live out the rest of their lives.

In a letter circulated yesterday to all Members of the House James J. Kenney, executive director of AMVETS stated:

> The designated appropriations still falls well short of the funding necessary to even maintain the current level of earned entitlements for our veterans.

Further he says:

> The proposed budget will require painful decisions on the elimination of critical services.

The bill falls short in the areas of medical care—almost $200 million below the President's budget request, in construction—where critical facilities are needed for a growing and aging veterans population, in benefits servicing—where a cut to the VA Benefits Administration would impact the first line of support veterans receive when they approach the VA through the vocational rehabilitation counselling and the veterans services divisions.

This bill, once again, targets housing programs as we saw earlier this year in the rescissions bill. On top of the $7 billion taken from HUD in the 1995 rescissions, this measure cuts $5.3 billion from the President's request. The severity of the reductions are appalling enough seeing that $4.2 billion of the cuts to HUD came from housing programs alone. Hardest hit are those programs that provide affordable and decent housing for the elderly and poor, like section 8 incremental rental assistance and public housing operating and modernization funds.

But our colleagues on the other side did not stop here. Added to these crushing reductions are pages of extensive legislation that is tantamount to repealing the statutory goal of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for all Americans. Minimum rents are set and residents who only average $8,000 a year in income are forced to pay more in terms of their rent contributions.

At a time when affordable housing is at a record short supply, this bill would not only gut affordable and low-income housing but cut homeless assistance grants by $400 million. Secretary Henry Cisneros has stated that while the committee sees savings in these actions, he sees a terrible pain for the most economically vulnerable working people. Several colleagues and I will be offering amendments to try and correct these harmful actions.

When they finished with destroying our investment in public and low-income housing, our colleagues decided to set back this Nation's efforts to ensure that each American breathe clean air, drink clean water, and be safe from hazardous waste dangers. This devastation is accomplished through a cut in funding to programs like the Superfund Program, the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Fund, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and EPA operating programs. The public health is further jeopardized by the nearly 20 limitations and riders that further these pernicious acts. I will be offering, with my colleague on the other side, Congressman SHERRY BOEHLERT, an amendment to strike these riders from the bill.

The list of egregious actions in H.R. 2099 unfortunately continues. The Corporation for National and Community Service [AmeriCorps] and the Community Development Financial Institutions Program are terminated. The bill also calls for the close out of the Council on Environmental Quality within the Executive Office of the President.

Our Nation's critical investment in science and technology has also been reduced through the 5-percent cut in NASA and the 6-percent cut in the National Science Foundation.

The reductions in this bill are severe and reason enough for not supporting this legislation. What is even worse is that the cuts are being made in part to finance a tax break for the most wealthy. These actions are penny wise and pound foolish and I therefore strongly oppose this bill.

□ 1230

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of the committee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the bill.

I would like to begin by commending the gentleman from California, Chairman LEWIS, for all of his hard work. Shepherding an appropriations bill through the legislative process is no easy task, yet he has done it with skill and flair. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

And finally, we all owe a debt of gratitude to the subcommittee staff—Frank Cushing, Paul Thomson, Tim Peterson, John Gauthier and Todd Weber. We truly would not be here today if it weren't for their tireless efforts.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It does not simply spread the pain throughout all of the programs in its jurisdiction, it makes the tough choices necessary to move up toward a balanced budget. Overall, it cuts about $10 billion in spending from last year's level. But it also preserves funding for programs which work well and are important to the Nation's future.

Now, we are going to hear a lot of heated rhetoric about disproportionate cuts in housing programs. But do not let that get in the way of the facts. Yes, next year housing programs will have to absorb some spending reductions—there is no doubt about it.

But when compared to the other agencies in this bill, HUD's funding actually will take up a larger share of the outlays than they did this year. In short, HUD will enjoy a slightly larger piece of a smaller pie. And in the present budgetary environment, that is nothing to complain about.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of good in this bill. VA medical care has been protected, as has funding for university-based scientific research. We preserve funding for NASA's core missions; and we send EPA a strong message that they must move away from their current Soviet-style, command and control system of regulation.

I am sure that every Member of this body, given the chance, would draft a VA–HUD bill that is different from the legislation before us. But, to use an often-heard quote, we can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in expressing my strong opposition to the mean spirited and draconian HUD–VA appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. If this bill is enacted, we are signaling almost a full retreat by the Federal Government as a critical partner in affordable housing and community revitalization. H.R. 2099 slashes one-quarter of the budget for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It neither expands, nor preserves, nor rehabilitates public and assisted housing and then requires poor families to pay more for deteriorating housing, or go homeless.

I find it ironic that on Monday the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities released its new study, ''In Short Supply: The Growing Affordable Housing Gap,'' which determined that the number of low-income renters exceeded the number of affordable rental units by 4.7 million low-income renters. This Nation has lost 43 percent of its affordable housing supply, some 2.2 million housing units, over the last two decades, according to the study.

If we pass this appropriations bill, we virtually ensure that affordable housing will continue to decrease and deteriorate; we will lose our $90 billion investment in public housing; and hundreds of thousands more families will become or remain homeless. Despite what our colleagues on the majority and on the Appropriations Committee contend, these are not hard decisions, they are heartless.

Public housing residents in the more than 3,400 local housing authorities throughout the Nation are at risk of seeing their everyday maintenance requests go unanswered for lack of operating subsidies. This appropriations bill funds operating subsidies at only $2.5 billion, some $400 million below this year's funding and only 85 percent of what housing authorities need to operate their housing authorities.

And the eyesores of deteriorated and dilapidated housing in many of our urban centers will remain vacant and crumbling, further destroying neighborhoods because nearly one-third of the modernization funds and all of the urban revitalization grants for severely distressed public housing projects will be lost if this bill passes.

There will be no new public housing funded and no new section 8 certificates available for the first time in 20 years even though there are more than 5.6 million families today who pay more than 50 percent of their incomes for rent, or who live in substandard housing. There are more than 1.5 million families on public housing and section 8 waiting lists throughout this country. The number of families who are homeless or who pay exorbitant rents or who live in terrible housing conditions grows each year by more than 10 times the number of new families that would be assisted under the appropriation bills for 1996. During this fiscal year 88,400 units of affordable housing were financed through the various Federal housing programs—next year fewer than 15,000 units.

Frail elderly residents of public and assisted housing will not receive critical supportive services like personal care, transportation, and congregate dining, hastening the entry into expensive nursing homes and destroying the elderly's dignity and independence. Why? Because this bill provides no funding for the Congregate Housing Services Program. The bill also eliminates funding for the drug elimination grant program which has been so helpful to so many in fighting crime and providing residents a sense of safety and security.

The bill leaves two of the core programs untouched—HOME and CDBG. That is good; however, do not be surprised if a year from now or sooner, the mayors and the Governors are here begging for more money. Because, the deep, deep cuts in public housing and section 8, and the increases in the cost of that housing inevitably will mean trouble for our cities and States—more deteriorated housing and more homelessness—more people with nowhere safe and sound to live. While it may seem that there are a myriad of discrete programs, in truth Federal housing programs are interrelated, serving different needs and segments of our low- and moderate-income families. When one program is underfunded, it places pressure on all the other programs. What this bill does, make no mistake, is place the burden on cities and States, while the Federal Government takes a walk and abrogates its responsibilities.

I know it has become fashionable to bash the Department of Housing and Urban Development and to blame the poor, the victims, for their troubles. But slashing funding for the very programs that provide for one of the most basic needs—housing—is simply inexcusable.

HUD has taken a budget hit disproportionate to any other agency, except perhaps the EPA. And through the appropriations bill, housing policy—which I might add, should be under the purview of the Banking Committee—has shifted and changed course dramatically, without the benefit of hearings or analysis—all to get to the bottom line. So the Republicans will make the fundamental problems of a lack of affordable and decent housing and viable communities worse.

I have watched these programs work for poor and working families, for the elderly and for the disabled throughout my public career. One of my jobs in my home city of San Antonio before I came to Congress was with the San Antonio Housing Authority. Then public housing worked as it continues to in many communities today. And now with one simple action, the Republican majority will devastate the lives of families currently residing in public and assisted housing and those who wait, sometimes for years, for such housing.

The Republicans talk about their historic budget resolution, their vaunted balanced budget. But their bold insistence and desire to provide foolhardy tax breaks for the wealthy at the expense of America's poor and working families drives this process. That is the thrust of this massive and mean assault on our most vulnerable citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I include the executive summary of the study referred to in my remarks for the RECORD, as follows:

IN SHORT SUPPLY: THE GROWING AFFORDABLE HOUSING GAP

I. SUMMARY

New national housing data show that the shortage of affordable housing for low-income renters is now wider than at any point on record. This gap—4.7 million units—has grown consistently in recent decades because the number of low-rent units has fallen while the number of low-income families has grown. As a result of these trends, four of five poor renter households with incomes below the federal poverty line face housing costs that exceed 30 percent of their income, the federal housing affordability standard set in 1981. More than three of five poor renters spend at least half their income on rent and utilities.

The Affordable Housing Shortage

Data from the 1993 American Housing Survey, which is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, indicate that a substantial shortage of affordable housing has developed in recent decades.

In 1970, the first year for which comparable data are available, there were 7.4 million low-cost rental units. That was roughly 900,000 greater than the number of low-income renters, which stood at 6.5 million. (Low-income renters are defined here as those with incomes of $12,000 or less in 1993 dollars, or roughly equal to the poverty line for a family of three. Low-cost units are those with rent and utility costs totaling less than 30 percent of a $12,000 annual income, or less than $300 a month.)

By 1993 this situation had reversed. The number of low-rent units fell to 6.5 million while the number of low-income renters rose to 11.2 million—resulting in a shortage of 4.7 million affordable units. This is the largest shortage on record. There are nearly two low-income renters for every low-rent unit.

The affordable housing squeeze means that many poor renters spend very large proportions of their income on housing. The new AHS data show that:

Some 82 percent of poor renter households—5.7 million households—spent more than 30 percent of their income on rent and utilities in 1993.

Some 4.1 million poor renter households—or three of every five poor renters—spent at least half of their income on housing. These households are considered by HUD to have ''worst case'' housing needs and are given priority for housing assistance under federal law.

The typical or median poor renter spent 60 percent of income on housing in 1993.

These housing affordability problems are nationwide, affecting poor households in every region of the country and both urban and rural areas. They are not limited to racial or ethnic minorities, and poor families with one or more workers are nearly as likely as those relying on public assistance to have very high housing cost burdens.

The shortage of affordable housing is one million or more rental units in every Census region—Northeast, Midwest, South, and West. The widest affordable housing gaps, when measured as the number of low-income renters competing for each occupied low-rent unit, are in the West and Northeast.[1]

Some 83 percent of poor renter households in central cities spent at least 30 percent of income on housing in 1993, as did 87 percent of poor renters in suburban areas and 74 percent of poor renters in nonmetro areas.

The problems of high housing cost burdens affect poor white, black, and Hispanic households alike, with more than four of five poor renters in each group spending at least 30 percent of income on housing. Similar proportions of both elderly and non-elderly poor renters had housing cost burdens this high, as did both working poor families with children and poor families without a worker.

The Role of Housing Assistance

The growing affordability problem reflects both an increase in poverty—and thus in the number of low-income renters—and a sharp decline in the supply of low-cost housing in the private market. In 1973, the first year for which such data are available, there were 5.1 million unsubsidized units with costs of $300 a month or less, as measured in 1993 dollars. By 1993, this number had fallen to 2.9 million units, a decline of 43 percent.

To help offset these trends, a significant portion of funds appropriated for housing programs since the early 1970s has been used to expand the supply of subsidized housing. While this has led to an increase in the number of low-income families receiving housing assistance, the number of new housing commitments dropped markedly in the 1980s, even as the affordable housing gap was widening.

Between fiscal years 1977 and 1980, HUD made commitments to expand rental assistance to an average of 290,000 additional low-income households each year.

From fiscal year 1981 through fiscal year 1995, new rental housing commitments fell nearly three-fourths to an average of 74,000 per year. In addition, two other federal housing programs—the HOME program created in 1990 and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit created in 1986—provide funds that allow state and local governments and private organizations to produce housing. Nevertheless, these programs are likely to add only modestly to the supply of housing affordable to the poorest renters since the programs generally are not targeted to very low-income households with severe housing problems.

If the number of additional commitments made since 1981 had remained at the level of the late-1970s, over three million more low-income renters would be receiving housing assistance today and the affordable housing gap would not be so wide.

Altogether, the relatively large expansion of federal housing assistance in the 1970s and more modest expansion in the 1980s resulted in an increase of 2.3 million in the number of families receiving housing assistance. This expansion was roughly equal to the decline in the number of low-cost units in the private market but failed to match the large increase in the number of low-income renters over this period. The overall result was a net loss in the proportion of low-income renters able to find affordable units and a substantial widening of the affordable housing gap.

Most poor renters remain without housing aid. In 1993, some 37 percent of poor renter households received a housing subsidy from the federal, state, or local government. The limited level of housing assistance means that most poor families seeking housing assistance are placed on waiting lists and usually wait several years before receiving aid. In 1993, some 1.4 million households were on waiting lists for housing subsidies for privately owned housing, and 900,000 households were on waiting lists for public housing.

The Impact of Congressional Proposals To Cut Housing Programs

The trends highlighted in this analysis—a declining supply of low-cost rental housing in the private market and a growing number of low-income renters—indicate that unless the number of families receiving government housing assistance increases each year, the affordable housing gap will grow wider. Congress, however, is considering large cuts in funding for federal low-income housing programs. These reductions are likely to end the longstanding practice of modestly adding to the supply of subsidized housing each year and would likely lead to a reduction in the number of low-income families receiving assistance.

The cuts being considered would have an adverse effect on the supply of low-cost housing. Reductions in operating and modernization assistance for public housing included in the House appropriations bill for HUD would likely lead to an increase in the number of vacant public housing units, since public housing authorities would face difficulty maintaining current units and repairing dilapidated units. The bill also would reduce funding for homeless assistance by nearly half, while suspending the requirement that available subsidies be targeted on households with severe housing problems that are most at risk of becoming homeless. In addition, the bill's elimination of efforts to expand the subsidized housing stock while the number of low-rent unsubsidized units continues to fall would widen the affordable housing gap. This can be seen by calculating what would have happened had such policies been in effect in the recent past. If no additional families had received housing assistance between 1973 and 1993, the shortage of affordable housing would have reached nearly 6.9 million units in 1993, rather than 4.7 million.

The proposed reductions in low-income housing programs also would tighten the financial squeeze on many households with very low incomes. Some of the federal savings would come from raising rents on nearly all tenants of subsidized housing, with the greatest increases falling on the poorest tenants. Poor renters not receiving housing assistance also could experience rent increases; if the number of unsubsidized low-cost units continues to fall while the subsidized housing stock is stagnant or begins to shrink, there will be more low-income renters competing for fewer low-rent units. The laws of supply and demand suggest this could push rents upward for many unsubsidized low-rent units. Furthermore, both poor renters who receive housing assistance and those who do not are likely to face greater difficulty in meeting higher rental costs as a result of reductions in other federal programs that assist low-income families and individuals. Expected reductions in AFDC, SSI, food stamps, Medicaid, and the Earned Income Tax Credit will limit the ability of many families to pay rent and meet other necessities. The combined effect of these developments is likely to be pressure for more poor families to ''double up'' and an increase in the number of families at risk of becoming homeless.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as a new member of this subcommittee I want to thank Chairman LEWIS, Congressman STOKES, and the subcommittee staff for their leadership and guidance during this long process.

Our bill contains funding for many vital programs for our Nation's veterans, to protect and preserve our environment, to help house the needy and disabled, and for scientific research and discovery.

It has been a difficult task balancing these needs and funding all of the programs. I believe that we have achieved this. In total, our bill provides $79.4 billion for these programs. Mr. Chairman, this is $10.5 billion less than last year and $10.5 billion below the President's budget request.

Like the other appropriations bills that have passed the House this year, this bill moves the country closer toward the goal of a balanced budget. While I do not agree with all the reductions in this bill, I do believe it is time to stop throwing good money after bad and start refocusing our limited resources toward programs that work.

Since subcommittee markup, I have been contacted by many people who merely look at the bottom line or the appropriated level for each agencies that are contained in this bill. I would suggest to these people that they begin to look at the programs contained in this bill and ask the question are these programs working? In many cases they are not.

For example, both Secretary Cisneros and the President agree that the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] needs to be reformed. In fact, it is the Secretary's own suggestion that many programs should be eliminated and the entire department should be reduced down to three umbrella programs. I am hopeful that the authorization committee on housing will soon adopt a housing bill that will reform HUD and put it back on track.

This message is also targeted toward the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]. Simply sitting back and extending current law, like Superfund, is an abdication of their leadership. Its time to come to the table and be a full partner toward reform. EPA's Administrator has said the program is broken and this bill recognizes that fact. The bill provides adequate funding to keep the program moving, however, it stops the expansion of the program until the law is reauthorized. The last reauthorization was done in 1986.

In reviewing EPA's budget, I have found that the Superfund situation is not an isolated case, but a rule of thumb for many of EPA's programs.

[1] Due to data limitations, the regional gap figures refer to occupied low-cost units only, while the national gap figure accounts for all low-cost units, including those that are vacant.

Yes, environmental laws have worked, however, laws need to be updated and reformed and the status quo is not acceptable. In many cases the bureaucrats have decided arbitrarily to overstep their legal authority and push policies that are clearly beyond statutory intent. Distracted by regulation and litigation, EPA has lost their focus on the bottom line—protecting our resources and addressing critical environmental needs.

In my State of New Jersey, both housing and environmental programs are extremely important. That is why I am pleased to have worked with the chairman to provide additional resources for section 202 and 811—two housing programs that do work to help our older Americans and people with disabilities. This issue will be addressed in the chairman's amendment and I thank him for his support of these programs.

This bill also funds the Department of Veterans Affairs. Nearly half of the bill's funding supports these activities and I am pleased that the committee was able to increase medical care above this year's level by nearly $500 million. In addition we have been able to fully fund the compensations and pensions programs, veterans' insurance, and the Loan Guarantee Program.

This bill is not the perfect answer to all the problems that we face, however, it is the first step in a process that will bring us toward a compromise. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and I urge my colleagues to adopt this measure.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise as a strong supporter of the space station and urge my colleagues to continue funding for this valuable space and science mission.

When I first came to Congress in 1993, I became a member of the Science Committee and the Space Subcommittee. During the 103d Congress, we lived through the highs and the lows of this program. There was a call for the project to be redesigned, and space station funding passed on the House floor by one single vote.

In early 1994, NASA made significant changes in the way it conducted business. They streamlined the program. For the first time, they named a single overall prime contractor for the space station, and they brought proven private sector know-how, decision-making, and competitiveness into the program.

Russia joined our international partnership, a partnership that already included Japan, Canada, and member countries of the European Space Agency. This provided us the opportunity to use selected Russian hardware, to learn from their experience in extended space flight, and to use the MIR space station for testing and training purposes. We all witnessed the successful results of this partnership earlier this month with the MIR docking.

The new, redesigned station, with Boeing as the prime contractor, forced NASA to trim costs and develop a program that was both fiscally and scientifically sound. The space station budget has been capped at $2.1 billion annually. This is not an open-ended obligation, Mr. Chairman. We will reach completion in 2002.

In 1994, continued funding for the station passed overwhelmingly, highlighting the success and bipartisan support for this program.

Mr. Chairman, with the station, we will promote international cooperation and the peaceful exploration of space. We will spawn new industries, new products and new jobs. We will give rise to unprecedented research capabilities, and we will provide incentives to our students to pursue scientific professions if America remains dedicated to preserving its scientific cutting edge.

Since we began the race for space in the 1950's, this Nation has taken upon itself the role of leader, not only in space exploration but also in space-based research.

For my colleagues who are looking for a down-to-earth, practical reason to support this station, here is one for you: your mother, your daughter, your sister, or your wife. Because of the unique microgravity environment the station provides for research, new and exciting approaches to diagnosing and treating breast cancer, ovarian cancer, and osteoporosis are being investigated in space labs in ways that simply are not possible on Earth.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, as a result of an amendment that I worked on that set aside funding specifically for women's health care research, for the first time on the recent MIR mission female rats were used to study the relationship of long-term space existence on the development of osteoporosis. Biomedical research on Earth, working hand-in-hand with space-based research, will help eradicate this terrible disease that affects our mothers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that some of the cuts in this bill are obviously acceptable in the interest of deficit reduction. But the problem with this bill is that it simply goes too far. It makes what I consider to be savage cuts in housing. It contains a wholesale assault on our ability to protect public health and to protect clean water and clean air and our natural resources, and it contains unnecessary reductions in veterans' health care, all to free up more money in this grand scheme to provide significant tax reduction for people who make $200,000 a year or more.

I do not believe that is right. I would urge at the end of the day after we have had at it on the amendments that unless this bill is improved markedly, and I do not think it can be—I think it is beyond help almost—I would urge you to vote against it.

I have great respect for the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], he is a good friend of mine, but I do not see any reason why we ought to use this vehicle to really crunch in a serious way our ability to protect public health from toxic chemicals.

If you take a look at this bill, fully one-third of this bill, which is supposed to be simply a budget bill, contains illegitimate legislative language that prevents the Government from enforcing the law to protect the health of workers, to protect the right of neighborhoods to know what kind of toxic chemicals are being infused into the atmosphere, to protect the public's right to drink safe clean water, and it engages in all kinds of Rube Goldberg operations in the veterans' health care area in order to squeeze out yet more money for tax cuts for the rich.

This is not a fair bill. It is not a decent bill. It ought to be defeated.

□ 1245

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], my good friend who has done yeoman's work on trying to protect the poor and the vulnerable and the working people and our senior citizens in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the trouble is we just do not have the votes to protect the people that the Republican majority wants to cut in order to provide a tremendous tax break to the richest and most powerful interests in this country, and at the same time, pump more and more funds into the defense bill.

It would be one thing if all of these bills were looked at with any kind of sensibility, but what we have seen is a $7.6 billion increase in the defense bill alone as it pertains to equipment purchases. We are buying B–2's that the Navy and Air Force say they do not need. We are buying F–22's that they say they do not need. The Navy says it really does not need this new submarine, but we are buying that anyway.

But, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to housing, we are going to go out and get public housing, raise rents on our senior citizens, and turn around and say that we are going to try to protect the homeless by cutting the homeless program in this country by 50 percent.

When all sorts of Cain was raised about that, the Republicans are going

to come back in and say they are going to put another $1 million back into the homeless program after 7 years, but they are going to take the money out of assisted housing in order to fund the homeless program.

We are going to create more homelessness and put the money back into homelessness. This is one of the most half-cocked, hair-brained schemes I have ever seen. The authorizing committee ought to have had hearings; made decisions about whether or not we ought to put funds into the section 8 program, versus public housing, versus assisted housing. There are good decisions that could be made and we do not have one of them that is located in this bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE], the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2099.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us realize that these cuts are targeted to the most vulnerable people in our population, those persons who are in the greatest need, those persons who cannot stand the lethal blow that this particular bill makes available for them.

Mr. Chairman, it is the highlight of arrogance, in my opinion, that we devastate possibilities for community revitalization, that we take those persons who are in need of government support as it relates to section 8 rental assistance and that we reduce the amount available to them, while at the same time raising the amount of rent that they will have to pay.

Mr. Chairman, the height of hypocrisy is reflected in the fact that on this day we unveil a memorial for the Korean War veterans, while at the same time are cutting millions of dollars from the veterans' programs.

As a nation, we cannot afford to continue to allow people to live in substandard housing, allow people to live at a standard that is not qualitative, so that all of our people understand that they have a place in this great democracy of ours.

Mr. Chairman, where is our compassion? If we are compassionate, we will vote this bill down.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, when I refer to H.R. 2099 in one word that word is ''commitment.'' Congress has made a commitment to the people of our Nation to balance the budget and this bill takes a large step in that direction—providing more than $10 billion in deficit reduction. Yes, Uncle Sam can be put on a diet and the Appropriations Committee is his personal trainer.

But Congress also committed itself to end duplication of programs and eliminate the never-ending source of redtape. This bill eliminates outlived bureaucracies and consolidates several programs, with the President's blessing, in an effort to improve services such as better housing for those who need assistance.

Last, the bill fulfills our Nation's commitment to veterans. Our veteran's health is of utmost importance. That is why the VA medical care account was the only account in the bill not to receive a reduction. Assuming that the chairman's upcoming amendment is approved—and I urge my colleagues to support it—the VA medical care account will increase by $562 million more than last year's funding level. But that is not all. The bill provides increases over fiscal year 1995 funding for compensation and pensions, readjustment benefits for education and training, and veterans insurance. The bill also provides funding for medical research, the National Cemetery System, and State veterans' cemeteries, among other essential programs for veterans.

As a member of the VA–HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, I can tell you that this was not an easy bill to draft—and I thank and applaud the chairman and his staff for their dedication to this task. But it is a bill that makes priorities and fulfills our commitment to the people of this Nation to spend their money wisely. That is a promise made and a promise kept by this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is fundamentally flawed. It would ravage communities, uproot families, and disrupt the lives of thousands of Americans. We must reform public housing, but Republicans have gone about it entirely wrong.

This bill would increase rents paid by residents recieving section 8 vouchers from 30 to 32 percent of adjusted income. The average voucher family has a yearly income just under $8,000. This increase would have the affect of taking away $140 per year from these families.

It would also decresae the work incentive for able-bodied adults.

It would zero out community development banks, a bi-partisan programs which generates private-sector economic development.

This bill reduces housing for seniors, for the sick, and for the needy. It legislates a series of changes which would greatly inhibit our ability to house Americans, expand opoprtunities, and develop economically. It is extreme and it should be defeated. I urge defeat of this bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD], a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the cuts contained in the Republican VA–HUD appropriations bill are devastating for working American families. For example, the community development financial institution fund, which helps communities and individuals empower themselves, will be defunded.

The CDFI fund was created because residents and entrepreneurs from low and moderate income communities unfairly experience barriers in obtaining credit.

Many do not qualify for loans to purchase a home or start a business because they lack conventional credit histories. As a result, individuals and communities cannot achieve economic prosperity and self-reliance.

CDFI fund resources leverage private sector funds and provide assistance and training to community development financial institutions.

The CDFI fund is a powerful tool that creates jobs, restores hope, and provides a better way of life for those desiring a piece of the American dream.

Only last year the CDFI received the near unanimous support of Democrats and Republicans. Vote ''no'' on the VA–HUD appropriations bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk specifically about cuts in this bill which concern me greatly; cuts to the Mission to Planet Earth, a critical NASA program. The President requested $1.34 billion. This bill, unfortunately, includes only $1 billion. That is a lot of money, but it is a very significant reduction from the request and from the level adopted by the Committee on Science this week.

The committee, on Tuesday, reported a bill that authorizes $1.27 billion for Mission to Planet Earth. This is $272 million above the reported appropriation amount.

Mr. Chairman, we should restore that money, if the allocation to this appropriation measure was not so constrained. I understand the problem of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] with respect to the funds available, but this program is a critical program for the future, not only of the space program, but for the future of the ability of those of us on Earth to understand better our environment and our weather.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the committee would see fit to increasing this sum as this bill moves through.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 2099. It represents a political meat ax, rather than a responsible

carving knife, as we approach the budget process.

Mr. Chairman, there is a 23-percent cut in housing programs, representing more than $5 billion; representing the elimination of personal programs such as section 8, which helps disadvantaged people get housing, and HOPE homeownership grants that allow people to pursue the American dream.

This bill represents a 46-percent cut in housing for the elderly. How some Members could say we are helping the elderly is beyond me. The elderly will pay between an average of 400 and 600 additional dollars per year for senior housing.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a 54-percent cut for low-income assisted housing programs, the working poor of our country, and a 49-percent cut in homeless programs, which means that more Americans will be living in cardboard boxes and laying out along the street side.

Critically, it represents a 48-percent cut in construction and improvement in veterans' facilities, which means our Nation's veterans will continue to see inadequate treatment and work in inadequate facilities.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today out of a sense of deep sadness and outrage. Yet again, the majority brings before this body an attack on children, the elderly, and the poor.

The cuts in this bill are criminal. Funding for low-income housing is slashed by $7 billion. Homeless assistance; public and assisted housing; housing for the elderly, the disabled, and AIDS victims; and the FHA multifamily insurance program all suffer steep rollbacks. Many others, such as the Drug Elimination Program, are eliminated altogether. These cuts, Mr. Chairman, aren't about numbers—they're about human beings. There's a human tragedy behind every dollar of these reductions.

On any given night last winter, there were 600,000 men, women, and sometimes children living on the streets. This bill's $540 million cut in the McKinney program would mean that hundreds of thousands more will join them this winter. I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 2099. There is too much pain behind this bill.

A $700 million cut in public housing operating subsidies, and a $2.3 billion reduction in the public housing capital budget isn't an abstraction. These cuts mean delays in both basic maintenance and major repairs; less security services; and the elimination of essential social services. For 3 million public housing residents, the reductions translate into deteriorating buildings, greater insecurity, and fewer opportunities for economic advancement.

Ending the Drug Elimination Program isn't about cutting wasteful pork-barrel projects. In New York City, the program funds 435 housing police officers who patrol the grounds and hallways of New York's public housing developments. These beat cops would be lost.

This is only a partial list of the many tragedies that would result from this bill. At some point in this appropriations process, reasonable minds and compassionate hearts must prevail. I urge my colleagues to reach that point in this bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I certainly rise in opposition to this bill, because it affects the people we represent.

Mr. Chairman, what do they want from us? What do they expect from this bill? They expect decent, affordable, sanitary shelter. They expect environmental justice. They expect us to try and respond to what their needs are.

We obviously have a budget problem, that is dug deeper by the tax breaks that our Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to want to advance and dig the hole deeper with our Federal budget deficit. We have to pull in the belt, but we do not have to do it on the basis of the poorest of the poor, the working people, or families.

□ 1300

They want shelter; they want a green environment. They want the same small good things of life. People want us to take the knowledge we have and use it to provide for their need and protection.

There are a lot of people walking around who have got their heads up in the stars. They want to look too and fund the space station. The votes are here for that.

Frankly, to me, it is the alchemists project of the 20th century trying to do something of questionable value at the very same time we have got real serious problems right here in our communities. We have got to advance not just on defeating the budget deficit, the fiscal deficit, but we have got to deal with the human deficit, what is happening to people in our communities. Those that do not have the skills, that do not have the education, do not have the shelter, to give them the wherewithal, those working people, so they can pull themselves up.

We have got to be partners in this process, the Federal Government with the non-profits and others. We cannot walk away from the State and local governments that are depending on these housing and environmental programs. They work. Let us not kill them.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this, appropriations legislation that devalues communities and families with slash-and-burn cuts in important programs at HUD and the EPA. While the VA, HUD, and independent agencies bill has essentially insulated important Veterans programs, and saved NASA's space station yet again, this bill has set in its sights the undermining of environmental law and policies and the gutting of basic housing and shelter needs of poor American citizens. These housing cuts measuring roughly 25 percent of the total and budget for 1995 and are all the more dangerous in light of the recently approved rescission bill for fiscal year 1995 that took over $6 billion from HUD.

The underlying bill basically halves the funds available for HUD's homeless programs: assuring that approximately 130,000 fewer homeless Americans will be served this coming fiscal year. These are not just numbers, they affect real people families. They are the lives that won't recover from homelessness by moving into transitional or permanent housing, to jobs and self-sufficiency. Talk about a fiscal deficit must also consider the human deficit. The Minnesota communities of St. Paul, Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and St. Louis County, that could receive over $13 million in fiscal year 1996 for homeless assistance, would likely see $6.5 million less for providing key services and intervention to do just that.

Furthermore, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Emergency Food and Shelter Program for the homeless is reduced 23 percent by this bill. This highly successful program that partners with the major national charities will find that it will be able to serve almost 24 million fewer meals, provide close to 1 million fewer nights of shelter for individuals and families, and give homeless prevention assistance through emergency mortgage-rent-utilities payments in close to 200,000 instances in the next fiscal year because of this bill.

To add salt to the budget cut wounds, this appropriations bill will cut public housing modernization funds and operating subsidies funds, forcing an increase in vacant unit, a reduction in maintenance and less spending on necessary security and social services. These cuts will mean almost $19 million less for housing authorities in Minnesota alone. The underlying bill then ironically asks low-income families, who do not have income to spare, to kick in more of their meager funds through minimum rents, a repeal of the decades old Brooke amendment that limits the percentage of their income spent on rent, and through the inclusion of utilities payments which of course is a significant cost in extreme climate areas such as Minnesota. All of this, without one hearing on the implications of these policy changes in our Housing and Community Opportunities Subcommittee at the Banking Committee.

This bill eliminates the Congregate Housing Services Program. It combines elderly, disabled and HIV/AIDS housing programs into one program and then cuts their funds 46 percent. It wipes out the successful Public Housing Drug Elimination Program. This program, which I tried to expand last year, often provides the extra support necessary for public housing authorities [PHA's] and their residents to make a difference in their lives. For example, in St. Paul Public Housing, this program is being used to offer a STEP Program: Support for Training and Employment Program. STEP provides job training with individualized

case management. This particular program partners with the Minnesota Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and St. Paul Public Schools.

This appropriation bill further reneges on decent, safe, affordable housing for all Americans by eliminating funding for new incremental section 8 rental assistance. This move will resign the millions on waiting lists today to an certain terminal wait in substandard housing or our Nation's streets.

The VA, HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill continues the assault on underserved communities by killing AmeriCorps, the FDIC Affordable Housing Fund, and the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund. The CDFI fund that was created in late 1994 to provide a national network of financial institutions dedicated to community development. It was bipartisanly supported at that time—and, even in the recent 1995 rescissions bill assured that the CDFI would have $50 million as it streamlined and reduced the administrative costs of the program.

This program is unique providing capital support for CDFI's to use to leverage or to provide incentives for more traditional thrifts and banks to increase community investment and lending. This Clinton initiative is about developing private markets in distressed communities in order to create jobs, provide housing loans, construct affordable housing, and provide other opportunities to help communities and individuals to help themselves through access to capital. The CDFI program should be funded. It has broad support from community groups and lending institutions alike. It is petty politics that sees it defunded today and I would hope that this Congress could rise above that and seek good policy instead.

In a year of relentless attacks on decades of environmental policies and laws, the Appropriations Committee budget plan for the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] sets a new standard for outrageousness. The VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 cuts EPA's operating budget by one third and enforcement budget by 50 percent. The legislation prevents EPA from enforcing central parts of the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and other major environmental programs.

Because of these proposed radical cuts, the bill would reduce the ability of the EPA to respond to threats to the environment and human health. In the long run, this approach will mean more water pollution, more smog, more food poisoning, more toxic waste spills, and eventually, more taxpayer dollars spent to solve these problems.

It is particularly egregious to use the budget process to eliminate critical programs that protect public health and the environment—the Appropriations Committee should not be prohibiting any agencies from enforcing Federal law. If Congress intends to repeal or roll back environmental protection statutes, these changes should be debated out in the open. The American people will not stand for this give away to polluters behind closed doors.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, I have so very many concerns regarding this bill that I must certainly and will oppose it. This bill is full of authorizing language that reflect policy changes that have not been reviewed by the Committees of jurisdiction much less the public. This Congress has its priorities all wrong: Tax breaks for the rich, $2 billion in pie-in-the-sky funds for space stations our modern day alchemy, and giveaways for corporations who plunder our natural resources, while at the same time, eviscerating affordable housing, gutting environmental safeguards, and cutting funds for our most vulnerable citizens, the homeless. I do wish to be associated with supporting these ill-conceived attacks on our future and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I am pleased to rise in support of an appropriations bill both because of its substance and the process that molded it.

Chairman LEWIS fully consulted with the Science Committee on programs under our jurisdiction. The result is a bill that closely tracks the NASA and NSF authorizations reported by the Science Committee over the past 2 months.

H.R. 2099 starts the transition of NASA from an operational service agency to a premier research agency. Space science and human exploration are the priority as evidenced by full funding of such programs as the Cassini Saturn mission, Gravity Probe B, and the paramount space-based basic research laboratory known as Space Station Alpha. Revolutionary new efforts such as fundamental research in support of private sector development of fully reusable launch vehicles and small satellite and spacecraft technology is also promoted.

NASA programs that continue the Government as a service provider are transitional to the private sector. These include the space shuttle and Mission to Planet Earth. American commercial interests can provide both space transportation services and environmental and planetary data much more efficiently and effectively than huge, inflexible Federal bureaucratic armies that too often lack creativity and incentive.

The other shining jewel for science in the VA–HUD bill is NSF. Its basic university research grant funding is held virtually harmless at its current level. Not too many Federal missions can claim that fact. This appropriation follows the Science Committee's lead in promoting the priority of basic research in the physical science directorates.

So, all in all, Mr. Chairman, this is a very good bill. It makes significant progress on deficit reduction while also setting wise priorities for the future knowledge base of the Nation. I thank and commend Chairman LEWIS for accommodating the Science Committee's policy goals. I strongly support the bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], a member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Sadly, I rise in opposition to this bill, which we have worked so very hard on.

Let me say for the record that I voted for almost every balanced budget amendment that passed this House and maintain a voting record that proves that.

This bill is truly too severe. It cuts housing in our country by over 23 percent. It means seniors living in buildings across this country will be paying $1,000 more a year even though they make $8,000 a year. It means our mayors will have to choose between homeless, where funds are being cut by half, and drug elimination programs, and I think that EPA's cut of 33 percent, when we have got dumps and leaking dumps all over this country and toxic waste that we have to clean up is really wrong.

I think the President had a 2-percent cut in this budget. I think that was reasonable. This budget is too extreme, too sever, and in addition to that, if you read the provisions in the report, it even tries to undermine EPA's ability to enforce environmental standards along our border as a result of NAFTA.

It is even undermining environmental enforcement. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this measure.

Mr. Chairman, sadly, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is too extreme, at the same time too severe. I want to commend the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], for his cordial handling of this very complicated bill and to express my sincere appreciation for his efforts in restoring $10 million of funding to the Department of Veterans Affairs' Health Professional Scholarship Program by transferring funds from other accounts. I also want to acknowledge the diligence an wise counsel of the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], on this bill.

Let me point out, I voted for the budget amendments that passed this House and maintain a voting record that proves it. But this bill is not even-handed—it cuts environmental protection by one-third; it cuts housing and senior housing by 25 percent, and it cuts medical care by $250 million at times when our World War II veterans are using the system in greater numbers.

INTRODUCTION

The programs under our committee's jurisdiction provide assistance and benefits that help millions of Americans achieve a better life. Included are programs for medical care and benefits for our Nation's veterans, affordable and decent housing for families and individuals of all incomes and circumstances, a safe and clean environment, and investments in technology and science.

Rather than cutting these budgets by a reasonable amount—say 2 to 5 percent—it axes support for key national commitments. The overall effect of the bill before this body is to seriously erode our efforts for veterans, housing, and the environment. This bill provides inadequate support for our Nation's veterans,

and it will impair our ability to provide them quality medical care. It also makes deep cuts in the funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development—25 percent—and the Environmental Protection Agency—32 percent. In addition, this bill continues to fund one very big-ticket item, the space station, at the expense of other programs under the committee's jurisdiction, including ones designed to assist the poorest, the neediest, and the most vulnerable among us. I disagree with the severity of the reductions. And what makes it more egregious is that all the savings will not be used to balance the budget. Rather, the money is being controlled to give tax breaks to the Fortune 500 ''big daddies'' later this year. This is simply wrong.

HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Let me say, I am grateful to the chairman for his willingness to work with me to fund the Health Professional Scholarship Program. This educational and training program assists in assuring an adequate supply of trained health professionals, not only for the VA but also the Nation. To date, these scholarship awards have provided more than 4,000 scholarships to students in nursing, occupational therapy, physical therapy, respiratory therapy, and nurse anesthesia. I thank the chairman for his strong willingness to cooperate and provide leadership on this health scholarship program which helps advance professionals during a time when tuition costs are skyrocketing.

Upon graduation, students are required to complete 2 years of service in the VA health system, and the retention rate of the scholarship recipients in VA medical centers is greater than 50 percent.

The flexibility to provide scholarships for the education of a variety of health professionals has made this program particularly useful as changes have occurred in the delivery of health care services. As the program has identified shortages in particular categories of health professionals, the numbers and types of scholarship awards have been shifted accordingly. For example, in fiscal year 1994, more awards were made for advanced practice nurses, in contrast to entry-level nurses, and for physical therapists and occupational therapists. These are the health professionals currently in shortest supply in the VA, and they are anticipated to be needed nationwide in the future. This academic year, the program will be adding physician assistant awards to meet the needs of a health care system that is increasingly focusing on primary care.

The funding of this program is vital to the recruitment and retention of scarce health professionals in the VA, and it is necessary to be responsive to the health care needs of veterans who have courageously defended this Nation. I thank the chairman for his strong leadership on this program.

EAP/NAFTA REPORT LANGUAGE

I also oppose this bill because it contains too much free rein with legislation on an appropriation bill.

In addition, the report to this bill contains language which undermines our ability to enforce NAFTA. The report to the bill questions EPA's use of subpoenas to collect United States-Mexico border environmental data it infers EPA's issuing subpoenas to American companies with subsidiaries located in the vicinity of the New River and Imperial Valley in southern California, has somehow contravened NAFTA. This language is just one more example of the influence of big business lobbyists, and the extent to which the majority has subordinated the health and safety of our continent to pure greed.

Everyone knows that the EPA is well within its authority in issuing these subpoenas. They were issued to U.S. companies, which are required to comply with existing U.S. standards. The NAFTA contains provisions that protect our rights to determine and apply our own levels of environmental protection, and the Toxic Substances Control Act specifically authorizes the EPA to issue subpoenas as it did in this case. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be better served by listening to the Member of their own party who represents the district in question rather than the special interests and big business lobbyists who would use report language such as this in an attempt to intimidate the EPA into backing off of an investigation which would have major health implications for our citizens.

CONCLUSION

As I outlined earlier during the debate on the rule, I also oppose this bill because it zeroes out the effective drug elimination program. That has stemmed the drug tide across this Nation. Because of its elimination as well as the reductions in other vital programs that help veterans, the elderly, and children, I must oppose this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same. The bill is not balanced, and its savings will not help reduce deficit, but rather be transferred to billions in tax breaks to the privileged few. How sad.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the 1996 appropriations bill for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.

The Republicans have once again adopted a paint-by-numbers strategy to reach their arbitrary deficit reduction target and finance a tax break for wealthy special interests.

How simple is their strategy? Remarkably simple. And remarkably cruel.

Draw a line through those programs that help the poor, the needy, and the less fortunate. Slash your way across the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Veterans' Affairs, until you reach the Environmental Protection Agency.

Once again, the Republican's have enacted wholesale change that will significantly decrease the quality of life for millions of Americans.

The Republicans profess to have our long-term interests at stake, but their actions—in this case—speak loudly and clearly.

This bill not only risks the health of our veterans, but the health and safety of all Americans.

Unable to eliminate the EPA, my Republican colleagues have done their level best to cripple this agency and eviscerate programs that ensure every American has access to safe drinking water, clean air, and a toxic-free environment.

Mr. Chairman, along the way, strike a crippling blow against housing programs that provide affordable, safe, and decent housing for the elderly, the poor, and the sick.

When you are painting by numbers, when your goal is driven by numbers, not by people, it is easy to pursue your goal with abandon.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind my Republican colleagues that behind those numbers are real human beings, living real lives, and struggling to get by in tough times.

A great number of the public housing units in this country are occupied by elderly women. And over a million of our children—of America's children—live in public housing units. For many of these kids, just about the only thing they can depend on, from day-to-day, is a place to go home to at night.

This bill slashes public housing operating subsidies and modernization funds. The bill eliminates—obliterates—funding for severely distressed public housing and development, in addition to new housing vouchers and certificates for the poor.

If you are homeless, forget it. The Republicans have decided to paint you out of the picture, cutting homeless assistance grants by 50 percent.

The Republican approach is really very simple. They shake your hand and direct your attention to the magnificent prize behind curtain No. 3. When you turn your head, they reach around and pick your pocket.

Hundreds of thousands of families who depend on section 8 assisted housing will get their pockets picked if this bill passes. At least 600,000 families in public and section 8 assisted housing will pay more every month in rent unless we reject this bill.

While we debate these cuts, I urge my colleagues to remember that this week marks particularly poignant moment. Today, we will dedicate a monument to the veterans of the Korean war.

There are few Americans more deserving of our support than these veterans, and the veterans of our wars of the last half-century.

Yet, the Republican bill cuts $250 million from veterans medical care and zeroes-out funding for a replacement VA hospital in northern California that was to service a veterans population of over 400,000 men and women. These cuts are unwise and break a promise that Congress made to northern California veterans 4 years ago.

Without adequate support, the VA will simply be unable to meet the increasing demand for health services as our veterans population ages.

This bill cuts the EPA budget by one-third, hazardous waste cleanup programs by 30 percent, and funds for wastewater treatment facilities by 25 percent.

Perhaps most devastating is the legislative language in this bill that would prohibit the EPA from taking action to clean our environment. These include restrictions on the EPA's ability to regulate sewer systems, wetlands, refineries, oil and gas manufacturing, radon in water, pesticides in processed food, lead paint, and water pollution.

Some very important programs—such as the Sacramento River Pollutant Control Program—have been funded in this bill. With this funding, Sacramento County will be able to complete the process of identifying which pollutants exceed water quality standards.

Once this is accomplished, the county can develop a feasible, cost-effective plan to address the problem of pollution in the Sacramento River.

While this critical program has been funded, hundreds of others around the country have not.

The Sacramento River Pollutant Control Program is a step in the right direction. But it does not begin to make up for the hundreds of steps back in this bill.

All of us have been asked to make sacrifices to help balance the Federal budget. We are prepared to make those sacrifices. But no one—not one American—should have to sacrifice decent living conditions or a clean environment to finance a tax-break for Republican special interests.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, but I do want to say to this House and to this country that to cut VA, HUD, and independent agencies as they have been cut in this bill is obscene, and it is not credible, and it does not show responsibility on the side of the Republicans' part of our House.

I have served with them for 2 years, but I cannot believe that our good chairman on the Republican side would cut these housing programs and gut them for poor people.

I want you to go with me for a moment or two and realize that there are poor people who live in public housing whose water has sewage in it, whose housing is really, really depreciated to the point that they can not live in the housing. It makes just a mockery of poor people who need public housing.

If government is any good to anybody, it should be good to poor people.

You zero out funding to seriously distressed public housing. I appeal to you to, please, redo some of the things in this bill.

First of all, you need to kill this bill, because it deserves a respectable death.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is very big on the deficit and tiny on fairness.

Certainly, we have to contribute and share the sacrifice in moving to a balanced budget by the year 2002. But we should be as concerned about the millions of senior citizens in this country as we seem to be about housing for astronauts in space. Our priorities should not be just about four astronauts being housed in comfortable quarters but about being fair to millions of seniors and low-income people and not slash their budget by 23 percent.

Let us make some of the tough choices around here and cut a B–2 bomber or two that the Defense Department does not even want. Let us cut back on the CIA and the tobacco subsidies. Let us not decimate NASA and the space station.

Other people have said the NASA budget is good. That is not true. Mission to Planet Earth is cut by $338 million. Science, aeronautics, and technology is cut by $313 million.

Let us be fair in our efforts to move together in a bipartisan way to balance this budget.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad bill. Through targeted spending cuts, restrictive language, and legislative riders, this bill is designed to assure less environmental protection and increased risk to the health and safety of our constituents. Without substantial changes, the House should reject this bill and allow the Appropriations Committee to develop a bill which is worthy of support.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2099 reduces funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by over one-third. This is unconscionable. While all agencies can use trimming of their budgets, we should be reviewing unsuccessful programs for cuts. Instead, this bill inadequately funds many of the programs which have proved to be highly successful—programs such as the Clean Water Act State revolving loan fund program. This is not cutting the fat, this is cutting the lean.

It also inadequately funds the Superfund Program with the excuse that this is a transition year for that program. If this bill is part of a transition, it is a transition to disaster.

This bill makes the funding of assistance to States and local governments subject to reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. It creates a hostage of every constituent who is concerned about clean water. It would also cut off funding for the Superfund Program on December 31 of this year. It creates a hostage out of every constituent who cares about cleaning up toxic waste sites.

Why does the bill contain these restrictions? Unlike past years, this is not about the prerogatives of the authorizing committees under the rules of the House. No, the restrictions of H.R. 2099 are designed to put pressure on the Senate to adopt the House position on waivers, loopholes, and rollbacks for industrial polluters which were included in H.R. 961.

That's right, the needs of State officials for money to operate State programs, the needs of cities to construct improvements in wastewater treatment, and the needs of the people for improved water quality are all being put on hold so that industrial dischargers might have more leverage in convincing the Senate to accept waivers, loopholes, and rollbacks of the Clean Water Act.

Throughout the clean water debate on this floor, proponents of the legislation repeatedly argued that the States know best, and that the States must be allowed the maximum ability to control water pollution decisions. But now, when it is time to actually indicate your support for cities and States, to literally put your money where your mouth is, the interests of State and local governments are being swept aside so that industrial polluters can have increased leverage in the Senate.

Under H.R. 2099, States and local governments are held hostage in receiving $1.4 billion in grants to implement the Clean Water Act programs, even as cities and States continue to bear the burden of State and Federal requirements to improve water quality. This bill is the mother of all unfunded mandates. This is not what the cities and States want, and it is not what the citizens who we represent deserve.

H.R. 2099 is an abuse of the legislative process, and an abuse of the interests of State and local governments.

In Clean Water alone, the funding in H.R. 2099 is far below what is required, and far below the levels which the House approved just 2 months ago.

The most recent estimate of needs generated by the States indicates that there are documented needs of over $130 billion over the next 20 years. At the funding levels of this bill, it will be impossible to ever fully capitalize the State revolving loan funds so as to meet these needs.

Additionally, the House budget resolution assumed a funding level of $2.3 billion annually for the water infrastructure account. During consideration of the clean water amendments of 1995 in May, it was the opinion of the majority of the House that the funding authorization level should be reduced to match the budget resolution. I opposed that amendment, and many of you joined with me. Now, even that reduced funding level is cut in half.

What we see is just one broken commitment after another to the cities and States. Promise the cities and States $3 billion to get support for gutting the Clean Water Act. When critics raise concerns about the bill, proponents argued that H.R. 961 was a strong bill because it provided $3 billion annually to the States.

But then the House Budget Committee developed a budget resolution which assumed spending of $2.3 billion annually. So the Republican leadership supports an amendment on the floor to reduce the authorization level to $2.3 billion to conform to the budget resolution. Now, we are being asked to approve a funding level one-half of the promise made just 2 short months ago.

This sounds again like promises made, and promises broken.

However, as objectionable as these funding levels are, this bill is totally unacceptable for the way in which it seeks to radically alter the implementation of the Nation's environmental laws. In all my years in the House, I have never seen a more outrageous attempt to dismantle environmental protection through the appropriations process.

Changes to the Nation's environmental programs should be debated within the context of the proper committees of jurisdiction. Instead what we have here is an attempt to gut the major environmental statutes by tucking legislation in the back of an appropriation bill at the last minute—legislation which would never survive public opinion if done in the open and through the normal process.

Let's look at some of the more egregious provisions.

Under this bill, EPA is prohibited from using any funds for the implementation of the Great Lakes water quality guidance, notwithstanding the enormous amount of work which States, local governments, private citizens, and EPA have put into the development of that guidance.

This guidance was the subject of two separate amendments during markup of the clean water amendments of 1995 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Over the course of 2 days, a compromise was developed which was adopted by the committee. While the compromise clearly did not please all parties, it allowed the authorizing committee the opportunity to fully debate and consider the issue. In the end, the Transportation Committee specifically approved the use of the guidance. This thoughtful and deliberate process would be overturned should the provision in this bill restricting the use of funds remain.

Another of the restrictions prohibits EPA from taking steps to stop raw sewage overflows regardless of the environmental consequences of these overflows. These are the same overflows which cause beach closures and prevent the consumption of shellfish. This is not an imaginary concern, and it is not without its economic consequences. In 1994 alone, polluted water caused at least 2,279 swimming advisories and beach closings. This results in the loss of millions of dollars in tourist and recreational dollars, and thousands of lost jobs.

This bill says that EPA cannot address the serious issue of stormwater pollution, even though it often represents the major pollution problem in urban areas. This restriction would bar enforcement not only of municipal stormwater violations, but also of all industrial stormwater violations as well.

While I have long supported changes to the municipal stormwater program to make it more responsive to environmental needs and the economic realities of the cities, it is not the role of the Appropriations Committee to stop all efforts to address this serious problem. Not even H.R. 961 did that. Yet, that is what we have here before us.

EPA is prohibited from taking any action to implement or enforce the wetlands program. Clearly the Nation's wetlands program is in need of reform, but it is not in need of wholesale abandonment. H.R. 2099 will allow illegal activities to proceed unabated, regardless of the impacts on adjoining property owners since EPA will be powerless to assist in any enforcement activities. If this bill is enacted, upstream property owners will be able to fill wetlands with no risk of EPA interference. Upstream property owners will be able to contribute to flooding and water quality degradation downstream with no fear of enforcement of the law by EPA. This is not wetlands reform, this is an abandonment of the protection which we all expect our Government to provide.

The bill prohibits EPA from revising or issuing effluent limitations guidelines and standards, pretreatment standards, or new source performance standards notwithstanding the need of industry, States and localities for updates of existing standards. Yet, it is these standards which the States use for the dramatic improvements in water quality which we will enjoy. If this language is enacted, there are two likely results—either all progress in improving water quality will stop, or States will have to go this route alone. I do not believe that American people want improvements to stop, and telling the States that they must develop standards and guidelines on their own is a very expensive proposition for the States.

H.R. 2099 creates a new right to pollute the environment with no fear of repercussion. First, it reduces the enforcement budget of EPA by nearly $130 million. Second, it creates an entirely unfounded and new defense to any enforcement action. No penalties may be sought against a polluter if the matter is subject to a State law providing for a privilege for voluntary environmental audit reports. This may be the biggest ''Get Out of Jail Free'' card which ever existed.

Under this language, a polluter would be able to escape any penalty for environmental violations, no matter how severe, if the polluter merely turns himself in. In addition, this language is written so broadly, that the admission need not be related to the pollution which is the subject of the enforcement action. If this language is taken to its extreme, it appears as though it is not even necessary that the State law providing for immunity and the pollution need to have taken place in the same State.

Imagine if you would, the ability for a polluter to escape responsibility merely by reporting the polluter's own wrongdoing, and even if the reported wrongdoing is unrelated to the environmental harm caused by the pollution.

H.R. 2099 also would permanently waive categorical pretreatment standards for a single wastewater treatment plant in Kalamazoo, MI. Why this particular plant, and why right now? There has been no public discourse over the merits of such a broad exemption. Yet, the appropriations process seems to be the place where all your concerns with environmental laws can be addressed, and all environmental protection abandoned.

Mr. Chairman, the concerns I have just outlined are more than enough reason to oppose this bill. Unfortunately for the interests of our constituents and the environment, I have barely touched the surface. H.R. 2099 includes many more riders and restrictions on the ability of EPA to perform its responsibilities under the law and to fulfill the expectations of the general public. Many of these riders and restrictions favor specific industries or specific locations—industries such as oil, cement kiln, and pulp and paper, and locations such as Kalamazoo, MI, and the Kammer power generating station in West Virginia.

Each of these special riders or restrictions must be removed from the bill prior to House approval. That is why I intend to support the Stokes-Boehlert amendment to delete the riders and restrictions. The waivers, loopholes, and rollbacks which H.R. 2099 contains clearly make this an unacceptable bill.

I urge defeat of H.R. 2099.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON]. No Member has been more diligent in representing his district and more cooperative with the committee than the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I commend the chairman for the hard work that he has been doing.

It must be made very clear to all Members that if we do not balance our budget, there will be no resources for important programs like that NASA, like VA, and like HUD.

I support the chairman in the outstanding efforts in making sure that our manned space flight program is funded in this budget, particularly the space station.

I do have some concerns about the provisions in this budget for VA medical care in my district as well as some concerns about senior housing. I believe that we will be able to address some of these issues in an upcoming amendment on this bill.

However, I cannot overstate the importance that if we do not move toward a balanced budget, all of these crucial programs will no longer exist.

I commend the chairman. I commend all the Republican Members as well as the Democrat Members on the other side of the aisle for working very hard to getting us toward that goal, that goal that has been so elusive for so

many years and years and years, up until this new Congress, of balancing our budget and moving our Nation toward a future of prosperity not only for the people alive today but as well for future generations that will not be inheriting bankruptcy.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today recognizing what we have to do regarding a sound fiscal policy.

But I also rise to say that we must give hope to the homeless. We have some 600,000 individuals who are homeless at any given night, and these cuts specifically in Homeless Assistance would fall heaviest on the poorest Americans. A national sample found the average monthly household income among homeless persons was less than $200, regardless of household composition.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking we give hope to the homeless. I would like to see more money added. I hope I will be able to offer an amendment that adds an additional $25 million to the homeless so they will not be hopeless.

I think the key issue is investment. Are we investing in people so that they can make a difference in their lives?

I think the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act supportive housing [SHP] funds for the homeless have been utilized successfully and productively. It provides the homeless with an opportunity to be housed, but at the same time it provides the homeless families with support services. In addition to this program, housing for those living with AIDS is vital. My local government and community in Houston found that those individuals suffering with AIDS can live in dignity if we provide them with support services and good housing.

We are here today to give hope, Mr. Chairman, and I hope we will give hope to the homeless by providing them the opportunities to make a difference in their lives.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this appropriations bill, VA, HUD. Cuts go too deeply. They have cut housing, veterans, space, environmental programs, HUD cut 23 percent, deepest cuts against the homeless people, funds for the elderly and disabled cut in half, operating expenses for improving public housing cut, elderly and low-income people soon to become homeless, EPA cut 33 percent, the Superfund toxic waste sites cleanup cut a third, the State revolving loan funds for sewage treatment plants cut in half, no funds for safe drinking water loan fund, veterans cut $1 billion, almost, veterans medical care cut $250 million under request, VA administrative costs and construction costs $500 million below requests, no new veterans hospitals, services to veterans who are now receiving it, 916,000 of them will be cut, the President's National Service Program cut.

□ 1315

Cuts, cuts, cuts, cuts. We need to do something better than this. We need to send this bill back. This appropriation is insufficient, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for yielding this time to me. I rise to oppose H.R. 2099. The Republican majority finally has to reveal how they pay for $245 billion in tax cuts mostly for the wealthiest handful of Americans and who will get hurt. The hour of reckoning is here.

Who gets hurt? Well, yesterday it was our neighborhoods which lost the certainty of security that more cops on the streets have given them. Today the victims of the Republican assault are the homeless and low-income families who lose billions in housing assistance. Today it is middle-class students who lose the opportunity to serve their country while paying for college. Today it is our cities and rural areas which lose millions in community development block grants. At a time when the majority is block-granting everything in sight, they choose to slash this effective, flexible block grant that was established 20 years ago by President Nixon. Today it is our environment that takes a hit. Clean water, clean air, safe drinking water, the cleanup of hazardous waste; all are hurt by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, these are just a few examples of the harm done in a bill that at the same time preserves funding for the archaic Selective Service and gives billions to the space station. This bill typifies the Republicans' agenda: Slash funding for housing, education, training, and job creation for average Americans to finance tax cuts for the handful making over $100,000 a year.

Vote against this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for the tremendous job he has done in crafting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and want to compliment subcommittee Chairman LEWIS and Chairman LIVINGSTON of the full Appropriations Committee for their work on this measure.

They have made some of the most difficult decisions to implement the budget resolution mandate to balance the Federal budget by the year 2002.

The bill reduces virtually every agency under its jurisdiction below last year's spending level except the VA.

Compared to fiscal year 1995 spending levels, HUD is decreased 25 percent, EPA 32 percent, NASA 5 percent.

On the other hand, the bill puts VA's total spending levels slightly above 1995 rather than cutting it substantially.

The bill fully funds the President's request in several areas, with spending over and above the fiscal year 1995 level.

These include compensations for veterans with service-connected injuries, pensions for war-time veterans, education and training readjustment benefits, insurance programs, and the VA Home Loan Program.

Major construction is not as much as last year because the bill does not fully fund the two new inpatient hospital construction projects in the administration's request.

Medical research, which is very important to VA's ability to attract high-quality health care professionals, is funded at last year's level.

The national cemetery system is funded at last year's level to maintain this important activity.

I believe the cemetery system is in particular need of long-term attention because of demographic trends facing the veteran population.

Between 1990 and the year 2010, the VA projects that the veterans population will decrease by about 7 million veterans, or 26 percent. Many of these veterans will desire to be buried in a national cemetery and the VA should be ready.

The annual operating budget for the cemetery system, as well as grave site development in existing cemeteries, and establishment of new cemeteries should receive high priority than they are currently getting.

I will continue to work closely with the Appropriations Committee and the VA to expand and improve our national cemeteries so that veterans may be accorded the last measure of dignity a grateful Nation can provide in recognition of service to country.

H.R. 2099 increases VA medical care by $563 million. This is 75 percent of the administration's requested increase, and puts VA medical care spending at $16.8 billion for fiscal year 1996.

This increase has been accomplished through a combination of additional appropriated dollars and legislative savings which will probably not be possible again next year.

The VA should use this year to prepare for tougher fiscal constraints through management initiatives such as the New Visions Networks and the North Chicago hospital example.

Integrating VA medical centers and other health care facilities on a regional basis can eliminate or reduce duplication of capacity and administration.

Recent testimony in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs by the Disabled American Veterans indicates that the North Chicago VA Medical Center has implemented an HMO-based model of health care delivery.

Their experience apparently shows that since October of 1993, the number of veterans enrolled in their managed care plan increased fivefold.

In less than 10 months, the number of acute days of hospital care per $1,000 enrollees fell by 85 percent.

This was due to a reduction in the consumption of acute hospital resources due to

50 percent reduction in hospital stays; 90 percent reduction in the need for acute hospitalization for nursing home care unit patients; and 98 percent reduction in acute hospitalization for detoxification resulting from a shift from inpatient medical evaluation of these patients to an outpatient medical evaluation.

The facility was able to reduce from five to only two the number of acute hospital wards, representing a 63 percent reduction in beds.

The medical center estimates that they have tripled their efficiency. Quality of care was maintained while their operating costs were reduced dramatically. It is projected that annual potential savings could exceed $15 million.

Also, the realignment of services allowed for a reduction of 170 full-time positions.

If such projected savings and increased efficiencies prove out, this example should be duplicated as much as possible throughout the VA system.

The VA should aggressively pursue initiatives which can help reduce fixed costs and overhead, so that funds can be shifted to delivery of health care and other services.

The VA should eliminate or merge duplicative positions within the Veterans Health Administration and Veterans Benefits Administration bureaucracy in areas of procurement, personnel, logistics, EEO, administrative services, and finance.

Such duplication is acutely apparent in the departments of Veterans Affairs organizations that are collocated or within networking proximities.

The VA should also actively pursue privatizing service areas such as third party insurance collections, laundry services, food service, and computer software development and fire protection services.

The department currently has a tremendous opportunity to reap savings by more proactively implementing the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

The DOE recently published final rules for accelerating installation of energy conservation measures in existing federally owned buildings through energy saving performance contracts with the private sector.

These contracts allow Federal agencies to contract for energy conservation equipment and services with performance guarantees, and pay for them in the future from resulting energy cost savings.

This program could boost energy efficiency investment significantly beyond what can be purchased with appropriate funds.

The VA can use those savings to help maintain services during tighter fiscal times.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee will continue to explore proposals to increase VA's flexibility to provide health care at the most appropriate level and in the most cost effective way.

Working within current budget constraints, we will pursue eligibility and health care delivery reform. We will also look for additional revenue sources for the VA health care system.

I hope the VA will more aggressively pursue areas where it can save money to use for direct care rather than continuing to threaten closure of significant parts of the system.

The VA should close its 22 golf courses and sell off all its excess land before closing any hospitals.

The amount of money the VA receives each year is obviously critical to the amount of care which can be provided.

But just as important is what the VA does with those dollars.

Given a rapidly declining veterans population, the VA must improve strategic planning for its health care system, reevaluate infrastructure needs, enhance contracting and sharing agreements, and continue the shift away from expensive hospital inpatient care.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support the bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I would tell my colleagues that I have shared some of the serious reservations that others have expressed on this floor today with the bill as it was reported from the committee. But may I say to the chairman of the committee that, as a former ranking member of the HUD subcommittee, I was very concerned about the HUD budget and the housing for the poor and the homeless. Let me be clear there is no question that HUD was certainly primed and ready for significant reductions. It is badly in need of reform, and in fact I would like to say it is in need of reinvention.

That having been said, may I say that I understand the problems that the committee had in reaching our budget targets, and they were enormous. But I, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], quickly went to our committee members to state our concerns, particularly the concerns for the senior citizens, and the disabled, and those AIDS sufferers that have been talked about. Certainly these are needy and vulnerable populations, and, more than that, for those of us who worked with HUD over the years and on these programs, we also know that these programs are not only among the most popular programs, but from my perspective among the most scandal-free and well-run programs in HUD, and so I was very pleased when Mr. LEWIS, the subcommittee chairman and others on the committee were responsive to our concerns.

We will talk a little bit more later about the manager's amendment, but I do want to say that many things have been corrected in this legislation. We have targeted with humaneness and sensitivity the problems that are most in need of reform and at the same time protected the concerns of the vulnerable populations.

Compared to current funding levels, the bill deeply cuts appropriations for virtually every department and agency funded by the measure. Most significantly, the measure cuts funding for HUD by 25 percent and EPA by 32 percent.

While at the same time, the NASA budget is cut by a mere 5 percent—assuming full funding of Congress' new sacred cow, the space station. This is despite the fact that continuous redefinition of the goals and designs have inflated the cost of this project more than $63 billion over budget before its completion. And despite the fact that after 11 years, not one piece of hardware has been put into space for this project.

As the former ranking minority member on the Housing Subcommittee, I was very concerned about the effects of the cuts in the HUD budget.

Let me be clear, HUD was primed for significant reductions. It is badly in need of reform—significant reform. Indeed, reinvention.

But as the bill was reported out of committee, the combined cut to the programs affecting seniors, disabled persons, and people with AIDS—those people with special needs was 47 percent, from $1,852 billion in fiscal year 1995—prerecission—to $1 billion in fiscal year 1996. These seniors, disabled and AIDS suffers, are among the most needy and vulnerable. And, I must stress these 202 and 206 programs are among the most popular and well run scandal free of all the programs under HUD jurisdiction.

With that said, let me say that I recognize the difficult task that our members on the Appropriations Committee have before them. If we are to meet the goal of a balanced budget by 2002, we must make difficult decisions and significant changes in Federal spending.

We must work to fund the programs that work well and perform essential service while beginning the process of reducing or eliminating programs that are repetitive or ineffective.

For this reason, I will be supporting Chairman Lewis's amendment to H.R. 2099. This amendment addresses many of the concerns raised by both Chairman LAZIO and me. Including, retaining the ceiling of 30 percent on the retail levels for public housing tenants.

I share the concerns of some of my colleagues across the aisle about rent increases for residents of public housing. That's why I worked with Chairman LAZIO of Housing Subcommittee to remove the suspension of the Brooke amendment and minimum rents for public housing. These changes will be adopted in the manager's amendment, and I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to support the manager's amendment.

In particular, the floor manager's amendment increases the total aggregate budget authority for HUD from $19.1 to $19.4 billion. This brings HUD to the post rescission fiscal year 1995 funding level.

Special needs housing for the elderly, disabled, and persons with AIDS is increased from the 1995 post-rescission amount of $1 billion to $1.4 billion, and HUD homeless assistance programs are increased by $100 million.

In addition, this amendment restores $70 million in budget authority for FHA multifamily credit subsidy. This $70 million is sufficient to meet current multifamily credit needs and provide funding authority for HUD and the authorizing committee to transition FHA's multifamily to a self-sustaining program.

This amendment deserves the support of this House. The provisions included in this amendment make H.R. 2099 a better bill—one that I can support.

Nevertheless, I must also note my reservations and deep concerns over the funding levels and the legislative language and prohibitions on the enforcement abilities of the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]. I welcome the full and open debate we will engage in during the amendments offered by SHERWOOD BOEHLERT and others.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 3½ minutes remaining on each side.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the fiscal year 1996 VA–HUD appropriations bill. This bill is a polluters' bonanza.

Our environment is cleaner today *not* because individual businesses decided to put themselves at a competitive disadvantage and stop polluting. The air we breath and the water we drink is cleaner today because Congress passed Federal laws, which leveled the playing field for businesses and mandated a cleaner environment.

Instead of building on this success and fine tuning our environmental laws, the Republican majority is bent on taking us back to the good old days of little or no environmental regulation. Let me tell you about the good old days. The good old days resulted in six declared superfund sites in my tiny northwest Indiana district. In the Black Oak section of Gary the water was so toxic that the residents couldn't drink it or even water their plants without killing them. In the good old days, a northwest Indiana river stopped flowing because it was clogged with animal carcasses. Why does the Republican majority want to take us back to the good old days?

If a regulation is silly we should end it. It a law is wrong we should change it. But we must not roll back years of environmental progress.

Consider the drastic cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency. This agency, whose sole purpose is to protect public health and improve the living conditions of American citizens, will take a cut of 34 percent—the biggest reduction by far for any major agency! But this Republican bill does not stop there—it also contains 17 legislative riders all aimed at curtailing or eliminating the EPA's ability to set environmental standards or enforce regulations that are aimed at protecting public health. What's the point of giving the EPA two-thirds of its funding when you prohibit its enforcement of our laws in the same bill?

Upon closer examination of the vicious assaults upon the EPA, Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to oppose this bill.

The VA–HUD bill cuts funding of hazardous waste site cleanup by 33 percent, or $560 million. Does the Republican Party believe this waste is just going to disappear? If we slow the cleanup by cutting funding, it will cost us more later. Furthermore, one in four Americans lives near a toxic waste dump. Are we helping the citizens of this Nation by allowing the perpetuation of hazardous filth? Absolutely not.

The VA–HUD bill slashes enforcement of all environmental programs by almost 50 percent. By cutting $245 million of the funds that enforce those laws, the Republican majority's proposal severely limits enforcement of the protections Americans demand and deserve—and encourages polluters to continue breaking the law. Moreover, the cutback unfairly penalizes the thousands of companies that have invested in pollution controls and played by the rules to protect our health and our environment.

It gets worse, ladies and gentlemen. For, the VA–HUD bill sharply limits citizens' right to know about toxics released in their own community. By slashing funds used to provide American communities with information about toxic chemicals being emitted in local areas, citizens will be left in the dark. Toxic emissions don't understand property lines. People should have access to information about the toxics that are being emitted into their air, and harmful substances are polluting their streams. Thinking along practical lines, emergency workers need this information as well. If an environmental catastrophe were to occur in your community, would you feel safe with any less than the full information?

And what about the housing provisions in this bill. It targets its deepest cuts at vulnerable populations: the poorest residents in public and assisted housing, the homeless, poor and working families and the elderly.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has been slashed by 25 percent. HUD assists 4.7 million households living in public housing and receiving section 8 rental assistance. Of these households, 36 percent are elderly. Encompassing housing assistance for the elderly, HUD's Special Needs Housing program took an $852 million cut! Is this the Republican's moral mandate—to abandon our senior citizens and their need for decent, affordable housing?

In my district, Merrillville, IN is lucky to be the home of the AHEPA House, a section 8 apartment complex that serves senior citizens. More than 100 elderly people are on AHEPA's waiting list.

Recently, the AHEPA House was able to afford an expansion. There will be 50 new units opening up in September. Calls requesting applications for those 50 units have been coming in from Indiana, Illinois and Michigan. So far, almost 150 people have applied for these 50 units. One hundred senior citizens are going to have to be turned away.

When I recently spoke with AHEPA staff about the crisis, I was told they were extremely concerned. One staff member spoke of those on the waiting list, ''I don't know how some of these people even eat,'' she said. Calls come in to AHEPA house every day asking for help.

If this bill passes, Congress will be sending a clear response to those calls for help. It comes in the form of a $852 million cut to the section 8 Special Needs Housing program.

I urge a return to decency. Are we to turn our backs on senior citizens who are barely able to get a roof above their heads while majority in this House finances a tax cut for the wealthiest in society? Of course not.

This legislation is a travesty and a danger to the American people. Public health is threatened. Pollution is encouraged. Housing is denied. The elderly are abandoned. Let's stop these irresponsible and indecent proposals that hurt American citizens.

Join me in opposition to this Republican bill and join me in a vote for the American people.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my appreciation for the cooperation of the Members dealing with this very, very difficult bill. We have had within our allocation great difficulty in dividing up these accounts in a way that is equitable to all. There is little question that everyone who is used to government continuing to grow is most disconcerted by the effort to reduce those historical levels of growth.

Nonetheless, let me address two basic subject areas of this bill. I want to make sure that it is clear in the RECORD that, while we have been through some very difficult times with housing, we have had great cooperation from the key members from the authorizing committee in connection with the way we have distributed these funds. It is a fact that housing accounts have increased by 50 percent in the last 4 years, so there is some room for flexibility as we address those problems.

In terms of actual spending in the 1996 year, the outlays for housing will actually increase over 1995. Those programs will have both time and a good deal of flexibility in terms of responding to the future pattern that we hope to see in these accounts.

Beyond that, I want to mention to my colleagues that the one account within this bill that has been treated differently than all others has to do with Veterans Administration medical services. There is an increase of some $553 million over the 1995 outlay account for medical services. The House has indicated its concern about making sure that we do not have cuts in medical services available to our veterans.

As my colleagues look throughout the bill, while there is very, very tough decisions that have been made, there is little doubt that the membership has helped the committee a great deal to make sure that we have treated each of these responsibilities as fairly as possible.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], and my colleagues the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] for their help in correcting a FEMA problem in my district as part of this legislation. I also appreciate the need for belt-

tightening as identified by the chairman, but I must point out that the Environmental Protection Agency, I believe, is treated too harshly in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains about eight pages of provisos limiting the EPA's ability to improve, implement, and enforce regulations related to the environment and particularly with regard to the Clean Water Act that passed this House, which I opposed. If it does become law, this legislation would attempt to accomplish much of its negative impact through the appropriation process.

Just as examples: If the Clean Water Act was not reauthorized by October 1 of 1996, funds are not available or are limited under this bill for implementation or enforcement of the stormwater permitting process, enforcement of permit limits or compliance schedules for combined sewer overflows or sanitary sewer overflows. There is also cutback in implementation in enforcement of the wetlands programs and pretreatment standards.

For these reasons, unless some of the amendments are passed by the ranking member, I would oppose.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio for 1½ minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, let me in closing say once again how disappointing it is for me to have to vote against this particular bill. It is a bill that, as I said earlier, in the last Congress I took a great deal of pride in bringing to the floor, and it was a bill which I felt was responsive to the Nation's priorities at that time. Unfortunately I do not feel that this bill is currently responsive to our needs, and, therefore, I must oppose the bill.

But also in closing, a lot of comments have been made with reference to what has been done for veterans, and I just want to cite some of the statements that have come to us by way of letters.

''We strongly oppose any action by the Committee on Appropriations to make substantive changes to laws authorizing veterans benefits''—the Blinded Veterans Association.

The Vietnam Veterans of America say ''We like to see an appropriation bill that provides for medical research, and running the Veterans' Administration at the levels recommended by the President. There is room for change, but we cannot accept substantive changes in the veterans benefits laws being made by the appropriations committees.''

I can go on and cite the American Legion's response, the Paralyzed Veterans of America response, all of whom are not satisfied with this bill as it appears now.

As I said earlier, the President has indicated that unless this bill is changed substantively from its current form, that he intends to veto the bill. I think the best thing Members of this House can do is vote down the bill.

Mr. FILNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise today to alert you to a matter of utmost importance. Many of you know of the large number of veterans residing in California, and especially in my congressional district.

I am committed to seeing that we do not abandon our veterans, especially those who are in need of care—ranging from moderate care in assisted-living situations to full nursing home care. These veterans, who have sacrificed so much for our Nation, deserve to have their country come through for them when they need help.

Last October, the California Governor's Task Force selected a site in Chula Vista, CA as their top choice for a proposed home for military veterans. This is an excellent site, given the large number of veterans in Chula Vista and the nearby community of National City. This site is near Sharp Chula Vista Medical Center and within a 20 minute drive to the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in La Jolla, CA. Close to the waterfront and located in a stable community, this home will provide southern California veterans with the care they need and deserve. It will also create 250 to 300 permanent jobs for this region.

The construction of this home depends in part upon funding from the Federal Government. The State of California will fund 35 percent of the cost—the State assembly has passed the appropriations for this project and the bill is now pending in the State senate. The State will soon be applying to the Federal Government for the remainder of the funding—and I intend to fight to insure that this funding is available.

This money will come from the line item, grants for construction of State extended care facilities, in the Federal Veterans' Health Administration construction budget.

I am here today to advocate for our veterans. We must never forget their service to our country. We must remain steadfast in our support as they grow older.

I am as committed as anyone to balancing our Federal budget, but not on the backs of our veterans. I urge my colleagues to keep the promise to our veterans during these budget deliberations and vote to retain the State home construction program funding. Our veterans deserve no less.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee for his willingness to increase the funding for the special needs account. If the HOPWA Program funds remained at the level reported by the Appropriations Committee, it would have resulted in significant program cuts for New York City.

Homelessness would have surely increased for people living with HIV infection. This limitation on funding would have delayed the release of homeless inpatients and prevented individuals and families from moving out of housing that is no longer adequate to the health status of a person with AIDS. Fortunately, because of the compromise that you reached with my good friend from Long Island, Mr. LAZIO, New York City has been spared these serious program reductions. I want to complement you Mr. Chairman and all of my colleagues, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. LOWEY, who have been worked so hard to develop a positive solution for restoring the HOPWA funds.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The bill before us places many vital services such as housing, veterans benefits, and environmental protection on life support. The amendment seeks to sustain some of these important programs through a transfusion. Unfortunately, the transfusion is inadequate and is not sufficient to bring about a full recovery. In the process, a program no less meritorious than those the amendment seeks to protect will perish.

This is the 19th vote on the space station program. The station has been studied and redesigned to death. We are less than 30 months away from deployment—enough is enough.

As if terminating the space station was not enough, the amendment reduces funding for NASA an additional 20 percent below the level the President requested and severely threatens the viability of the space shuttle program. The loss of these two programs will result in the loss of more than 50,000 jobs and countless dreams.

Over the last 2 years, NASA has managed to keep the birds flying while absorbing a 30-percent cut. Frankly, I consider that a phenomenal feat. Dan Goldin and the men and women at NASA deserve our gratitude and appreciation for their hard work. But, the truth is Dan Goldin has run out of miracles. NASA simply cannot handle any more major programmatic cuts. There is no more water in the well.

So, although I am sympathetic to the gentleman's efforts to correct the deficiencies in the bill, I do not agree with his method. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2099, the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill.

As vice chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am especially pleased that, under this bill, the VA will experience a $159 million increase over fiscal year 1995's levels. The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for asserting that, even in these times of fiscal restraint, our Nation's veterans deserve quality health care and equitable compensation for their service to our country.

The VA's medical care account will be increased by over half a billion dollars from last year. The compensation and pension program will see a $23 million increase from fiscal year 1995. Funding for readjustment benefits, which assists former service members in getting acclimated to civilian life, will increase over $50 million.

Mr. Speaker, New Jersey's veterans will be greatly assisted by this appropriations bill. Included in the funding for minor construction projects are two programs—a geriatric patient care program at the Lyons VAMC and a low vision center at the East Orange VAMC—which will bring immediate relief to thousands of New Jersey veterans who previously were forced to travel out of State for these types of care.

I will be working with Veteran's Affairs Chairman STUMP to ensure that report language endorsing these initiatives—along with an outpatient cancer chemotherapy center at the East Orange VAMC—is included in our construction authorization bill to be marked up later this year.

I have also been working with the New Jersey Department of Military and Veterans Affairs in an attempt to secure funding for a replacement State nursing home located in

Menlo Park, NJ. We have gone through a grueling application process and are encouraged that Menlo Park will be at or near the top of a priority list of deserving applicants. Because the Appropriations Committee funded the Grants for Construction of State Extended Care Facilities Program at last year's equitable level, we can be assured that sufficient funds will be available to fully fund those projects deemed most worthy.

I would like to thank Chairman LEWIS for all his hard work on this spending bill. It is fair to veterans, while still being mindful of the Nation's fiscal realities.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to cuts in the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program which are part of the Appropriations bill for Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies.

The bill reduces funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development by $5.6 billion, or 23 percent below the 1995 level. It cuts funding for important programs which have important and beneficial impacts on the lives of many elderly and low-income Americans. I cannot turn my back on these people, so I want to bring some facts about these programs to the attention of the House.

While all Members of the House would claim to be opposed to the sale and use of illegal drugs, funding for the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program is zeroed-out in this bill. This program funds effective locally-run efforts to eliminate drugs. It is a key tool to help local housing authorities combat crime in public housing communities in Massachusetts and through-out the country.

The Drug Elimination Program received $290 million in fiscal year 1995. This money is used to fight drug distribution and abuse by reimbursing local law enforcement agencies, by employing security personnel and investigators, by providing physical improvements designed to enhance security, and by supporting tenant patrol groups. Along with making communities safer, it also funds the creation of innovative youth programs, offering young people and adults positive alternatives to drug use.

This money is a very cost-effective expenditure. The costs of drug use include higher security and law enforcement costs, a lower quality of life, lower educational attainment, and higher healthcare costs. Compared to the terrible costs which drug use imposes upon individuals and communities, this program is a bargain, and it is essential.

In my district, several housing authorities were recipients of drug elimination funds in 1995, including Medford ($240,000), Chelsea ($175,000), Woburn ($50,000), and Malden ($250,000). The end of funding for these programs would significantly hamper efforts to lessen drug use and improve the quality of life in these communities.

Mr. Chairman, I call upon the House to put taxpayers' money where their commitments are, and to continue funding for the Drug Elimination Program. The House recently funded $553 million as the down payment to build two additional B–2 bombers that the Pentagon didn't ask for or want. Let's stop wasting money on unwanted planes and start saving wasted lives.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

The Republicans have once again adopted a paint-by-numbers strategy to reach their arbitrary deficit reduction target and finance a tax break for wealthy special interests.

How simple is their strategy? Remarkably simple. And remarkably cruel.

Draw a line through those programs that help the poor, the needy, and the less fortunate. Slash your way across the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Veterans Affairs, until you reach the Environmental Protection Agency.

Along the way, strike a crippling blow against housing programs that provide affordable, safe, and decent housing for the elderly, the poor, and the sick.

When you're painting by numbers, when your goal is driven by numbers, not by people, it's easy to pursue your goal with abandon.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind my Republican colleagues that behind those numbers are real human beings, living real lives, and struggling to get by in tough times.

A great number of the public housing units in this country are occupied by elderly women. And over a million of our children—of America's children—live in public housing units. For many of these kids, just about the only thing they can depend on, from day to day, is a place to go home to at night.

This bill slashes public housing operating subsidies and modernization funds. The bill eliminates—obliterates—funding for severely distressed public housing and development, in addition to new housing vouchers and certificates for the poor.

If you're homeless, forget it. The Republicans have decided to paint you out of the picture, cutting homeless assistance grants by 50 percent.

The Republican approach is really very simple. They shake your hand and direct your attention to the magnificent prize behind curtain No. 3. When you turn your head, they reach around and pick your pocket.

Hundreds of thousands of families who depend on section 8 assisted housing will get their pockets picked if this bill passes. At least 600,000 families in public and section 8 assisted housing will pay more every month in rent unless we reject this bill.

While we debate these cuts, I urge my colleagues to remember that this week marks a particularly poignant moment. Today, we will dedicate a monument to the veterans of the Korean war.

There are few Americans more deserving of our support than these veterans, and the veterans of our wars of the last half-century.

Yet, the Republican bill cuts $250 million from veterans medical care and zeroes-out funding for a replacement VA hospital in Northern California that was to service a veterans population of over 400,000 men and women. These cuts are unwise and break a promise that Congress made to Northern California veterans 4 years ago.

Without adequate support, the VA will simply be unable to meet the increasing demand for health services as our veterans population ages.

Once again, the Republican's have enacted wholesale change that will significantly decrease the quality of life for millions of Americans.

The Republicans profess to have our long-term interests at stake, but their actions—in this case—speak loudly and clearly.

This bill not only risks the health of our veterans, but the health and safety of all Americans.

Unable to eliminate the EPA, my Republican colleagues have done their level best to cripple this agency and eviscerate programs that ensure every American has access to safe drinking water, clean air, and a toxic-free environment.

This bill cuts the EPA budget by one-third, hazardous waste cleanup programs by 30 percent, and funds for wastewater treatment facilities by 25 percent.

Perhaps most devastating is the legislative language in this bill that would prohibit the EPA from taking action to clean our environment. These include restrictions on the EPA's ability to regulate sewer systems, wetlands, refineries, oil and gas manufacturing, radon in water, pesticides in processed food, lead paint and water pollution.

Some very important programs—such as the Sacramento River Pollutant Control Program—have been funded in this bill. With this funding, Sacramento County will be able to complete the process of identifying which pollutants exceed water quality standards. Once this is accomplished, the county can develop a feasible, cost-effective plan to address the problem of pollution in the Sacramento River.

While this critical program has been funded, hundreds of others around the country have not.

The Sacramento River Pollutant Control Program is a step in the right direction. But it does not begin to make up for the hundreds of steps back in this bill.

All of us have been asked to make sacrifices to help balance the Federal budget. We are prepared to make those sacrifices. But no one—not one American—should have to sacrifice decent living conditions or a clean environment to finance a tax-break for Republican special interests.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 2099, the Department of Veterans' Affairs [VA], Housing and Urban Development [HUD] and Independent Agencies appropriations bill. This short-sighted legislation is a devastating attack on low-income Americans, seniors, veterans and disabled individuals. It drastically cuts worthwhile housing programs, does not provide adequate funding for veterans' programs, completely eliminates AmeriCorps, and is one of the most blatant attacks I have ever seen on our most comprehensive environmental laws. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

First, with respect to HUD programs, funding levels for the current fiscal year do not meet the current demand and will force people to live in substandard housing or worse yet get thrown out on the street. That's not only bad policy but it's mean.

Further, I am disappointed that the bill consolidates accounts for special needs housing such as assistance for low-income seniors, disabled individuals and people with AIDS [HOPWA]. This consolidation would have been more tolerable had the funding level been set at the FY 95 aggregate amount. But it doesn't. In fact, H.R. 2099 reduces this funding by 46% compared to FY 95. The measure also eliminates the important congregate services program. Simply put this is mean.

But the Republicans did not stop there. H.R. 2099 reduces funding from the current fiscal

year for the modernization of existing public housing projects, seriously affecting capital improvement projects at many public housing authorities, in my district and across the country. Many of these facilities were built nearly 40 years ago and are beginning to fall into disrepair. This is mean and bad economics.

Second, it saddens me to think that AmeriCorps is being abolished. This program accomplishes what many in Congress have been calling for: federal money directed to local communities without interference from Washington. It taps into the desire of many young people to have a positive impact on their community by encouraging them to volunteer in education, environment, poverty and public safety programs.

Detractors say that the government shouldn't be in the business of supporting charities. AmeriCorps is far from a charity: the participants earn scholarship money to further their education. Others say that paid volunteers will undermine the spirit of volunteerism in the United States. The truth is, these young adults are paid only a small stipend. It is foolish to think that the AmeriCorps participants are doing this for monetary gain. In addition, many charities have fallen on hard times and are only too glad to have the help of these ''paid'' volunteers.

All this, however, disregards the basic idea of AmeriCorps: Encouraging national service at the grassroots level. Killing AmeriCorps will have a minuscule impact on the effort to balance the budget, but it will also kill the enthusiasm the program was designed to inspire in young Americans.

Third, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has long been the target of polluters and their allies in Congress. I'll be the first to admit that the Agency has often been inflexible in its approach and too ready to restore to heavy-handed tactics. At the same time, I believe Administrator Carol Browner has instituted many internal reforms which have made the Agency more ''user-friendly'' while effectively carrying out its obligations to protect our environment and public health. I strongly believe that the Administrator has been responsive to Congressional mandates and requests. In spite of these actions, the bill before us is a vicious attack on the Agency, its mission and its personnel. And make no mistake about it, this measure is a threat to every American because it will compromise water and air quality, prevent hazardous waste cleanups and allow polluters to violate the law as long as they let states know they are doing it.

The cuts in EPA are devastating. The bill provides $2.35 billion less than the current fiscal year and $2.5 billion less than requested. Compliance and enforcement programs are slashed by nearly $460 million below FY 1995 and by $884 million below the request. These cuts will prevent the Agency from effectively enforcing the Clean Air and Water Acts, Safe Drinking Water Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), the Community Right-to-Know Act and many other environmental statutes. The report accompanying the bill makes it clear to this member that these massive cuts are designed to punish the Agency for carrying out its duties in a manner which is at odds with the vision of some of my colleagues. If members have problems with the direction of the Agency or wish to attempt to amend our environmental laws, they should utilize the authorization process to effect these changes. H.R. 2099 is an inappropriate vehicle to attempt to make major policy changes.

The bill makes deep cuts in the Superfund program. I do not believe a single member of this body, including this member, would argue that Superfund is flawless. I agree with many of my colleagues that we must reform this important program to reduce litigation, to direct more resources to cleanup and to set some parameters which link cleanup standards to future land uses. However, slashing funding by more than $400 million below the current level and prohibiting actions at new sites is not the best way to accomplish reform. This action is more akin to cutting off your nose to spite your face. This action also poses a real threat to human health because it prohibits the Agency or a contractor at a site to move beyond the stage of work in which the entity is engaged at the beginning of the fiscal year. Under these restrictions, the Agency or contractor would be prohibited from beginning to remediate a site if it was not in that phase of the process when the fiscal year begins. This limitation makes no sense. The most important goal of Superfund is to physically clean up sites and we should do everything we can to ensure that remediation moves forward as quickly as possible. If sites are on the cusp of being cleaned up but aren't, the American people have no one to blame but the Republicans on the Committee who wrote this bill.

In addition, the bill provides all funding for the program from the Treasury rather than from the Superfund which is largely capitalized by fees assessed on chemical manufacturers and on petroleum products as well as by revenue from settlements with polluters. The Committee has done this because some members of this body want to transform Superfund from a polluter-pays statute to a taxpayer-pays statute. This transformation will take place by doing away with retroactive liability and requiring every American to pay to clean up sites contaminated by a small number of companies or parties. While it might be appropriate to repeal retroactive liability under certain circumstances, this policy change must be carefully evaluated through the authorization process. The funding arrangement required by this bill effectively makes Superfund a public works project in fiscal year 1996. This change is designed to let polluters off the hook and will shift the costs of cleaning up every Superfund site from those responsible for the contamination to the taxpayers.

Nothing is more important to our survival than clean water. The American people in poll after poll have expressed their overwhelming support for the Clean Water Act (CWA) and for directing their tax dollars to ensuring our nation's waters are clean and safe. Unfortunately, this bill falls far short of the expectations of the American people. The bill provides $761 million less for water infrastructure projects than the current level. As a result, communities across the country will not be able to upgrade or build new sewage treatment plants. Modern sewage treatment can be credited with improving water quality in more communities than virtually any other measure. While we have made tremendous progress since the enactment of the CWA, the states have estimated that they have in excess of $130 billion in sewage treatment projects outstanding. Investing in these projects makes good environmental, public health and economic sense. However, the Committee bill fails to provide adequate federal investment in this vital area. My state of Connecticut estimates that it will lose $9 million in assistance from the CWA State Revolving Fund. As a result, the state will be forced to abandon several major sewage treatment plant upgrades or many smaller ones. This is a lose-lose proposition for my constituents and one with which they shouldn't be faced with.

In addition, the Committee eliminates all funding to support drinking water treatment grants. Millions of Americans continue to drink, and continue to get sick and die from drinking contaminated water. We don't know exactly how many Americans become sick each year because many people believe they have the stomach flu rather than attribute their illness to tainted water. Many of the problems with drinking water contamination can be traced to thousands for small water systems which serve millions of Americans largely in rural areas. These systems do not have the rate base to purchase modern treatment technology or to adequately protect source waters. In fiscal year 1995, the Congress provided $700 million to capitalize the Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, similar to the existing State Revolving Fund, to provide assistance to communities to improve and develop water treatment systems. This revolving funds would be most beneficial to the small systems I mentioned above. Instead of investing in improving the health of millions of rural Americans, the committee eliminated all funding for this important initiative. This is action that adds insult to injury coming on the heals of the Republican rescission package which took back more than $1 billion provided for this purpose.

These accounts support activities which have direct impacts on public health and environmental protection. The American people want their resources to be spent to improve sewage treatment or to ensure that drinking water is free from harmful contaminants such as cryptosporidium. Moreover, these accounts provide assistance to communities and systems which have great needs, but lack the tax or rate base to pay the full costs associated with these needs. Finally, this is not a Federal giveaway. States must contribute their own dollars and many States, including my State of Connecticut, contribute far more than required by law. Federal support helps to ensure that every community can have safe water. Moreover, it guarantees that communities which invest their own resources do not have those investments compromised by communities upstream which cannot, or do not, invest in these areas. This is yet another example of the counterproductive cuts contained in numerous appropriations bills being brought to the floor this year.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill is loaded down with 17 ''riders'' which prohibit the EPA from enforcing some of the most important sections of the Clean Air, Water, Safe Drinking Water and Community Right-to-Know Acts. By including these far-reaching provisions, the committee wins the award for legislating in an appropriations bill. Make no mistake about it, these riders are legislative provisions and are not simply spending restrictions. In fact, Chairman LEWIS referred to these riders as ''legislative provisions'' in a story about this bill in today's Congress Daily. Every American is threatened by the restrictions imposed in the provisions in question. Under the committee

bill, the EPA will not be able to enforce standards to curb nonpoint source pollution, to stem the discharge of raw sewage, to limit arsenic and radon in drinking water, or to ensure that communities are fully informed about the toxic chemicals which are released in the air.

I believe these provisions are detrimental to the interests of the American people and have been included at the behest of narrow special interests. In spite of overwhelming evidence that runoff from city streets, parking lots, and feed lots is the largest remaining water pollution problem, the bill prohibits EPA from enforcing standards to reduce contamination from these sources. Regardless of the fact that raw sewage is routinely discharged from storm drains nationwide following heavy rains, the Agency is barred from enforcing standards which will substantially reduce this public health threat. In a major blow to States like mine, which have taken aggressive steps to improve air quality, the bill allows questionable vehicle inspection programs to be given equal weight with centralized inspection programs. Moreover, it prevents the enforcement of certain rules which limit toxic chemical emissions into our air. These Clean-Air-Act-related provisions are especially egregious for Connecticut which is a dumping ground for air pollution generated in Western States. While certain States and their Representatives in Congress are decrying the alleged burdens imposed by the act and inserting provisions into this bill to delay their enforcement, these provisions will force residents in my State to endure very real burdens from western polluters.

I could go on and on about the harmful effects of these riders. I could go on to talk about how the bill prohibits the EPA from issuing standards designed to limit the amount of arsenic in drinking water. That's right Mr. Chairman, arsenic. Suffice it to say, these provisions are extremely damaging and represent a calculated attack on environmental protection. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STOKES, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. BOEHLERT, to strike each and every rider from the bill. Policy changes of this magnitude should be addressed in the authorizing committees and in clear view of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, members should defeat this legislation. While I understand the need to balance the budget and reduce the deficit, this bill is no answer. This bill would hurt veterans, seniors, disabled individuals, and low-income families. Further, it is bad for the environment, public health, and the economy. It makes sweeping changes in our most fundamental environmental protection laws completely outside of the authorization process.

If the House passes this bill as reported by the committee, we might as well do away with authorizing committees and turn everything over to the Appropriations Committee. Passing this bill will set a terrible procedent.

Simply stated, this bill is mean, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate on this bill, I have heard several of my colleagues imply that as far as this Nation's investment in biomedical research is concerned, we should cancel the space station and just dump the money into similar research activities at the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. What this kind of suggestion tells me is that the nature of NASA's program of biomedical research and its collaboration with the NIH is woefully misunderstood. I'd like to take this opportunity, therefore, to highlight briefly the intellectual underpinning of NASA's program of biomedical research and the nature of the collaboration between NASA and the NIH.

On Earth, we are prisoners of gravity. Gravity influences all life on Earth. Gravity influences the behavior of everything—from single-celled organisms to rocks, plants, and ships at sea—on the surface of this small blue planet. When we fall, we fall down. We stay attached to the chairs in our offices because of the constant pull of gravity. In the plant world, roots grown down. Even in our own bodies, our hearts have to work harder when we stand than when we're lying down. Try as hard as I might, I can't even begin to imagine what life would be like on Earth without gravity.

So, too, gravity has influenced and shaped the development of all life on Earth for millions of years, ever since life on Earth began some 3½ billion years ago.

In space, there is very little gravity. This radically different environment is sometimes referred to as ''zero-g,'' or, more accurately, microgravity. For researchers in the field of biomedicine, this is an essential distinction, for the microgravity environment of space allows them to unmask gravity and to see, in many cases, for the first time, deeply into the physical, chemical, and biological processes which were previously obscured by gravity. Thus, thanks to our space program, for the first time in the history of humankind, scientists can manipulate gravity by decreasing its force as well as increasing it. This allows us to manipulate a primary force in nature in a way that promises to lead to radical new scientific discoveries about life on Earth.

This new capacity provides the intellectual underpinning of the relationship between NIH and NASA, and is the reason that thousands of life and biomedical scientists across the Nation want to conduct a portion of their research in space.

Over the past 2 years, many researchers at the National Institutes of Health [NIH] have expressed excitement over discoveries in the field of biomedicine. NIH scientists and NASA scientists have worked together on these problems since the days of the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo space flight programs. Nearly 3 years ago, this partnership was formalized between NASA and the NIH for space biomedical research scientists.

Today, this partnership is thriving. NASA and the NIH have executed 18 cooperative agreements since 1992 and joint activities have included: scientific workshops; ground-based and flight investigations; and other specialized activities, such as a spaceline reference system developed with the National Library of Medicine [NLM].

As the world's premier organization in life and biomedical sciences, the NIH has access to the world's best biomedical scientists, who need a variety of laboratory resources. NASA's biomedical research program maintains and develops a rich supply of unique and specialized resources, including laboratories and access to the weightless environment of space. Thus, cooperation between the two agencies strengthens the performance of each and helps to ensure the highest possible return on America's investment in biomedical research.

Cooperation between NASA and the National Institutes of Health has expanded rapidly as the research community's understanding of the value of orbital research has grown. This cooperation expands access to NASA facilities and resources to a broader community of the world's finest research scientists. Cooperation between these two premier Federal science agencies leverages NASA's unique facilities, including orbital facilities, to produce the maximum return on America's investment in biomedical research.

Collaborative partners in space research, NASA and the NIH look forward to an expanding level of cooperation as orbital research enters the space station era. NIH researchers are expected to use the Space Station's next generation life sciences facilities, including the human research facility, the gravitational biology facility, and the centrifuge facility, in pursuit of national biomedical research goals.

Let me take this opportunity to share some specific examples of this thriving partnership with you.

Neurolab, NASA's next dedicated life sciences space shuttle mission, will carry investigations funded by five different institutes of NIH. NIH's Division of Research Grants managed the scientific peer review for all neurolab proposals. Neurolab will be launched on the space shuttle in March, 1998 and will support research in the brain and behavioral sciences.

The National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders [NIDCD] and NASA are co-funding a Center on Vestibular Research and Training at the Northwestern University Medical School with research sites in Chicago, Il, and Portland, Or. Each agency is funding this center at $500,000 a year.

Dr. Josh Zimmerberg of the NIH National Institute for Child Health and Human Development is using NASA-developed bioreactors and NASA-funded resident technical staff to pursue AIDS research goals under a 1994–1998 NASA–NIH joint venture.

NASA and the National Cancer Institute have developed a joint program to apply NASA developed digital imaging technology to improve early diagnosis for breast cancer. Digital mammography will be more sensitive than the current procedures.

The National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases has released a program announcement for supplements to its Osteoporosis Centers for research related to space flight.

The point I'm trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the NASA–NIH relationship is not one of competition—it's one of collaboration. Shutting down NASA space research, canceling the international space station and handing the money over to the NIH wouldn't solve the problem, for the NIH would have no way of getting into space, or of using the international space station.

NASA needs the NIH, Mr. Chairman and part of the NIH certainly needs NASA. It is precisely this kind of collaboration which ensures the highest return possible on America's investment in biomedical research.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the section of H.R. 2099, the fiscal year 1996 VA–HUD Appropriations Bill, that will prevent the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] from spending any further taxpayer dollars for work on Flood Insur-

ance Rate Maps [FIRM] for the City of Stockton and San Joaquin County, CA. I have worked with this appropriations subcommittee to see that language is included in this bill that would ensure that these inaccurate and deficient maps are not prematurely imposed on the Stockton metropolitan area. This Congress must ensure that FEMA is a partner with the city and county in providing accurate and complete information on the risk of flooding and to assist in coordinating the completion of improvements to the existing levee system. Such a coordinated effort will more rapidly restore an adequate level of flood protection and enhance, rather than threaten, the regional and state economies.

Unlike most FEMA floodplain maps for urbanized areas, the proposed FIRMs for Stockton do not indicate flood depths. Such information is critical to determine insurance premium rates and building code requirements. Because FEMA did not provide this information during its most recent flood insurance study, the city and county can only estimate flood depths, thereby assuming liability for inaccurate estimates, in addition to its individual property owners incurring the costs of determining the appropriate flood depths. In order to minimize this cost to property owners, the city and county have stepped forward to fully finance the necessary flood depth study. This necessary study is expected to be completed in two years. The legislation we are adopting today will suspend FEMA's maps and ensuing process, at least for one year, while the study is conducted.

FEMA's draft maps also contain significant errors. Processing has already been delayed by FEMA because of omissions and inclusions that were not part of the initial draft. The city and county have already hired an engineering firm to review the maps, and numerous other errors have been found. Despite the fact that the city and county are moving rapidly to review the proposed FIRMs, the 90-day appeal period allowed by FEMA is insufficient time considering the vast area that has been remapped. My provision contained in the appropriations bill is intended to prevent the appeal period from expiring while more accurate data is collected and eventually provided to FEMA.

Mr. Chairman, FEMA has praised the city and county for the initiative they have exercised to respond to these maps and the potential for future flooding. Since being notified last November, that nearly the entire metropolitan area was being redesignated as a floodplain, the local governments have already established a joint powers authority [JPA], retained engineering and public finance consultants, and appropriated more than $2 million. The city and county JPA plans to construct the needed flood protection improvements without federal financial assistance in order to expedite completion of the project. The JPA has already established a fast-track schedule that begins construction in May 1996 and expects completion before the end of 1998. We must now ensure that FEMA's administrative actions assist rather than impede this effort.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, as it comes to the floor of the House today this bill is not only an abuse of the legislative process but a threat to the quality of America's air and water, the safety of America's food supply, and the health of all Americans.

This bill is striking evidence that the new Republican majority in the House is intent on carrying out a sneak attack on public health, on environmental protection, and on our public lands. Following the unfortunate example of James Watt, they are distorting the normal legislative process around here, acting against House rules by using the appropriations process to rewrite law and reshape policy, so that they can achieve, by stealth, objectives that lack real public support.

We saw the start of this pattern with the first rescissions bill, with its pages of legislative language waiving environmental and forest management laws, language that under the normal rules of the House should not have been in any bill of that kind.

We saw it again in the Interior appropriations bill, with its provisions to dissolve the National Biological Service, transfer its functions to the U.S. Geological Service and its provisions to essentially eliminate the Mojave National Preserve in California as a unit of the National Park Service, by a back-door attack instead of a straightforward proposal to repeal or amend the California Desert Protection Act.

Now, here it is again, and even worse, in this bill's provisions dealing with the Environmental Protection Agency. That part of this bill has more riders than the Long Island Railroad. Most of them are intended to prevent the government from doing its job in protecting our water, our air, our wetlands, our health.

Just take a look at the passenger count, Mr. Chairman, the number of riders on just that one part of this bill. In just seven pages, there are 21 anti-environment riders, including the following provisions: blocking enforcement of air pollution permits; limiting enforcement of stormwater and sanitary sewer provisions in the Water Pollution Control Act; handicapping the EPA's ability under the Clean Air Act to regulate toxic emissions from certain refineries; putting other limits on enforcing environmental laws affecting other parts of the oil and gas industry; stopping EPA from taking steps to keep arsenic, radon, or other radionuclei out of our drinking water; limiting the EPA's efforts to control toxic releases from cement kilns and other incinerators; restricting the gathering and publishing of information about the use of chemicals; restricting the protection of the country's wetlands; blocking efforts to encourage car-pooling; restricting efforts to improve water quality in the Great Lakes; and, undermining the regulation of pesticides in food.

Mr. Chairman, the pattern could not be clearer. Just take a look at it, page after page of regressive, antienvironmental and underhanded provisions aimed at handcuffing efforts to protect our food supply, keep our air and water clean, protect vital wetlands, all things vital to our natural systems all over the country.

It's no wonder, Mr. Chairman, that Carol Browner, the EPA Administrator, has concluded that we are seeing ''an organized, concerned effort to undermine public health and safety and the environment.'' If anything, Carol Browner understates the situation.

The American people need to know what is going on. They need to know that this new Republican majority is determined to undermine the progress we have made in the last several decades in protecting our environment, progress that the American people are proud of and want to see continued. They need to know that we are in the midst of a full-fledged attack on the safeguards of the water we drink and the air we breathe. They need to know, because when they do know, they will reject this assault on public health, public safety, and the public lands.

Mr. Chairman, the American people know that we need to do more, not less, in this area. For instance, two new studies this year tell us that 53 million Americans are drinking tap water that is below standards. What is the response of the new majority in this Congress to this? To do more to clean up the Nation's water? No. The Republican response is to come up with eight different legislative riders to undermine the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act! Hard to imagine.

This Republican sneak attack on the environment should not and will not go unopposed. The American people did not vote last November to roll back 25 years of environmental progress. They did not vote for more pollution, or for backhanded legislative shenanigans to undercut environmental standards just to satisfy the greed and the access paid for by many industrial polluters' campaign contributions.

So, Mr. Chairman, during the Committee's consideration of this bill, I joined in an effort to remove the numerous provisions intended to cripple the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to perform its duties. Unfortunately, that effort was unsuccessful, as was my own effort to amend the bill by removing language that prohibits protection of wetlands.

Later, Mr. Chairman, there will be a renewed effort to remove these and other offensive and improper provisions from the bill. Unless they are removed, and the bill is otherwise improved, this bill will not deserve the approval of the House.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises to express his thanks to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. LEWIS, and the distinguished ranking member, Mr. STOKES, for their efforts in bringing this bill before us today.

In particular, this Member wishes to express his thanks to the chairman for accommodating the concerns of this Member and many others in the manager's amendment, by increasing the bill's funding levels for several housing programs for the Department of Housing and Urban Development by approximately $300 million with appropriate offsets to meet the established budget restraints set for the subcommittee. This Congress faces serious fiscal restraints and this measure, with the adoption of the manager's amendment, faces those restraints in an admirable way.

This Member is also particularly pleased that H.R. 2099 includes $3 million in funding for the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee program at HUD. This very modest sum will guarantee the private financing of nearly $37 million in housing loans for Indian families. As you know, Mr. Chairman, there is a severe lack of decent, affordable housing in Indian country, due in large part to the lack of private financing in Indian country. This program provides a substantial means of bringing much needed private financing to Indian country. This very limited Federal funding is money well spent, and this Member commends the appropriators for including it in this measure.

This Member would also like to express his appreciation for the inclusion in the bill of $8.5

million for the National Rural Water Association's training and technical assistance program which the Members had specifically requested of the subcommittee.

In every State, on-site technical assistance is the backbone of small system compliance. Small systems have limited funds to operate and to comply with the Safe Drinking Water Act [SDWA]. Providing on-site technical assistance has been the most cost-effective way to improve drinking water quality in rural areas and to assist small towns with SDWA requirements.

Through technical assistance, small communities work together to conduct a statewide, peer-oriented, grassroots assistance program. Small towns do not have the engineers, the labs, and the resources of large cities to meet Federal requirements. Technical assistance allows small communities to help each other outside of the regulatory bureaucracy, results in a growing number of small systems moving into SDWA compliance, and assures steady improvement and a long term solution to small water system public health problems.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not provide the funding levels many, including this Member, might like to see for many programs. However, at a time when difficult choices are necessary, the crafters of this measure have attempted to make those choices in a responsible way. For that they are to be commended.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the VA–HUD appropriations legislation before this House.

Mr. Chairman, many other Members have made the point that this bill goes after HUD funding with a machete instead of a scalpel. I understand the need for spending cuts, and I support eliminating programs that are wasteful or do not work. However, I would like to bring to your attention one HUD program that is efficient, cost-effective, and extremely necessary—and yet was eliminated by the Appropriations Committee.

Service coordinators were established in 1992 in response to a crisis in our Nation's public housing projects. It was at this time that financially strapped public housing managers began placing senior citizens and non-elderly disabled residents in the same housing facilities. The Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel recently reviewed the situation of the early 1990's, and I quote:

> Only a few years ago, frightened seniors couldn't move out fast enough from the city's 14 public housing towers and their muggings, noisy tenants, and other troubles.

The conflict between the needs and lifestyles of the elderly and disabled non-elderly populations in these projects was leading to mutual fear and distrust. Some of the younger residents were engaging in drug and alcohol abuse. In a few cases, violence even broke out.

In 1992, Congress passed corrective legislation that authorized and appropriated annual funding for service coordinators to bring the elderly and disabled residents together and to ensure that the needs of all were met. These needs included critical transportation, nutrition, psychological counseling, and similar services. The change in the projects was dramatic. To quote the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel:

> Within months, [service coordinators] * * * had made major inroads in easing tensions, helping residents get to know one another and linking those who were sick or abusing alcohol or drugs to the help they needed.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disturbed by the committee's decision not to fund these service coordinators. In cities like Milwaukee across the nation, service coordinators play a crucial role in maintaining a safe and healthy environment for our elderly and disabled public housing residents. I strongly urge my colleagues to support reinstatement of these funds in the Senate and conference committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment printed in House Report 104–206 is now pending. That amendment shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

If that amendment is adopted, the bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Further consideration of the bill for amendment shall proceed by title and each title shall be considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member who has caused an amendment to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSOINAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by the resolution.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

AMENDMENT MADE IN ORDER BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 201—PRINTED IN PART I OF HOUSE REPORT 104–206

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment printed in House Report 104–206.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment made in order by House Resolution 201, printed in Part 1 of House Report 104–206:

On page 8, line 9, strike ''$16,713,521,000'' and insert ''$16,777,474,000''.

On page 8, line 11, strike ''$771,000,000'' and insert ''$789,000,000''.

On page 8, after line 21, insert the following:

HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

For payment of health professional scholarship program grants, as authorized by law, to students who agree to a service obligation with the Department of Veterans Affairs at one of its medical facilities, $10,386,000.

On page 20, line 25, strike ''$10,041,589,000'' and insert ''$10,182,359,000''.

On page 21, lines 18 through 21, strike the proviso and on p. 22, line 4, after the colon insert the following new proviso:

''*Provided further,* That of the amounts earmarked under this head for modernization of existing public housing projects, $15,000,000 shall be used for the Tenant Opportunity Program:''

On page 22, line 15, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$1,440,770,000''.

On page 23, line 7, after ''Housing Act:'' insert the following new proviso:

''*Provided further,* That of the funds earmarked in this appropriations Act for special needs housing, the Secretary may waive any provision of section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and section 811 of the National Affordable Housing Act (including the provisions governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance) that the Secretary determines is not necessary to achieve the objectives of these programs, or that otherwise impedes the ability to develop, operate or administer projects assisted under these programs, and may make provision for alternative conditions or terms where appropriate:''

On page 24, line 1, strike ''$4,941,589,000'' and insert ''$4,641,589,000''.

On page 28, line 3, strike ''$576,000,000'' and insert ''$676,000,000''.

On page 30, line 15, strike ''$495,355,000'' and insert ''$505,745,000''.

On page 32, line 7, strike ''$302,056,000'' and insert ''$308,290,000''.

On page 32, line 14, after the last comma insert the following:

''That any amounts made available in any prior appropriation Act for the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) of guaranteed loans that are obligations of the funds established under section 238 or 519 of the National Housing Act that have not been made available for obligation or that are deobligated shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the making of such guarantees and shall remain available until expended, notwithstanding the expiration of any period of availability otherwise applicable to such amounts: *Provided further,* That any amounts of negative subsidy resulting in fiscal year 1996 from the sales of assigned mortgage notes or insurance actions that exceed the amounts of negative subsidy determined to be generated during such fiscal year, based on the assumptions specified in the President's Budget for such fiscal year, shall be available to the Secretary for the costs of any note sales or insurance actions, without regard to whether the source of the negative subsidy amount is a note sale or insurance action, and the last proviso of this paragraph shall not apply to such amounts so used in connections with insurance actions: *Provided further,*''

On page 33, after line 2, insert the following new paragraph:

''In addition, for the cost of guarantees for loans, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–3 and 1735c), $69,620,000: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.''

On page 33, line 16, strike ''$193,299,000'' and insert ''$197,455,000''.

On page 34, strike line 12 and all that follows through line 16 on page 35, and redesignate the subsections accordingly.

On page 39, lines 3, 10, and 16–17, strike the words ''and the cost of any utilities''.

On page 48, after line 25, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 211. EXTENSION OF MULTIFAMILY HOUSING FINANCE PROGRAM.—(a) Section 542(b)(5)

of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1707 note) is amended by striking ''on not more than 15,000 units over fiscal years 1993 and 1994 and inserting ''on not more than 7,500 units during fiscal year 1996.''

(b) Section 542(c)(4) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1707 note) is amended by striking ''on not to exceed 30,000 units over fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995'' and inserting ''on not more than 10,000 units during fiscal year 1995''.

SEC. 212. DOCUMENTATION OF MULTIFAMILY REFINANCINGS.—Notwithstanding the 16th paragraph under the item relating to ''ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS'' in title II of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 103–327; 108 Stat. 2316), the amendments to section 223(b)(7) of the National Housing Act made by the 15th paragraph of such Act shall be effective during fiscal years 1996 and thereafter.

On page 54, line 17, strike the word ''four'' and insert the word ''five'' in lieu thereof.

On page 63, line 13, strike all after the comma to the end of the line 16 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

''That except for grants made under sec. 1443(a) of the Public Health Service Act, appropriations for programs and projects pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act made available under this heading shall be available only upon enactment of legislation reauthorizing such Act, and appropriations for programs and projects pursuant to other Acts made available under this heading shall be available only upon enactment of legislation specifically authorizing such appropriations.''

On page 64, line 16, strike the number ''$320,000,000'' and insert the number ''$235,500,000'' in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will each be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

□ 1330

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment is an attempt, working with Members of both sides of the aisle, to deal with some very specific problems while returning some funding to several accounts.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment restores $10 million for VA health professional scholarships, $64 million for VA medical care, $440.7 million for HUD's special needs housing account, $100 million for homeless assistance, and $69.6 million for credit subsidies associated with two FHA multifamily loan programs.

All of the costs associated with increasing these amounts are fully offset within the bill. To accomplish this, we have reduced FEMA's disaster relief by $85 million, and transferred moneys within salaries and expenses associated with the Federal Housing Administration. Additionally, we have offset the costs associated with unobligated reserves in the section 8 contract renewal account.

The amendment also strikes two HUD administrative provisions which have no immediate budgetary effect in terms of our 1996 bill. We have removed provisions relating to minimum rents in public housing as well as a suspension of the Brooke amendment which deals with limiting the amount of tenant's income which must go for rent.

These changes were carefully negotiated with the chairs of the appropriate authorizing committees and the leadership and leave the bill within its 602(b) allocation.

I urge an affirmative vote. The priorities addressed by these changes should meet with your strong and bipartisan support.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. LEWIS] takes a positive step in beginning to move this bill in the right direction. In fact, the areas which he has elected to modify, and thus included in this amendment, are the very ones that I have advocated in support of since the subcommittee markup several weeks ago. Unfortunately, this amendment does not go far enough.

While we can be pleased that an additional $74 million has been added to veterans medical care—$64 million to medical care and $10 million to the Health Professions Scholarship Program—we still are nearly $200 million below the President's request in this area. We also still leave the general operating expenses and construction accounts deficient.

The additional moneys in housing programs—as negligible as they are—and also the striking of the rent increase provisions for public housing residents are a welcome change in this committee's actions toward HUD. Once again, the actions by the chairman mirror my recommendations to this committee for some of the areas where we could do better and an amendment that I was going to offer.

It is unfortunate, however, that the amount provided in the chairman's correcting amendment is insignificant in terms of the overall cut to HUD. In fact, HUD still assumes nearly $5 billion in cuts, after this amendment. This amendment also does not remove the very damaging rent increases to section 8 tenants or any other of the harmful legislation.

I must also note a glaring omission in this amendment. That is the complete disregard for the devastation to EPA funding and the pages and pages of limitations and riders in this bill. I had hoped that the chairman would be more receptive to some consideration of changes in these areas. Clearly, the letters from chairmen and ranking members of numerous authorizing committees and subcommittees in opposition to the EPA riders tells us there needs to be a remedy for these actions. This exclusion of EPA from the amendment is a serious signal of the lack of regard for environmental concerns. It also reflects a total disregard for the functions of the authorizing committees having jurisdiction over environmental legislation in the House.

I hope that as we deliberate this bill today the chairman will be more open to other amendments and recommendations that are certain to be offered. I know that, if given the opportunity, we could attain both savings and provide essential quality of life programs for all Americans, as well as protect the health and welfare of our citizens.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the cooperation of my ranking member. Even though this is not all that both of us may want, at least we are moving in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services that deals with housing, and a very effective and cooperative Member in establishing the provisions of this bill.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment because it is a responsible reply to the concerns of many Members.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I supported our efforts to balance the budget. I supported the rescission package that this body passed and will hopefully be signed by the President today.

Though I support reducing the Federal budget deficit, I do not support wholesale cuts to programs helping this Nation's most vulnerable populations.

I testified on Tuesday before the Committee on Rules on behalf of my amendment to this bill. I am pleased that my concerns and the concerns of several of my Republican colleagues have been addressed by the manager's amendment to this bill.

Through this amendment, HUD's budget is returned to the postrescission funding level it had for fiscal 1995. The reason I have been so adamant over recent weeks to increase the funding for particular HUD programs that directly help the most vulnerable populations in our communities is that I believe cuts should be appropriate to the program.

The Special Needs Account, which represents section 202 housing for the elderly, section 811 housing for the disabled and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS, and the homeless is an account that we should not cut thoughtlessly.

By restoring more than $440 million to the Special Needs Housing account in this amendment, we support our senior citizens and disabled. I think it is tremendously important that we view this in the context of what is going on in another part of Washington today, the dedication of the Korean Veterans'

Memorial. The generation of Americans who brought this great Nation through the Korean war, the Second World War, and the Great Depression deserve our support. This issue is what we as a Congress are all about.

The current housing stock is clearly insufficient to address the needs of America's seniors. The average senior trying to get housing through this program waits for 25 months and 15 percent of these seniors wait more than 4 years for housing. If we fail to help our seniors—our parents and our grandparents—we fail all of America. If we cannot own up to our responsibility to protect them, what have we come to Congress for? This is the role for government, helping those who cannot provide for themselves.

In its original form, this bill would have cut funding for the HOPWA program, which provides decent housing for people who are debilitated by disease and cannot operate in the marketplace. This community needs our help. The result of a 47-percent cut in this program would be to increase homelessness and increase the cost of care, requiring in-patient care and hospital support.

This amendment returns funding for FHA's multifamily insurance programs, which provide jobs and much-needed low- to moderate-income housing without long-term Government subsidies.

While I can appreciate the difficult funding environment that Washington is currently facing, I firmly believe that these restored funds are a wise and necessary investment of limited resources. These critically needed Federal dollars will help many vulnerable low-income seniors and disabled persons obtain affordable housing.

This amendment is about compassion. It is about the proper role of Government in protecting the helpless in our society. This is an important amendment and one I think makes this bill fair to America's defenseless populations.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will support this amendment. We know the old saying that a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. Well, this bill is a couple of thousand miles short, and this is the single step.

It is not the fault of the chairman, I believe, of the subcommittee. I think left to his own, he would have done better. But given the priorities that he had to work with, he has had to bring forward a bill that is savage in the negative effect it will have on elderly poor people and others.

They correct the rent increase that they wanted to give to people in public housing, but elderly people in assisted housing, elderly people in section 8, will get a significant rent increase in this. At the same time their Medicare costs will go up, and that is unworthy of us.

One thing I wanted to address: We are going to be told one part of the problem here, one of the reasons HUD has to take such savage deep cuts, is that HUD has been badly run. That is true. From 1981 to 1989, under the administration of Ronald Reagan, and specifically Secretary of HUD Samuel Pierce, HUD was one of the worst run departments in the history of the Federal Government.

When we are at the appropriate point in the full House, I will insert into the RECORD the statement of the Independent Counsel and the statement of Samuel Pierce which he issued when he was not indicted, and that was part, I think, of the deal, in which he said, ''I fully accept responsibility for my role in what occurred at HUD and deeply regret the loss of public confidence in HUD that these events may have entailed.''

HUD suffered grievously from the maladministration, the corrupt and inefficient administration from 1981 to 1989 under President Reagan. Now the poor people are paying the price. It is a classic case of blaming the victim, first for the Republican Party to have trashed HUD the way it did for 8 years, and now when Secretary Cisneros is building on the efforts of Secretary Kemp, Secretary Kemp did the damage control, and Secretary Cisneros is trying to move ahead and be positive, and we are being told HUD will be cut enormously, elderly people's rents will go up, people in need will not be helped, and it is partly because of the legacy of absolute corrupt inefficiency that we inherited from the Reagan administration.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the housing provisions in the manager's amendment. I made no secret of the fact I am concerned about the environmental cuts and the housing cuts in this particular piece of legislation, but I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that we must balance our budget. I supported the budget resolution and I fully understand that difficult choices have to be made to achieve our goal of balancing the budget by 2002.

However, as we made the spending reductions needed to move to a balanced budget, these cuts must be allocated fairly. Unfortunately, I believe that housing programs have taken a disproportionate share of the cuts in the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill.

Here are the facts: The overall funding for this bill is about 14 percent less than fiscal year 1995.

However, HUD is receiving a 25-percent cut in its funding.

Only EPA receives a larger cut in this bill.

By contrast: The VA receives a 1-percent increase over 1995.

NASA receives a 4-percent cut from 1995.

I am not critical of these agencies at all. In fact, I support them, but the numbers speak for themselves: HUD is being cut 25 percent from the current level. Except for EPA, no other account is receiving more than a 6-percent cut from fiscal year 1995.

Having said that, I support the improvements made in the manager's amendment. I want to thank Chairman LEWIS for working with Congressman LAZIO and those of us who believe that the original bill did not provide adequate funding for housing for the elderly, disabled, and others with special needs; as well as assistance for the homeless.

I think the manager's amendment is an honest compromise. While special needs housing and homeless assistance are still receiving large reductions, this amendment does restore over $400 million for special needs housing and $100 million for homeless assistance.

Mr. Chairman, the section 202 program for the construction of housing for the elderly is one of the most successful programs operated by HUD. It provides affordable housing and support services for our low- and moderate-income seniors. There is clearly a shortage of affordable housing for the elderly and the disabled. I am pleased that the manager's amendment restores half of the original cut.

I can tell you from personal experience that the section 202 program for the elderly works and works well. These developments are boon to our low-income elderly and there are waiting lists for these developments whenever they can be built.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage us all, regardless of where we stand on final passage, to support this amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the chairman's amendment, which would restore $441 million in funding for special needs housing programs. These programs include section 202 housing for the elderly and section 811 housing for disabled persons, as well as housing opportunities for people with AIDS, or HOPWA.

I would like to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, about the importance of the HOPWA program. A few months ago I joined with Members on both sides of the aisle in an effort to prevent the elimination of this vital program, which provides grants to State and local governments for housing and supportive services for low-income individuals living with HIV/AIDS.

In my State of Massachusetts alone, HOPWA provides over $2.5 million in formula grants for affordable housing

units, supportive services, and short-term rental assistance for people living with AIDS who are in imminent danger of losing their homes.

Without the funds provided by this amendment, many individuals who are fatally ill will be forced to choose between essential medical care and paying the rent. Some will wind up in emergency rooms; others will literally die in the streets this winter.

No civilized society can allow that to happen. I commend the chairman for offering the amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE].

□ 1345

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the manager's amendment and commend Chairman LEWIS for his outstanding leadership, and Mr. LAZIO and his Housing Subcommittee staff for their tireless work in bringing about this compromise.

This amendment includes funding to provide greatly needed housing for low-income senior citizens, the homeless, and the disabled. Also, included is budget authority to meet current multifamily credit needs to transition FHA's multifamily to a self-sustaining program.

Over the past 60 years, FHA multifamily insurance has provided rental homes for more than 10 million hard working families, individuals, and the elderly. In Ohio alone, the FHA multifamily program has helped renovate or build more than 26,000 affordable rental units.

Mr. Chairman, the need for affordable rental housing is tremendous, and in setting our priorities with our limited resources, we must not forget our elderly, our vulnerable, our homeless, our disabled, the ill, and those most in need. This is responsible legislation, it's the proper role of government, and I urge my colleagues to support this important perfecting amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I want to commend the chairman, the ranking member, as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and the other Members who were instrumental in adding money for AIDS housing and housing for the elderly.

We in New York have a staggering number of people with AIDS who face one of three choices. They can live on the streets. That is not very acceptable, to die of AIDS on the street. They can live in acute care hospitals. That treats them well, but it is extremely expensive, $1,085 a day, according to the Massachusetts Insurance Rate Setting Commission.

Or they can live in a HOPWA group home at the cost of about $40 to $100 a day. It is the humane way to go, and it is also the cheaper way to go.

That is why I am very grateful. I was one of the original authors of HOPWA on the housing committee. I am very grateful that the committee has made room for HOPWA, but my gratefulness is meaningless compared to those who will need this housing and use it. It has been a big success in New York.

I also want to say we are desperately short of 202 housing, and the fact that this will increase 202 is another benefit. I urge support of the en bloc amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Chairman LEWIS' amendment to reprioritize some of the housing programs and to add more funding for the special needs housing programs which consolidates the housing construction programs for people with disabilities, the elderly, and AIDS housing. In addition the amendment adds more funding for the homeless housing program and the Multifamily Credit Subsidy Program.

I am pleased to be a part of this compromise agreement reached between Chairman LEWIS and the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, Mr. LAZIO. While I agree that the Department of Housing and Urban Development is in drastic need of downsizing and consolidation, I was concerned about the reduction in the special needs program.

By adopting the Lewis amendment we will be sending a clear message to the bureaucrats at HUD that Congress is willing to support programs that work like the section 202 and section 811 programs. Both of these programs have a proven track record and I am pleased that this amendment addresses the successes of these two programs.

This amendment will also address the multifamily credit subsidy program. Here again, I believe that we need to find ways to revise the operation of the current multifamily programs, so that it can become self-sustaining without a federally appropriated subsidy. However, in the interim and lacking a new authorization, Congress needs to continue this program because if targets the people who are most in need.

Again, I urge my colleagues to adopt the Lewis amendment and make these constructive changes to the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I do want to rise in support of this manager's amendment. As has been stated, we are attending to the seniors, the disabled, and the AIDS sufferers.

I also wanted to point out that there is clarification necessary here because all too often there has been reference made to the fact that we are increasing the rental costs and suspending the Brooks amendment. That is not true. In this manager's amendment, we are restoring the ceiling on the rental levels, not only for public housing tenants, which is extremely important, but I would hope that my colleague from California, [Ms. WATERS] would understand also that the ceiling of 30 percent is retained not only on public housing but also on the senior citizens and the disabled.

So we are not ravaging the poorest, in terms of their rental costs. I think there has been a widespread misunderstanding bout this.

I also would want to say that as one who worked on the rental housing reforms of last year with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], we are not abandoning that. They are maintained, those reforms are maintained in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that as the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] has said, a very important part of this manager's amendment, which has thus far been ignored, is the FHA multifamily credit subsidy. We are improving that. We are working toward reform. This is an essential component of a private-public partnership that is essential to meet our multifamily needs.

Further I would like to clarify for Ms. WATERS: I share your concern with the increase from 30 to 32 percent for the section 8 Tenant-Based Program. However, this does not apply to the Public Housing Program. Nor does it apply to 202 elderly or disabled. Moreover, I am pleased that the bill does include the public housing rent reforms we worked on last year along with Representative KNOLLENBERG.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

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

I must say that on balance I think it does more good than harm. It is basically a pea and shell game, what is played here, in terms of what is funded. I think it deals with the short term types of needs, so I guess we have to take care of some of that, but only some of them. It restores, instead of underfunding, McKinney and FEMA by 50 percent. We now only underfund it by 40 percent in this amendment.

So those are the types of priorities that, in other words, we are going to do less in 1996 than we are doing in 1995. While that problem persists, it still maintains rent increases for those in some of the assisted housing programs. It is really trying to buy votes to secure support in terms of those that want to show that they are making

some move improving a bad bill. I commend them for the pressure they exerted, but frankly it falls far short of where we have to go.

It is, I think, an indication of where the priorities are in this new Congress that have to be addressed in terms of where the dollars are going to end up. The amendment with the underline bill simply provides a little more legislate a little bit less than otherwise would be the case.

It tries to basically buy off on the cheap in terms of this bill some reluctant supporters. It just does not go far enough, as my colleague from Massachusetts said. The journey begins with the first step, but we have got many miles to go before we get back to where we belong.

We have a responsibility, I think a moral responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to stand up for those that are vulnerable, those working families in our communities that are trying to make it. That is why we are here on the floor today, we Democrats, we want to stand up for those folks that in fact need our representation. They are not represented by the PAC's and the others, but they need our help and that of the House.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the manager's amendment that would increase the Special Needs Housing block grant by $441 million, providing for the restoration of crucial funding to the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS [HOPWA], section 202, and section 811.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when homelessness has reached crisis proportions and when so many very crucial programs that provide desperately needed services are being chipped away, one by one, we must work to preserve adequate funding for these important housing programs which are key to the basic existence of so many Americans.

The HOPWA program provides community-based, cost-effective housing for people living with AIDS and their families.

AIDS is now the leading killer of Americans between the ages of 25 and 44. At any given time, one-third to one-half of all Americans with AIDS are either homeless or in imminent danger of losing their homes. We have a responsibility, not only to respond to this very devastating public health crisis, but to provide assistance to those who are suffering from AIDS.

This amendment is cost-efficient and will save funds that would, in the absence of the housing and services provided in a HOPWA-funded residential facility, result in higher expenditures for hospital or emergency room costs. The costs of HOPWA facilities are between one-tenth and one-twentieth of the costs of hospital or emergency rooms. In fact, it is estimated that HOPWA dollars reduce the use of emergency health care services by an estimated $47,000 per person, per year.

Sections 202 and 811 have also proven to be enormously valuable programs, which have provided thousands from our growing senior population and people with disabilities with affordable housing, independence, and security.

Without these valuable programs so many risk homelessness, and, quite possibly, premature death due to exposure to poor nutrition, stress, and lack of medical care.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is socially, morally, and fiscally responsible. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN].

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to rise in support of the manager's amendment today and to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] and so many others across the aisle that have worked so hard to come up with this compromise. I think it takes a great step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about some big numbers, 19.1 to 19.4 billion. We talk later on in the bill about $600 and $300 million. The key though is back in our districts where we know it works. I recently visited a facility run by People, Inc., a not-for-profit. It takes these funds and makes sure that disabled and handicapped citizens are used properly in the right direction.

I think that when we look back at our directions in our home States and towns and districts, we can see that this money works. Seniors, homeless vets, and others, it works.

While there are some criticisms, we know that these big, big number we talk about here on the floor and in and out of committees, back in our districts where we have a chance to see it right away in action, we know that this money is put to its best use. I congratulate all the Members who worked for the manager's amendment and urge its support later on this afternoon.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think that if Jesus Christ were watching this particular amendment on the House floor, he would look down at us and think that this was a poor attempt to imitate his miracle of the loaves and fishes.

The fact of the matter is that we are trying to play a shell game here. We are trying to pretend that we are cutting off an arm and sewing back a finger and saying that everybody should be thankful for the efforts that have been put into it.

The reality is that we are cutting this budget, we are cutting the housing budget by billions and billions of dollars without a single hearing. We go about this by cutting $400 million out of the homeless budget. We put $100 million back, bringing it to a $400 million cut, and everybody is supposed to kneel down and say, thank you very much.

The fact of the matter is that, if we are interested in ending homelessness in America, we have to invest in building housing for folks. This country did not have homeless people in it in the 1960's and the 1970's and the like because we built affordable housing. Since Ronald Reagan's time, we have cut affordable housing and we have seen the rise of homelessness.

If we are serious about ending these issues, if we are serious about doing something about the plight of so many millions of Americans that live in public housing, we want to take a snapshot of some politician in front of a public housing project, that is great. And we condemn the whole thing. Or we are dealing with the fact that the vast majority of public housing is very good housing, and we need to continue to invest in it.

But by coming along and chopping it off, what we are going to do is go about creating the very public housing disasters that Members so adroitly condemn. So let us deal with the problems. Let us support this amendment, because it does a little bit more, and we cannot carry the votes to kill this whole bill. But let us recognize that what we need to do is kill this bill, put the funds into affordable housing. Cut the B–2, cut the taxes, not for the rich but for ordinary citizens.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have been wrestling with this bill for a long time and wrestling with what we are about as Members of Congress. I know that we have bankrupted this nation because of the kind of rhetoric of my colleague from Massachusetts who somehow thinks that if we spend more money we help people.

I think that in a hearing that my subcommittee is going to have in Chicago, we are going to have a hearing in Chicago because the Federal Government had to take over public housing because it has totally failed. A 4-mile stretch, one side a throughway and the other side 4 miles of public housing, and the poverty rate is 15 percent of the official poverty rate.

So I have come to the general conclusion that 12-year-old girls having babies and 14-year-olds selling drugs and 15-year-olds killing each other, 18-year-olds who cannot read their diplomas, 24-year-olds who have never had a job, 30-year-old grandparents is the legacy of this welfare state that must change. We are going to change it.

But this amendment, the fine work of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], the fine work of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the fine

work of some Members on this side who weighed in and have helped rescue a certain part of this bill to restore some funding for senior housing that works, for HOPWA that I know works, housing opportunities for people with AIDS and for helping those who are disabled to restore some money in the homeless is to me a gigantic step in the right direction.

□ 1400

I do not have all the answers, Mr. Chairman. I just know we have failed miserably, and I know it is not going to be solved by a lot more money. Hopefully we will get beyond the kind of rhetoric that we just heard and start to interact with people to make sure the money we do appropriate actually means something and does some good.

Mr. Chairman, I salute the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] again, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], and Members on both sides of the aisle who recognize that we have failed miserably, and we need to put a new and complete face on housing.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me.

My friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], who was talking about assisted and public housing, has left the floor. I just wanted to point out that I think that most of us recognize that there are problems with some assisted and public housing, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] said on the floor, and that there are troubled housing authorities. These constantly are held up as the basis for not continuing housing program.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that in my community, I would welcome the Congress to focus on the programs that are working very well. We have public housing that is 40 and 50 years old, that is being renewed in terms of contracts that represent some of the best quality housing for our low-income members of the community and working families, and it is serving its purpose. To be sure, any time we have that kind of concentration in terms of public housing—in some areas miles of low-income high rises—most of us recognize those political decisions that concentrate these tremendous numbers of low-income individuals in housing projects in large urban centers, and across the country. Such planning, such architecture causes a big problem—a very big problem.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think that this particular bill is denying modernization and operating funds for all public housing across the board. These policies are going to affect the good, the bad, and the indifferent, and I think we need to focus. We do not want to see more public housing have the type of plight that has happened in the example that has been given by my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS]. However, that is exactly what is going to happen.

What is really I think the problem in this bill, Mr. Chairman, is that it fails to help us preserve the existing resources of 4.7 million public and assisted housing units that we have. We are going to see a further deterioration of such housing. The money in the pipeline is necessary and useful for maintenance and operating in a fair way, and maintaining that housing.

Mr. STOKES. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the comments made by the gentleman from Minnesota, and they echo my own views in terms of that subject.

I would just say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that while I commend the chairman for his effort to improve the bill in this direction, and he certainly has improved it to some degree, it certainly has not gone as far as is really necessary to try and correct this legislation and make it palatable. It is unfortunate that we are in that position; and my position, of course, would have to be that until we can clear up these other matters in this bill, this is a bill which I would have to oppose.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the chairman's en bloc amendment. The program funding that is restored in this amendment affects individuals who do not have alternative resources. It is critical that we approve this amendment to restore at least a minimal level of funding for our most vulnerable communities.

Perhaps we have difficulty imagining ourselves in our seventies, eighties, or older. Do we think that because we have reasonable resources now, that a major illness, accident, or just a very long life could not wipe out our seeming financial security? How can we refuse to assume responsibility for minimum care, in this case just providing shelter for the elderly, for those living with HIV/AIDS, for the disabled, and for the homeless. I don't think any of us can, in good faith.

This amendment restores $441 million for HUD special needs housing and in addition, it strikes the provision requiring section 8 rental assistance recipients to pay additional utility costs. I have great concern with the bill's provision which pegs assistance to the marketplace. In Montgomery County, MD, this potentially could result in more than 3,500 section 8 recipients being forced to live in areas of concentrated poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this Congress really could accept a 49-percent reduction in the McKinney Homeless Assistance Program which has been a tremendous benefit to all communities. We still know little about how to meet our Nation's increase in the number of homeless, but it is a tragedy that must be addressed and we have a program that has proved itself over the years. Nor can we turn our backs on our seniors and the disabled who must depend on a fixed income and many of whom have no where else to turn.

My county's housing opportunity commission was recently lauded by Secretary Cisneros when he said: "Montgomery County, MD, may have the Nation's most comprehensive and balanced local housing program." It is important to remember that this success is dependent on, and in cooperation with, Federal support for "special need" housing programs. Assistance for such housing is needed in all areas of the country and every jurisdiction. No community can carry it alone.

Another program addressed by the amendment is the Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS [HOPWA] Program, the only Federal housing program that specifically addresses the housing needs of people with HIV/AIDS. It is estimated that one-third to one-half of all people with AIDS are either homeless or on the verge of losing their homes. Many people with AIDS are still faced with eviction because of discrimination, despite Federal and State antidiscrimination laws. Many others lose their homes when they are no longer able to pay their mortgage or rent because of illness and lost wages. Still others are already homeless when they become ill. Despite these problems, people living with HIV/AIDS historically have encountered great obstacles in receiving assistance through Federal housing programs.

HOPWA was created to address this desperate need, giving communities the flexibility to develop a broad range of housing options and support services to meet their specific needs, consistent with this Congress' efforts to provide greater local control.

Without adequate resources for HOPWA, people with HIV/AIDS will die early and without dignity—in emergency rooms, shelters, or worse—in the streets alone. This amendment ensures that at least a minimal amount of funding is available to provide housing for people with HIV/AIDS to ensure that they can live out the remainder of their lives with some level of decency and comfort.

Mr. Chairman, the cuts that have been chosen for H.R. 2099 are inhumane. We can do better than to take from the most vulnerable among us. This amendment is a fair and reasonable effort to restore basic housing needs, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I have no further speakers on this side. It is not my intention to ask for any more time. Indeed, I would hope that we could go to a voice vote on this, because buses are going to the Korean war memorial service. I certainly appreciate the cooperation of the ranking member in this matter.

Mr. STOKES. We are pleased to cooperate with the chairman in that regard. We do not see a need for a record vote on this particular amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 104–206.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment made in order by the rule having been agreed to, the Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

H.R. 2099

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of Article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, and for other benefits as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 50 U.S.C. App. 540–548; 43 Stat. 122, 123; 45 Stat. 735; 76 Stat. 1198); $17,649,972,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed $25,180,000 of the amount appropriated shall be reimbursed to ''General operating expenses'' and ''Medical care'' for necessary expenses in implementing those provisions authorized in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and in the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992, (38 U.S.C. chapters 51, 53, and 55) the funding source for which is specifically provided as the ''Compensation and pensions'' appropriation: *Provided further,* That such sums as may be earned on an actual qualifying patient basis, shall be reimbursed to ''Medical facilities revolving fund'' to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized by the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992 (38 U.S.C. chapter 55): *Provided further,* That $12,000,000 previously transferred from ''Compensation and pensions'' to ''Medical facilities revolving fund'' shall be transferred to this heading.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61), $1,345,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That funds shall be available to pay any court order, court award or any compromise settlement arising from litigation involving the vocational training program authorized by section 18 of Public Law 98–77, as amended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 19; 70 Stat. 887; 72 Stat. 487) $24,890,000, to remain available until expended.

GUARANTY AND INDEMNITY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $65,226,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $52,138,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further,* That during 1996, within the resources available, not to exceed $300,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans (38 U.S.C. chapter 37).

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $459,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $1,000, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 3698, as amended: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $4,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $195,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $54,000, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 31, as amended: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $1,964,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $377,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, subchapter V, as amended, $205,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries receiving care in Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs; oversight, engineering and architectural activities not charged to project cost; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); aid to State homes as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 1741); and not to exceed $8,000,000 to fund cost comparison studies as referred to in 38 U.S.C. 8110(a)(5); $16,713,521,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided,* That of the funds made available under this heading, $771,000,000 is for the equipment and land and structures object classifications only, which amount shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 1996, and shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 73), to remain available until September 30, 1997, $251,743,000, plus reimbursements.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, architectural, engineering, real property acquisition and disposition, construction and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including site acquisition; engineering and architectural activities not charged to project cost; and research and development in building construction technology; $63,602,000, plus reimbursements.

TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $7,000, as authorized by Public Law 102–54, section 8, which shall be transferred from the ''General post fund'': *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $70,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $54,000, which shall be transferred from the ''General post fund'', as authorized by Public Law 102–54, section 8.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail; $821,487,000: *Provided,* That funds under this heading shall be available to administer the Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training Act: *Provided further,* That the $25,500,000 earmarked in Public Law 103–327 for the acquisition of automated data processing equipment and services to support the modernization program of the Veterans Benefits Administration is available for any expense authorized to be funded under this heading: *Provided further,* That none of the funds under this heading (including funds referred to in the preceding proviso) may be obligated or expended for the acquisition of automated data processing equipment and services for Department of Veterans Affairs regional offices to support Stage III of the automated data equipment modernization program of the Veterans Benefits Administration.

NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of the National Cemetery System not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles, for use in cemeterial operations; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $72,604,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $30,900,000.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is $3,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, $183,455,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That except for advance planning of projects funded through the advance planning fund and the design of projects funded through the design fund, none of these funds shall be used for any project which has not been considered and approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further,* That funds provided in this appropriation for fiscal year 1996, for each approved project shall be obligated (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 1996, and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 1997: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall promptly report in writing to the Comptroller General and to the Committees on Appropriations any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above; and the Comptroller General shall review the report in accordance with the procedures established by section 1015 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (title X of Public Law 93–344): *Provided further,* That no funds from any other account except the ''Parking revolving fund'', may be obligated for constructing, altering, extending, or improving a project which was approved in the budget process and funded in this account until one year after substantial completion and beneficial occupancy by the Department of Veterans Affairs of the project or any part thereof with respect to that part only: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327, $7,000,000 shall be transferred to the ''Parking revolving fund''.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than $3,000,000, $152,934,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous ''Construction, minor projects'' appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is less than $3,000,000: *Provided,* That funds in this account shall be available for (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe, and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

For the parking revolving fund as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 8109), income from fees collected, to remain available until expended. Resources of this fund shall be available for all expenses authorized by 38 U.S.C. 8109 except operations and maintenance costs which will be funded from ''Medical care''.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist the several States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 8131–8137), $47,397,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veteran cemeteries as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 2408), $1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Any appropriation for 1996 for ''Compensation and pensions'', ''Readjustment benefits'', and ''Veterans insurance and indemnities'' may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations.

SEC. 102. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for 1996 for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 103. No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs (except the appropriations for ''Construction, major projects'', ''Construction, minor projects'', and the ''Parking revolving fund'') shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

SEC. 104. No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1996 for ''Compensation and pensions'', ''Readjustment benefits'', and ''Veterans insurance and indemnities'' shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 106. Appropriations accounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1996 shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from title X of the Competitive Equality Banking Act, Public Law 100–86, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable from ''Compensation and pensions''.

SEC. 107. (a) Effective October 1, 1995, section 5505 of title 38, United States Code, as in effect when repealed by section 1201(g)(4)(A) of Public Law 103–446 (108 Stat. 4687), is hereby reenacted and, as so reenacted, is amended by striking out ''September 30, 1992'' in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 1996''.

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''5505. Limitation on compensation payments for certain incompetent veterans.''.

SEC. 108. Chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1920 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting '', and for the reimbursement of administrative costs under subsection (c)'' before the period at the end of the second sentence; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) For each fiscal year for which this subsection is in effect, the Secretary shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund, reimburse the 'General operating expenses' account of the Department for the amount of administrative costs determined under paragraph (2) for that fiscal year. Such reimbursement shall be made from any surplus earnings for that fiscal year that are available for dividends on such insurance after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside. However, if the amount of such administrative costs exceeds the amount of such surplus earnings, such reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings.

''(2) The Secretary shall determine the administrative costs to the Department for a fiscal year for which this subsection is in effect which, in the judgment of the Secretary, are properly allocable to the provision of National Service Life Insurance (and to the provision of any total disability income insurance added to the provision of such insurance).

''(3) This subsection shall be in effect only with respect to fiscal year 1996.''.

(2) Section 1923 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting ", and for the reimbursement of administrative costs under subsection (d)" before the period at the end of the last sentence; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) For each fiscal year for which this subsection is in effect, the Secretary shall, from the Veterans' Special Life Insurance Fund, reimburse the 'General operating expenses' account of the Department for the amount of administrative costs determined under paragraph (2) for that fiscal year. Such reimbursement shall be made from any surplus earnings for that fiscal year that are available for dividends on such insurance after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside. However, if the amount of such administrative costs exceeds the amount of such surplus earnings, such reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings.

"(2) The Secretary shall determine the administrative costs to the Department for a fiscal year for which this subsection is in effect which, in the judgment of the Secretary, are properly allocable to the provision of Veterans' Special Life Insurance (and to the provision of any total disability income insurance added to the provision of such insurance).

"(3) This subsection shall be in effect only with respect to fiscal year 1996.".

(3) Section 1955 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting ", and for the reimbursement of administrative costs under subsection (c)" before the period at the end of the first sentence; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) For each fiscal year for which this subsection is in effect, the Secretary shall, from the United States Government Life Insurance Fund, reimburse the 'General operating expenses' account of the Department for the amount of administrative costs determined under paragraph (2) for that fiscal year. Such reimbursement shall be made from any surplus earnings for that fiscal year that are available for dividends on such insurance after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside. However, if the amount of such administrative costs exceeds the amount of such surplus earnings, such reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings.

"(2) The Secretary shall determine the administrative costs to the Department for a fiscal year for which this subsection is in effect which, in the judgment of the Secretary, are properly allocable to the provision of United States Government Life Insurance (and to the provision of any total disability income insurance added to the provision of such insurance).

"(3) This subsection shall be in effect only with respect to fiscal year 1996.".

(4) Section 1982 is amended by striking out "The United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in sections 1920(c), 1923(d), and 1955(c) of this title, the United States".

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO OFFER AMENDMENT OUT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 34 offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] to title I be in order at a later point in the reading of the bill, notwithstanding that title I may have been closed.

This has been agreed upon by both sides of the issue in terms of the Members debating it.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. Chairman, the report of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations contains language that highlights the excellent work conducted by the EPA in the use of a helicopter for water quality testing along the New York-New Jersey coasts. The EPA established a water quality testing program due to the pollution problems experienced that year by New Jersey and New York in the beaches which they experienced in 1988. As Members may recall, this was front page news which caused people to stay away from our beaches. This problem could have done irreparable harm to the economy, but with the cooperation of the Federal, State, and local governments, a comprehensive plan was implemented to ensure that the ocean water quality would never be in the sad shape that we found it in 1988. Since 1988, we have made steady progress in making our coastal waters clean.

There are two critical elements to the EPA's water quality testing program. First is the spotting of floatables in the coastal waters, and the second is the actual monitoring and surveying of water quality. In both situations, the EPA utilizes a helicopter to conduct its work.

I want to clarify the committee report language. The committee language discusses the spotting and immediate cleanup of floatables, but does not specify or mention monitoring and surveying of water quality. I ask the subcommittee chairman if the intent of the committee language includes the monitoring and surveying of water quality, in addition to the spotting of floatables?

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, yes, the committee realizes that the water quality testing program which has been instrumental in solving the coastal water problems which New Jersey experienced in 1987 and 1988 should continue. As the gentleman stated, this program includes spotting of floatables and monitoring and surveying of water quality.

Mr. SAXTON. Reclaiming my time, would the chairman of the subcommittee explain what funds are available to continue this program?

Mr. LEWIS of California. It is the committee's intention that the funds come for this program from EPA's environmental program and compliance account.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the willingness of the chairman of the subcommittee to include this language in the committee report. This program is vital to New Jersey and I want to commend the gentleman for his excellent work as chairman of the subcommittee.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 50.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: Page 8, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $230,000,000)".

Page 16, strike lines 12 through 21.

Page 20, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $400,000,000)".

Page 21, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $200,000,000)".

Page 22, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $200,000,000)".

Page 70, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $1,600,000,000)".

Page 71, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $400,000,000)".

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we have a limitation of 1 hour, divided equally on each side, the gentleman from Wisconsin controlling part of the time, and I will control the other half of the time.

Mr. OBEY. That is perfectly acceptable to me.

The CHAIRMAN. On this amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply cuts out the money for the space station, cuts the deficit by almost half a billion in the process, and transfers the rest of the unused money from the station into veterans' health care, into housing for the elderly and low-income and disabled, and to other science, especially other nonstation NASA science.

Mr. Chairman, like anybody else, I am thrilled by the history of the space program. I was at the launch when Neal Armstrong went to the Moon. It was one of the most thrilling experiences of my life and, I suspect, that of

every other American who witnessed it. However, these times require very tough choices. Some of those choices in this bill and a variety of other bills, are being avoided, rather than made. The result, I am afraid, is going to be severe constriction of our scientific capability, as well as a warping of our national priorities.

Mr. Chairman, the space station is sold as science, and I suppose, in some ways, it is, but there are two kinds of science which are funded by Government. One is investigator-initiated science in which a scientist gets an idea, he applies for a grant, other scientists review that proposal, and, because we have limited funding, only the science which is judged to be the very best is actually approved for Federal financing. This is, I think, quite different science.

Much of it, though certainly not all of it, Mr. Chairman, is what I would call politically generated science. It is, in many ways, a political project which has been redesigned countless times. And I do not mean to use the word ''political'' in a denigrating way. I happen to have great respect for the terms ''politician'' and ''public servant.'' Without politics, societies have wars, so I have great respect for political decisions.

However, I think there comes a point when we have to ask by which process we will learn the most and gain the most to advance this country scientifically. I think in many ways this project, desireable though it might be if we had additional resources, I think it is in many ways a public works demonstration project. Its supporters will talk about it in terms of the scientific payoff it can have. I think the question is: What knowledge will we gain through the expenditure of money for the station versus what kind of knowledge we will gain if we put that money to use in other scientific endeavors.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of this station is supposed to be, when we count up what has been spent and what will be spent, about $94 billion, $75 billion yet to be spent. To put that in perspective, that is about $4 billion a year; on average, that represents about twice as much as we spend annually on cancer research. It is more than we spend in the entire NASA or NSF budget, and it will not buy, in my view, 94 billion dollars' worth of new information.

It will finance, to a very large extent, repeated performances of functions that we already know how to do. It will finance 73 additional shuttle flights, at least, to carry into space very large amounts of material and equipment which will be assembled by workers floating around the globe. I would describe that as being, say, 90 percent a large-scale construction project and 10 percent a science project. My percentages may be off, but I think Members get my general drift.

Mr. Chairman, my concern at the scientific level, and because I have responsibility wearing my other hat as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, where we fund all NIH research, for instance, I have great concern that, because of the budget squeeze, this station is going to squeeze out other science in our Federal budget. We are going to have additional budget cuts next year.

Everybody knows that, no matter what decisions we make this year. I think if we keep the station, that over time, because of the declining level of Federal spending vis-a-vis previous plans, we will in essence obliterate our ability to support a lot of other needed science.

□ 1415

If I can keep just for the moment on the scientific issue, by passing this amendment, I think you help us to save other NASA science, you help us to fully fund Mission to Planet Earth, or virtually fully fund it at its requested level, and in addition to, I think, improving the balance of science that these dollars would produce, you allow us to restore $400 million to help the elderly and the disabled get decent housing here on Earth and, frankly, those of you who know me, know that I would, any time, put decent habitat for people on the face of the Earth ahead of habitat for astronauts.

In addition this amendment would allow us to restore $400 million to veterans' health, including correcting the problem which we have in the bill which will if not corrected squeeze the benefits of about 12,000 veterans, many of whom suffer from illness who will have their disability payments reduced because of the legislative provisions in this bill. This will allow us to try to correct that. It will also, in addition, give us a bonus of an additional almost $500 million savings on the Federal deficit. It seems to me that this is the rational thing to do given our budget squeeze.

One the veterans' side, for instance. The bill before us delays funding for $750 million in medical equipment in our veterans' medical centers around the country. This would enable us to meet some of the shortfall in the veterans' funding area. I really believe it represents a far better balance in expenditures.

I want to say this to those who have had a strong commitment to the station in the past. I understand that and I respect it. If this were the world that existed back in the 1960's when President Kennedy first began the space program, if we had an economy that was expanding at that rate, if we had resources which were expected to expand, if we did not have a poverty situation which was increasing, if we did not have a degenerating housing situation, if we did not have desperate needs in the environmental area, I would not be here offering this. But we have in the 1980's seen a huge run up in public debt because of policies which I largely opposed but nonetheless they were adopted and rammed through here over our objection, and those things have consequences. The consequence of those decisions in the early 1980's is that we have such a huge overhang of public debt, we are now being forced to make choices which squeeze out a good many valuable programs. The choices we face here is whether or not we will squeeze this one out or whether we will pretend for a while that we can continue it, meanwhile watching it every day gobble up other essential pieces of the budget, including other pieces of the science budget.

I respect people who differ with me on this issue, and I know that this offers people tough choices, but we are paid to make those tough choices. I think we ought to begin on this one today.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin for cooperating relative to the time difficulties that we have. While we have much agreement, there is some disagreement regarding this amendment.

It is suggested by way of the author's recommendation that there is some cost to go in terms of our space station completion and operation, somewhere around $94 million.

According to NASA's evaluation, the dollar figures really should be $26.2 billion including $13.2 billion for final development and construction and $13 billion for 10 years of operation.

Setting that aside, it really is no small bit of irony that we are considering an amendment here today that would eliminate space station funding. It was just last evening that I had the privilege of being at the White House where the President was giving a medal to Comdr. Jim Lovell, one of our best known and most talented and successful astronauts.

The effect of this amendment in the final analysis would do two things that I would suggest are very, very important for all Members to consider: First, the amendment would eliminate space station and thereby all those flight operations that relate to space station. It would undermine the President's effort to further develop an international cooperative effort between friends in Eastern Europe as well as with Russia.

There are those suggesting that if you eliminate space station, then in some way that money is suddenly going to become available for any number of other priorities. I would suggest the latter is a total misconception of what would likely occur.

It is my view that NASA's support flows around the public's interest in man's space flight, the public's interest in station. Indeed, if we eliminate those programs, it is my view that NASA would all but be eliminated itself. To presume that with the other priorities that we see in this bill, such

as housing, such as veterans, such as EPA, that suddenly a huge flow of dollars would be available for scientific research and other science programs, some would suggest is at least a bit naive.

This amendment would kill space station. In my judgment it would kill NASA's total program. Indeed it would terminate our American mission in space.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the Obey amendment. This is a summer when all of us are thrilled by recalling the adventure of *Apollo 13*. It was one of the milestones in the challenge John Kennedy put to America. We needed the challenge and we could afford that challenge. But that was then and this is now.

Now is a time when we need to make our public housing programs better—and this administration is trying. But we need to continue a Federal commitment to housing for the most vulnerable people in our society.

Now is not a time when we can renege on our commitment to the men and women who fought our wars.

Now is a time when we have to make genuine efforts to control our deficit. We have to be credible and fair in this effort.

Now is not a time when we can afford the space station. The challenges that face us today are very different than the ones that confronted us in the 1960's of John Kennedy and *Apollo 13*.

There are so many things that trouble me about this bill. It is so mean-spirited in so many ways.

As chairman of the Congressional Urban Caucus, I am distressed at the harshly anticity, antipoor, antiveteran, antienvironment aspects of this bill.

How can we make it better? Throw it out and start over again. But Mr. OBEY'S amendment does a good job in pointing out the inequities of the bill, as well as its departure from genuine and fair deficit reduction.

I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment and give my support for full funding of the international space station *Alpha*.

On the one hand we will hear from opponents that budget cutters have cut far too deeply into the NASA budget and that those cuts severely imperil the U.S. space program. On the other hand we hear opponents cite a flawed GAO study that says the space station is going to cost $94 billion and we should just do away with it.

Well, I believe both arguments are incorrect and wrong.

The space station represents America's future in the development of space. In the Science Committee, under the leadership of BOB WALKER and JIM SENSENBRENNER, we have gone to great lengths to make certain that the space station will progress in a responsible, fiscally competent, efficient, and on-schedule fashion for the next 7 years.

If that were not the case I would not support the program.

In a time when we are scaling back, tightening, and eliminating, some ask how we can allocate full funding for the station. The answer, quite simply, is that the station is an investment in America's future.

Are we going to lead the way in space or are we going to watch others from the sidelines? Are we going to lead the way in space-based research or will our citizens have to wait for medical progress? Are we going to lead the way in sending products into space or will we be forced to buy services from the other nations who stayed involved with the station?

The space station is very much about America's future. In fact, it is a pathway into the future. In the Science Committee, we recognize this reality and embrace it. We can see the commercial possibilities sand the necessity for America to be competitive.

We can do this and keep our commitment to balance the budget.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the ranking member of the Committee on Science.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 7 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think beyond question the remarks I make here today and the vote that I cast on this amendment will rank amongst the most difficult that I have ever had to make.

I have come to the conclusion that we can no longer sustain a space program of the type that I would like to see and which has been recommended by all of the experts in this field, at the budget level which we are now confronted with, and that as a consequence I will have to oppose the space station.

I have this chart here which will enable me to explain the budgetary situation. I have had this chart for a number of years. I used it for the last couple of years to try and tell the President that we could not continue the space program and the space station at the level of his budget. I have now revised it to include the Republican budget as well, which I find makes the President's budget look good.

When I came to Congress, NASA's budget was here. I came in the early 1960's. The Republican budget at the end of a 5-year period will bring us back to less than it was in the early 1960's. The President's budget would allow us to do slightly better but not too much.

Five years ago, President Bush commissioned a report on the future of the space program. This was at this point right here on the chart. The commission was chaired by the present chairman of Martin Marietta and composed of distinguished citizens and scientists.

At that point the commission recommended that to maintain all of the programs NASA was supporting, including the space station, it would be necessary to continue this upward curve, up to about here. At this point, it would equal about half in terms of GNP what it was over here.

Instead of following the recommendations of that report, what actually happened was just the opposite. We have tried to maintain all of those programs in NASA's portfolio with a budget which is less than half of what was recommended by that report.

Here is when the present administrator, Mr. Goldin, came in.

□ 1430

He was appointed by Mr. Bush, told to streamline NASA, to cut the budget, to use all of the necessary techniques, including reductions of the bureaucracy, and redesign of programs to achieve the NASA Program goals, but at considerably less money.

Here we are today, and Mr. Goldin has done one of the most magnificent jobs that I have ever seen a Government employee do and he has maintained the level of the programs and cut the overall budget by 15 percent.

Here is where we are. Where do we go from here? In my opinion, we can continue to make modest cuts and continue all of these programs, but we cannot go as far as the President recommends, which amounts to a 30-percent cut from where Mr. Goldin started, nor can we do what the Republican budget includes, which is a 40-percent cut.

Mr. Chairman, in other words we are proposing to cut the budget for NASA almost in half over a period of years, and to still finish what we have done.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, a very astute gentleman, recognized in his original subcommittee report that they could not do that, so the gentleman proposed cutting out a number of major science programs and three major installations. The gentleman will have to do that again next year, and it will carry

next year, because there is no way to continue with NASA.

So I am suggesting to all of my colleagues that we need to take a fundamental look of where we want to be in space. We are about to see the collapse of all of our cooperative efforts, including the space station, because we do not now have adequate reserves to guarantee us against the unexpected in the remaining 5 years of that program.

Our allies in Europe, with whom I keep in fairly close touch, including this morning, our allies in Japan, our allies in Canada, are questioning whether we can continue these programs on this kind of a budget trajectory, and they are correct, and they are likely to leave the ship in the very near future.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate both the interest of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] in the work of NASA and also the gentleman's chart, because it reflects many of the frustrations that I share with the gentleman.

One of our problems has been that NASA's financing begins in our Subcommittee on Appropriations. There is no question that funding competing with housing and veterans' programs has competed with NASA.

On the other hand I have argued that the only hope that NASA really has to get continued support within the House is the mission in space. That is how we developed the broadly based bipartisan support that NASA has had so far. Frankly, without space station, I think all of that disappears.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I happen to agree with the gentleman. I think NASA's programs will begin to unravel if we end the space station. On the other hand, we are now headed on a trajectory which will leave us at a level of expenditure of two-tenths of 1 percent of the Gross National Product at that point. Up here we were eight-tenths of national GNP.

Now, we all say we give NASA a high priority. Wonderful program, great science, great adventure, very stimulating. And then we give it less resources than any other part of the domestic discretionary programs; less than any other science; less certainly than nonscience aspects of the budget.

Of course, you can compare it with defense which continues to go up, even though we do not have any realistic wars in the near term. We are not giving NASA the priority which we all say that it ought to have, and it will collapse.

Mr. Chairman, I told the President this last year. I said, ''Your budget this year will survive. The programs could continue, but the 5-year outlook, it cannot.'' I said, ''I will vote for the space station this year, if you will work hard to keep it a half a billion dollars. Last year they gave the President more than he asked for; a good sign.

This year the President did not reexamine the 5-year outlook. I am not going to support it under these conditions and I continue to point out that we are lying in our teeth if we say space is important and then give it this kind of a budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to state my overall dismay over the events that have led us to consider this amendment today. In 1990, then-President Bush brought together the Nation's wisest and most knowledgeable experts on the space program to review the future direction we should take. At that time the concern centered around NASA's ability to sustain major efforts such as the space station and the space shuttle program and still carry out its basic missions in science and space exploration.

This panel, called the Augustine Commission, produced a report remarkable for its insight and vision. One of the most notable recommendations was that the scope and direction of our Nation's space program must be accompanied by a stable budget—a budget that at least keeps pace with inflation. If we truly have as our objective the expansion of human presence in space, the budget must some day reach a level approaching about half what it was during the Apollo years according to the Augustine report.

Scarcely had the Augustine report been released than Congress and the administration embarked on a fierce competition to cut the NASA budget. Over the past 5 years, there seems to be no cut large enough to satisfy the budget cutting frenzy in both the Congress and the executive branch. The most recent reduction by the White House—a $5 billion cut over 5 years—was doubled by the Republican budget resolution. This mimics some kind of high stakes poker game in which the losers will be not only NASA, but our future generations.

Over the past 5 years, as this scenario has unfolded, I have agonized over how best to call attention to this fantasy that NASA funding is a bottomless pit—that we can cut indefinitely and still expect to keep major NASA centers open, still keep major programs afloat, and still keep the public confidence in our stewardship of NASA.

Today, I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that this fantasy is no longer plausible. I see no juncture this year, nor in the future at which leaders in Congress and the White House will reverse this trend or reach a consensus on the need for a stable long-term NASA budget. Thus I plan today to vote to terminate the space station. This is a very painful decision for me—but I have no other morally acceptable choice.

In saying this I want to give my highest accolades to NASA and to Administrator Goldin who has struggled to meet the demands of OMB to cut back, and his strong voice against the further reductions proposed by the Republicans. NASA has made Congress's job vastly easier by forging ahead on reforms, by proposing rational ways to reduce spending and absorb the cuts levied by OMB and by returning the space program to the American people. It is profoundly unfair to ignore the solid work already done and replace it with the vague, misguided policy directives that masquerade these days for budget cuts—policy directives to go forth and privatize, commercialize and so on. These are no more than buzz words, indeed buzz words that nobody can even agree on.

I have been and will remain a strong supporter of the space station. But the Republican budget plan and the lack of leadership in the White House on space issues leaves me no choice but to point out that NASA cannot remain a viable agency and cannot sustain a viable space station program within the budgetary envelope that has been put forward by the Republicans.

I tried to make this point last year that the President's own 5-year budget plan would not sustain a balanced NASA program as well as the space station, but I was obviously unsuccessful in convincing them.

I fully recognize that the amendment which I will vote for will, if passed, put NASA overall in worse shape. The amendment that should be considered today is one that will restore the cuts that have been made to NASA in this bill and to bring it back to at least the level in the President's request in fiscal year 1996 and to maintain stability thereafter by keeping pace with inflation. There is no doubt that that amendment will fail miserably.

I will close by restating that my vote today represents my personal position and I do not necessarily ask that my colleagues join me. I hope, however, that my colleagues in this and future Congresses will join me in focussing on this important problem and lending their genuine support to the space program.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Obey amendment and in opposition to the misguided priorities represented in it.

Mr. Chairman, the money that we spend on NASA can never be justified in the abstract. But where it can be justified is in the spinoffs that our investment in the future, which is represented in the NASA budget, brings.

Throughout the civilian space program since 1957, we have seen revolutions in telecommunications, revolutions in materials development, revolutions in medical techniques, revolutions in the development of new types of medications that do a better job in treating what ails human beings with fewer side effects.

Mr. Chairman, those types of spinoffs will end if NASA collapses. And make no bones about it, the space station is the linchpin of NASA's efforts. We take away the space station, we take away a lot of the scientific research that will end up providing a huge improvement in the standard of living for every human being on this earth, and not just in the United States, but elsewhere as well.

So let us not eat our seed corn. Let us not turn our back on research. Let us continue to support the space station by voting down the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls into question the American commitment to space. We should not be questioning that. If it is adopted, it will

mean that the Congress will have, in effect, thrown away the $17 billion already spent on the development of the space station, and the 50,000 pounds of material that have been already produced that will go up into orbit.

It will welch on our international partners: the Russians, the European space agency, the Germans, the French, the Canadians, the Japanese, and will tell those international partners that America is an unreliable partner in any big-ticket expensive scientific investment and tell them that the $6 billion that they have spent will be thrown away, just as the $17 billion that we have spent.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that that is the example that we should be setting in the Congress of the United States. The $400 million that is transferred into HUD does not buy very much housing, but it is done at the expense of wrecking a major program that this Congress has committed itself to for over 10 years.

The space station should be kept in the budget. This amendment should be defeated. We should not wreck America's future in the development of the things that are spun off from what NASA has done.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, is it really appropriate to be talking about another $74 billion investment for a space station when we have 5 million children in America who are hungry and this Congress is cutting back on nutrition programs and food stamps?

I do not think that that is a proper or moral tradeoff. We should not be doing that.

Mr. Chairman, the budget that we are dealing with now devastates programs for affordable housing. How can low-income people bring up a family when they make $6 an hour and are forced to pay 50 or 60 percent of their limited incomes for housing? How many more families, how many more children, will be made homeless as a result of this budget? That is not right.

Mr. Chairman, the wealthy in our country have the resources to send their kids to the finest private schools and the finest colleges, colleges which often cost $25,000 a year or more.

The working class and the middle class of this country do not have that luxury. In fact, it is harder and harder for the average American family to afford college for their kids.

Mr. Chairman, how do we tell the working families of this country that we are prepared to spend tens of billions more on the space station, but we are cutting back drastically on student loans, on Pell grants, on upward bound, on the National Service Program; congressional decisions which will make it impossible for millions of American kids to afford college. Billions more for hardware in space; major cuts in education. That does not make sense.

The Republican budget that we are operating under eliminates LIHEAP. Elderly people in Vermont, throughout this country, will go cold when the weather becomes 20 below zero. Mr. Chairman, $74 billion more for the space station; elderly people in America going cold. Those are wrong priorities.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Obey amendment that would kill 40,000 high-technology American jobs and the support of that amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] that would somehow make NASA better by taking $2 billion out of its budget this year.

Mr. Chairman, today's decision is about the future. Today's decision is about doing something that will be remembered as a step into human kind's destiny. Today's decision is about contributing to the never-ending quest of human exploration. Today's decision is looking beyond our present problems and building something toward tomorrow.

The space station, like all the other vehicles that have carried us toward the future, is surrounded by controversy. It is easy to dispute, even mock, the unknown. Because what we will learn by going to the frontier is more about imagination and hope than it is about hard, cold fact, the potential of the space station often defies description; and that is a problem in legislative debate.

But history, rather than science, is instructive. The easy argument against exploration always has been not here, not now, because there are too many other needs that must be met first with our limited resources. Invariably, throughout history that easy argument has been wrong. Men and women who have bought the easy argument have become the defenders of the status quo and their dreams have been lost. Nations who have bought the easy argument have lost their sense of destiny and declined in both power and prestige.

Mr. Chairman, between now and the year 2002, we will spend something less than two-tenths of 1 percent of our projected national outlays to build, orbit, and man a space station. In that same period we will spend at least 12 percent of our total national outlays, or more than 70 times than what we spend on space station, paying interest on the national debt.

Massive commitment to debt without some small investments in exploration and imagination is not the foundation on which great nations are built or sustained. Still, putting men and women in space to live and work takes real money. We owe the American people no less than an assurance that the money will be well spent.

We will do completely unique scientific work aboard the space station that holds the promise of new discoveries. The payoff could be enormous.

We will develop new technologies in order to build the space station that will allow us to build world class products here on Earth. The payoffs will be immediate and real.

We will forge a partnership with the international community which will build mutual trust and respect. The payoff is a promise of peace.

We will cooperate in an international venture that may prove to be a model for other scientific endeavors. The payoff will be a triumph of American leadership.

Are the payoffs worth the price? For some here, the answer is obviously ''no.'' They want to spend the money in other ways. But they would have us give up a lot.

When we abandon space station, we stop 30 years of progress in human space flight. When we abandon space station, we leave the space shuttle as a magnificent flying machine without its original mission.

When we abandon space station, we kill off the last major science project being done with international partners and jeopardize the future of cooperative efforts.

When we abandon space station, we abandon American leadership in the arena of the future and leave the potential of space to others.

When we abandon space station, the dream is no longer alive.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues came to Congress to, in some small way, touch the future, here is their chance. Somewhere out there, on the endless frontier, is the destiny of humankind. We can step toward that destiny, or can we step back, away from it. I hope most of us will choose to step forward.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues' support for the space station will allow Americans to know a new and unique frontier for the first time. And in knowing that frontier, America will define the future. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I am, indeed, honored to follow the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and his remarks. He is right on. He is right on the issue, and I appreciate the work that the chairman of the subcommittee on VA, HUD, and independent agencies has done on this issue. He has been very fair in allocating these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this very misguided amendment. For the most part, the accounts the gentleman from Wisconsin seeks to

increase have already been accommodated in the managers amendment. In regard to the VA medical account, this is the only account in the bill that has already received an increase over the fiscal year 1995 level.

The Obey amendment attempts to redirect the priorities set out in this bill and I submit to my colleagues that the priorities of the gentleman from Wisconsin are far different from those of the majority of this House.

While this amendment makes rather small add backs to several accounts, it terminates the international space station program. This is a program that represents one of the few areas of this bill where Federal tax dollars actually contribute to an investment in this Nation's future.

I am a vigorous supporter of the space station for many reasons. For me, and I think for most Americans, America's space program is one of the activities undertaken by our Government which is unquestionably legitimate.

And the objectives are far too important to compromise. Forget the unparalled knowledge about space itself, forget even the new heights of international cooperation and the building of inhabitable structures in space.

The long-duration microgravity capabilities of the space station will directly affect research in cell and developmental biology, human physiology, biotechnology, fluid physics, combustion science, materials science, benchmark physics and the large-scale commercial development of space. We cannot afford to forgo the tremendous impact these scientific efforts will produce.

Moreover, the reaching of these objectives through space research is exactly the type of activity that Americans expect their Government to undertake. This expectation is what separates space station funding from Federal spending on paintings and poetry, on museums, publishing, broadcasting, farm subsidies, loan guarantees, real estate development, and bank bailouts.

And let me be clear: To those who believe that we can maintain a human space program without the space station, don't fool yourselves, without the space station there is no shuttle program and without that, there is no NASA. I submit to my colleagues that the space station is a program we cannot afford not to fund.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, later in the debate on this legislation, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and I will be proposing an amendment that will apply the entire savings from the elimination of the space station program to deficit reduction.

But I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] because I do believe that it is a worthwhile amendment to support as well. Although I would prefer that all the money go to deficit reduction, I believe that the $400 million of deficit reduction which is included in the Obey amendment is certainly not chopped liver and in future years the elimination of the space station will free up tens of billions of dollars for deficit reduction and for more cost-effective programs in space and on Earth.

Let me say right off the bat, I think ''Apollo 13'' is a wonderful movie, and I do believe that it is the destiny of humankind to explore space, to boldly go where no one has gone before, but I do believe, with this expenditure, as with every other expenditure that we consider, we have got to look at the numbers and we have got to be hard-eyed in our justification for it.

I marvel at how some of the flintiest, hard-core fiscal conservatives in this House get all wobbly and emotional when the subject comes to the space station.

I just urge you to look at the space station with the same hard-eyed analytical approach that you do with other spending programs. I believe that a critical reason why we have to kill the space station is the reason that my friend from California, the former chairman of the Committee on Science has laid out. There is no one, I believe, who feels more strongly about science and believes more deeply in space exploration than the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Science. He has come to the realization that we cannot afford both to continue good science in space and to build the space station.

I concur.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to speak today on space station.

My friend from New Jersey said we get wobbly and tear up when we talk about the space station. That is because I think of the starving children around the world who are hungry. We say, how can we feed these kids? Well, we are going to feed them one time by transferring the money.

Ladies and gentlemen, the answers to the problems may be by going to space. When we go to space, we have a totally new environment in which we can solve many problems.

We are denying our scientists that access to that research if we vote to cut the space station. It is wrong. It is misguided, and it is shortsighted.

I am embarrassed to say we cannot even cut the National Endowment for the Arts 10 percent, but we are willing to cut our Nation's future.

Queen Isabella had problems. She had potholes. She had problems. She still sought out new worlds.

We will always have problems, but we will always not have the space station.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I find it ironic that on this day of the dedication of the Korean war veterans memorial on The Mall, we will shortly be working here with the new Republican majority on the Hill to vote to deeply cut veterans' benefits.

This bill fails to meet the promise we made to our Nation's veterans in the areas of medical benefits, education, vocational rehabilitation and many other areas. If you do not believe what we Democrats are saying about this bill, I believe you should at least listen to the major veterans' organizations that strongly oppose it. The American Legion believes that the dramatic VA funding reductions called for will clearly undermine the commitment of our Nation to its veterans. This Nation's contract with its veterans is irrevocable and must never be abrogated. The Veterans of Foreign Wars says, ''The designated appropriations still fall well short of the funding necessary to maintain even the current level of earned entitlements for our veterans,'' and it says, ''The cuts cross the line and fall well short.'' The Paralyzed Veterans of America is upset gains in VA medical care account were achieved only at the expense of other major veterans' programs. Vietnam Veterans of America say the cuts ''far exceed what is fair and equitable and that it will force the VA to decide between equally worthy groups of patients.'' The Disabled Veterans are incensed because this bill cuts benefits to some service-connected veterans saying, ''The proposal is ill-advised and strikes at the very heart of our Nation's obligation to provide compensation to all citizen soldiers disabled in the defense of the freedoms we all enjoy.''

That is a provision that would deny mentally incompetent veterans any benefits if their estates are valued at less than $25,000.

The Obey amendment is important for the veterans of our country. It reinstates the cuts made in those mentally incompetent veterans' benefits, for example.

I urge my colleagues to stand up and support the Obey amendment, and that will be their effort to stand up for our veterans as well.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that we have to make every effort to ensure that our taxpayers are getting the most for their tax dollars. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that we need to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary programs.

I even go so far as to agree we need to cut back wherever we can, and I am willing to have a side-by-side review of

my record of having cutbacks and trying to be frugal with the people's money.

But Americans are not going to be getting the most for their tax dollars if they abandon the project that is going to help us have a better future. My basic support is for the biomedical thrust in space. We are still searching for cures for cancer, diabetes and other diseases. Micro-gravity research in space already has had encouraging results and has raised our hopes for future medical breakthroughs.

Of course, there are no guarantees. Jonas Salk had no guarantee. Louis Pasteur had no guarantee. Dr. Fleming had no guarantee. There are no guarantees. But we have not found these cures here in this environment, and we might just find them in the weightless environment of space.

Those Americans whose lives are threatened by disease would argue that finding a cure for their illness would be well worth this financial investment in the space station. Little children who have lost their hair to chemotherapy, tubes in them, veterans of the wars of the world wasting away, these are people who have hope in research.

Who would not be willing to pay 2.2 cents a day in return for this investment? Even if we do not eventually find these cures, the technological and scientific benefits that will result will justify this expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to vote against the Obey amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the termination of the international space station. Mr. Chairman, there have been seven votes in the House to terminate space station since 1991.

The space station has survived every vote. We have had a firefight every year.

I urge the Members to oppose this amendment. You cannot be responsible and build a house and get to the point of putting the roof on it and say now is the time to turn our back on this program. We have gone too far to do that.

If we give up on space station, we give up on human space exploration. Do not let the 104th Congress be the Congress depicted in another movie much like ''Apollo 13,'' as the Congress that turned its back on this very critical program.

Support the space station. Vote against this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in bipartisan support of a strong, balanced space program, and therefore must join the bipartisan opposition to the Obey amendment to terminate the international space station.

Our space program must balance human space flight with key science, aeronautics and technology initiatives like the Mission to Planet Earth. By killing the space station, we will greatly disrupt this balance by effectively ending NASA's human space flight efforts.

When I came to Congress 2½ years ago, I was a space station skeptic. I was concerned about the program's cost and how it was being managed. I was not sure that the program's benefits justified continued investment by American taxpayers.

But NASA's Administrator Dan Goldin has brought the station program under control. NASA has streamlined management by selecting a single prime contractor, and cut program costs by adding incentives for cost performance and penalties for delays.

Mr. Chairman, I am now persuaded that the program's benefits are enormous. Station's unique zero-gravity research environment will allow new insights into human health and disease prevention and treatment. Station's international nature, especially its Russian involvement, will demonstrate that former adversaries can move beyond the cold war and into new era of peaceful cooperation.

Station is an investment in our future. Twenty-six years ago, Neil Armstrong took his first step on the Moon—thereby inspiring a whole generation of Americans. Now, the space station will finally give us a permanent presence in space, and will give the next generation a springboard to future human exploration of our universe.

Mr. Chairman, our country needs a strong and balanced space program. The international space station must continue.

□ 1500

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment and rise to speak out in support of our international space station.

NASA has cut its budget 35 percent since fiscal year 1993, saving the taxpayers $40 billion. NASA's fiscal 1996 budget is below their fiscal year 1992 budget in real dollars.

Aerospace is the single strongest export sector in the U.S. economy; 1993 exports topped $40 billion. Station is less than 15 percent of the NASA budget, one-seventh of 1 percent of the Federal budget, and costs each American taxpayer $9 a year.

In essence, Mr. Chairman, we have a great program here. It is on budget, it is on time, and we have an agency that has been leading the charge in doing it smarter, faster, quicker, with less money, and what we are trying to do here is congratulate and encourage that Agency by kicking them when they are doing a good job.

This space station, I am convinced, is vital and important for our Nation to remain the world's leader in science, technology, as well as education, and I speak out very, very strongly in opposition to this amendment. I believe our space station is part of our future, it is important for our children, and I encourage all our colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Houston, TX, Mr. GENE GREEN.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the future of our manned space program. This space station is not, as some people call it, a pork-barrel program. It is the excitement of our era, the international space station.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and every school I go into and I talk about space and space exploration, the children light up whether they are in the poorest neighborhoods or the richest neighborhoods. That is the future of our country. The opponents of the space station have argued that this program costs too much. The truth is that every dollar spent on space programs returns at least $2 in direct and indirect benefits. Our commitment to America's future today will accelerate breakthroughs in technology and engineering that will have immediate, practical applications for life on Earth. It will inspire our children, foster the next generation of scientists, engineers, and satisfy humanity's ancient need to explore and achieve.

A robust space station program assures our students that they are critical to the Nation—that they are the next generation—and that the thrill of just beginning starts with them whether they are in kindergarten or in the 12th grade. By voting in favor of this space station, again the Obey amendment, my colleagues can confirm their equipment to the science of learning. I ask my colleagues that they base their decision on the art of science and not the art of politics of the moment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in just a few minutes we are going to see a lot of Members leave this floor and go down the street to the war memorial for the Korean war veterans, and, while that is a commendable program that is far overdue for our Nation's veterans, I think it would do us some good to concentrate a little bit on what is going on in our Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The veterans of this country for the large measure are getting older. When they get older, they need more health care, and yet we no longer approach veterans' issues as to whether or not they served this

country when the country put the call out, but we say whether or not their budget is going to fit into the needs of our country right at the moment for the people paying the taxes.

Well, I think it is important that we have a balance in terms of taxes in this country, but I do not think we ought to be taking it out of the hide of those veterans that served this country and defended this Nation when the call went out, and that is exactly what this bill does. We say all the Nation's veterans are held harmless because they get the same amount of money this year as they did last year.

First of all, that is not true; and second, they need more money. Anybody that would choose to go into a veteran's hospital versus a private hospital in this country today has not visited a veterans' hospital.

Mr. Chairman, we need to recognize that it is only the republicans that could come up with this bizarre concept that we need to take money out of the space program in order to cut our Nation's veterans' programs so that we can turn around and cut our housing programs by $6 billion.

As my colleagues know, at some point there has got to be some rationale of what it is we are trying to accomplish around here. Certainly I would very much like to see out country invest in the Advanced Technology Program. The Republicans killed that last night on the House floor. To suggest that what we want to do is have a space program to increase technologies is a bizarre twist on what the purpose of the space program was to begin with.

For those of my colleagues who may have forgotten we built the space program not to create new technologies, we built the space program because we were threatened by the Russians that could control space and perhaps gain control over this country's security. If we are interested in fighting back on the technology front, let us invest in technology. Let us not rob the homeless the way this bill does.

I support the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Committee on Science. I serve on the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics. I have heard the arguments. I have visited a NASA center in Huntsville, AL, and was treated very nicely and generously and kindly. But even after that, even after that, I feel that we cannot afford to fund the space station. I do not feel there will be the payoffs; I do not feel that it is the correct decision at this time to make.

I fully support the shuttle program, and I am afraid when I hear the argument that the shuttle program will have to be cut down or eliminated if there is no space station. I think there is plenty of value in the shuttle program and in the entire space program without the space station. It does not require a space station to be a productive contributor.

Mr. Chairman, I support the obey amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS for yielding this time to me, and I want to speak for my allotted time on an issue I think that is important.

In my decade now, in the House of Representatives, I think the total votes on station in this House of Representatives now number 19. We have voted over and over and over again about this issue, and during the process of the years of those votes we now have invested over $12 billion in this project, done so in a way with international cooperative agreements from 13 nations who themselves have invested over $4 billion so far in this project.

We are halfway home. We have this project under construction. Station is bending metal. We will be launching its first components in just a couple of years. The program of space station is the program that NASA has given us for decades, and that is a program of a future, of less pain and suffering, of greater science, of advancements of technology, of a stronger economy, and leadership in a global environment. We ought not back off our agreements, our investment, our future.

Mr. Chairman, what we can do today is once more say, and hopefully finally, that we are going to keep our agreements, we are going to build space station, and we are going to know the process of doing so, that like all other investments historically in NASA, this one is going to return to the people of our country vastly more than we will spend in this appropriations bill.

Defeat the Obey amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this shortsighted amendment. All of us have seen in recent months what has happened in the space program, the recent docking between America's space shuttle and the Russian space station. It brings new hope for greater cooperation in our efforts to understand our planet, our solar system, and even our galaxy, but, as nations from around the world are working together to establish a space station where we can work together toward a better future for our children, this amendment would end, end our manned space station program.

All of us remember what President Ronald Reagan said about the space program: ''The future doesn't belong to the fainthearted, it belongs to the brave.''

He was also talking about our space program when he said: ''We'll continue our quest in space. There will be more shuttle flights and more shuttle crews and, yes, more volunteers, more civilians, more teachers in space. Nothing ends here. Our hopes and our journeys continue.''

And I remember President Kennedy talking about the space program when he said, ''. . . not because it is easy, because it is hard.''

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment passes, mankind's dreams of reaching out from our world will end. A hope for greater understanding of our world and even for new developments in areas such as medicine and metallurgy, will end also all because we were unwilling to look ahead, invest in the future.

Let me quote a poem as I close from Alfred Tennyson:

> For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see. Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be. Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails. Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales.

My colleagues, today we have the opportunity to make this dream a reality. Vote no on the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers in opposition to this amendment said that my priorities were wrong. Well, I think I have the same priorities as the people who I run into when I visit with them in Wausau, or Stevens Point, or Chippewa Falls, or Wisconsin Rapids, or Superior, or any other place in my district. My priorities are the 80,000 displaced American workers who will be cut out of worker training programs in the next appropriation bill to come before this House. My priorities are the 50,000 kids who are going to get tossed out of Head Start programs they would otherwise be able to be taken into in the next appropriation bill that is going to come before this House. My priority would be the young people who are going to lose their college loans in the next appropriation bill to come before this House. My priority would be the 600,000 Americans who will lose any help whatsoever from their Government to help heat their houses in winter and cool them in the summer so you don't have 800 more deaths like we had 2 weeks ago. The Clinton administration just released emergency fuel assistance money. There will be no emergency fuel assistance money next year if the Republican majority has their way on the appropriation bill coming before this House next. My priorities would be the disabled veterans who are being chiseled on their disability benefits, 12,000 of whom will wind up being squeezed so that we can make more room in this budget for other priorities. I make no apology for putting those folks first.

My priorities would also be science right here on Earth, at NIH, NSF, just

name it: Cancer research, Alzheimer's, heart disease; we have plenty of science that we need to support right here on Earth.

□ 1515

I would also just close by reading one paragraph from the letter I received from the Disabled American Veterans. It simply says this: America's service-connected disabled veterans and their families are deeply disturbed by recent actions taken by the House Committee on Appropriations which would terminate compensation payments to certain service-connected mentally disabled veterans in order to provide additional funding for Department of Veterans Affairs [VA] health care. DAV certainly understands the need to put our Nation's financial house in order; however, this proposal is ill-advised and strikes at the very heart of our Nation's sacred obligation to provide compensation to all citizen-soldiers disabled in defense of the freedoms all of us enjoy.''

I agree with that statement. So I would simply urge you to support the Obey amendment. It saves almost half a million dollars on the deficit. It helps meet our commitment to veterans, a commitment which this bill welches on. This amendment corrects that. It also helps us to provide some decent housing for additional Americans who are elderly and disabled.

Mr. Chairman, I make absolutely no apology for those priorities at all. Those ought to be the priorities of this entire Congress. I urge Members support the Obey amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as we close this debate on the Obey amendment, I think it is very important for all of those who are interested and are listening to know that the amount of money that is available for NASA is a very small fraction of the total dollars available in this bill. We do not begin to put into station, let alone NASA, nearly the money we put into veterans programs or housing. NASA's programs should probably be in another bill so you would not have these kinds of comparisons that really make no sense at all.

America's greatness has been largely achieved by way of America's dreams. It was our willingness to think about a new world, a new future for mankind, that led to America in the first place. It was Americans seeking out their dreams that allowed us to build the West, the pioneer spirit that made the difference not only then, but makes the difference today, not just in our minds, but in our hearts as well.

One great dream for the future lies in space. There is absolutely no question there is broadly based support from the public for man's exploration in space. What remains is a partnership with friends around the world. We are, together, attempting to make breakthrough in space that will impact technology and that will create a new opportunity, not only for ourselves, but for mankind.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, which would destroy space station, and I believe destroy all of NASA's programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Are there other amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING

For assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (''the Act'' herein) (42 U.S.C. 1437), not otherwise provided for, $10,041,589,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of the funds made available under the head ''Annual contributions for assisted housing'' in this Act or any prior Act shall be expended if such expenditure would cause total fiscal year 1996 expenditures to exceed $19,939,311,000: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall report to the Committees on Appropriations every 90 days on the implementation of the spending limitation in the preceding proviso: *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this head, $100,000,000 shall be for the development or acquisition cost of public housing for Indian families, including amounts for housing under the mutual help homeownership opportunity program under section 202 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437bb): *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this head, $2,500,000,000 shall be for modernization of existing public housing projects pursuant to section 14 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437l): *Provided further,* That of the amounts earmarked under this head for modernization of existing public housing projects, $15,000,000 shall be used for the Tenant Opportunity Program: *Provided further,* That during fiscal year 1996, the Secretary may direct any public housing agency that receives any part of the foregoing amount, to use such amount, or any other amount that has been made available in this or any other prior Act for public housing under this head or for the HOPE VI/Urban Revitalization Demonstration Program, and that has not been obligated by the agency, to demolish, reconfigure, or reduce the density of any public housing project owned by the agency: *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this head, $862,125,000 shall be available for non-incremental rental assistance under the section 8 housing voucher program under section 8(o) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)): *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, voucher assistance provided under the preceding proviso may be used in connection with legislation enacted after the effective date of this Act that authorizes assistance for such purpose, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this head, $1,000,000,000 shall be for special needs housing: *Provided further,* That the amount earmarked under the preceding proviso shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance, and amendments to contracts for project rental assistance, for supportive housing for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended; capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, and project rental assistance, including amendments to contracts for project rental assistance, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act; and housing opportunities for persons with AIDS under title VIII, subtitle D of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may use up to $200,000,000 from unobligated carryover balances under this heading as of September 30, 1995, for assistance for State or local units of government, tenant and nonprofit organizations to purchase projects where owners have indicated an intention to prepay mortgages and for assistance to be used as an incentive to prevent prepayment or for vouchers to aid eligible tenants adversely affected by mortgage prepayment, as authorized under preservation legislation enacted subsequent to this Act: *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this head, $10,000,000 shall be for the lead-based paint hazard reduction program as authorized under section 1053 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992: *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this head, $17,300,000 shall be available for fees for coordinators under section 23(h)(1) for the Family Self-sufficiency Program (42 U.S.C. 1437u): *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this head, $4,941,589,000 shall be for assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437) for use in connection with expiring or terminating section 8 subsidy contracts: *Provided further,* That such amounts shall be merged with funds referenced in section 204 of this title: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may reserve amounts available for the renewal of assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and may use such amounts, upon the termination or expiration of a contract for assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (other than a contract for tenant-based assistance and notwithstanding section 8(v) of such Act for loan management assistance), to provide voucher assistance under section 8(o) of such Act in the market area for a number of eligible families equal to the number of units covered by the terminated or expired contract, which assistance shall be in accordance with terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, assistance reserved under the preceding proviso may be used in connection with any provision of Federal law enacted after the enactment of this Act that authorizes the use of rental assistance amounts in connection with such terminated or expired contracts: *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this head, $610,575,000 shall be for amendments to section 8 contracts other than contracts for projects developed under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

From the fund established by section 236(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 1995, and any collections during fiscal year 1996 shall be transferred, as authorized under such section, to the fund authorized under Section 201 (j) of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–1) is reduced in fiscal year 1996 by not more than $2,000,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts: *Provided,* That up to $163,000,000 of recaptured section 236 budget authority resulting from the prepayment of mortgages subsidized under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–1) shall be rescinded in fiscal year 1996.

PAYMENTS FOR OPERATION OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

For payments to public housing agencies and Indian housing authorities for operating subsidies for low-income housing projects as authorized by section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g), $2,500,000,000.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101–625), as amended, $1,400,000,000, to remain available until expended.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, other than loans, not otherwise provided for, for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners—both current and prospective—with respect to property maintenance, financial management, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions and meeting the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership, including provisions for training and for support of voluntary agencies and services as authorized by section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, $12,000,000, notwithstanding section 106(c)(9) and section 106(d)(13), of such Act.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $3,000,000, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 3739): *Provided,* That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $36,900,000.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For the emergency shelter grants program (as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100–77), as amended); the supportive housing program (as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act); the section 8 moderate rehabilitation single room occupancy program (as authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; the shelter plus care program (as authorized under subtitle F of title IV of such Act); and the innovative homeless initiatives demonstration program (as described in sections 2(a)–2(f) of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–120)), $576,000,000, to remain available until expended.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For grants to States and units of general local government and for related expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out a community development grants program as authorized by title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), $4,600,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided,* That $46,000,000 shall be available for grants to Indian tribes pursuant to section 106(a)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), and $19,500,000 shall be available for ''special purpose grants'' pursuant to section 107 of such Act: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 20 per centum of any grant made with funds appropriated herein (other than a grant using funds under section 107(b)(3) of such Act shall be expended for ''Planning and Management Development'' and ''Administration'' as defined in regulations promulgated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $10,500,000, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $1,000,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, $225,000 which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for departmental salaries and expenses.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z–1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, $34,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and nonadministrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $7,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $951,988,000, of which $495,355,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, and $8,824,000 shall be provided from funds of the Government National Mortgage Association, and $225,000 shall be provided from the Community Development Grants Program account.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $47,388,000, of which $10,961,000 shall be transferred from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Federal Housing Enterprise Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, $14,895,000, to remain available until expended, from the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Fund: *Provided,* That such amounts shall be collected by the Director as authorized by section 1316 (a) and (b) of such Act, and deposited in the Fund under section 1316(f) of such Act.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

FHA—MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 1996, commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of $110,000,000,000.

During fiscal year 1996, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed $200,000,000: *Provided,* That the foregoing amount shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under section 203 of such Act.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan program, $308,846,000, to be derived from the FHA-mutual mortgage insurance guaranteed loans receipt account, of which not to exceed $302,056,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for departmental salaries and expenses; and of which not to exceed $6,790,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for the Office of Inspector General.

FHA—GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Total loan principal any part of which is to be guaranteed shall not exceed $15,000,000,000: *Provided,* That during fiscal year 1996, the Secretary shall sell assigned mortgage notes having an unpaid principal balance of up to $2,600,000,000, which notes were originally obligations of the funds established under sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act: *Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated herein, an amount equal to the lesser of $52,000,000 or the excess of net proceeds above the value of holding the loans to maturity, such value established using assumptions specified in the President's fiscal year 1996 Budget adjusted for interest rates at the time of the sale, shall become available only after such sale has been completed.

Gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238(a), and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed $120,000,000; of which not to exceed $100,000,000 shall be for bridge financing in connection with the sale of multifamily real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act; and of which not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single-family real properties owned by the

Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, $197,470,000, of which $193,299,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for departmental salaries and expenses; and of which $4,171,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for the Office of Inspector General.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDES TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 1996, new commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed $110,000,000,000.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed mortgage-backed securities program, $8,824,000, to be derived from the GNMA—guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account, of which not to exceed $8,824,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for departmental salaries and expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. PUBLIC HOUSING. (a) SUSPENSION OF RENT FORMULA.—Notwithstanding section 3(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, each public housing agency that owns or operates public housing shall establish rental charges for dwelling units in public housing in such amounts as the agency considers appropriate and in accordance with the provision of this section, which shall be effective for fiscal year 1996.

(b) MINIMUM RENT.—During fiscal year 1996, public housing agencies shall require that each family occupying a dwelling unit in public housing shall pay an amount for monthly rent that is not less than one of the following amounts:

(1) An amount equal to the sum of $50 and the cost of any utilities for the unit.

(2) An amount equal to 32 percent of—

(A) the basic benefits to an individual for a month under the supplemental security income program under title XVI of the Social Security Act; or

(B) the amount of assistance allocated for a month to a family of the applicable size under the aid to families with dependent children program under a State plan approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act or any successor program.

(3) An amount based on monthly earnings of a person working 30-hour workweeks at a wage equal to the Federal minimum wage, except that this paragraph shall not apply to any disabled family or elderly family.

(c) CEILING RENTS.—Notwithstanding section 3(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, public housing agencies shall provide that the amount of rent paid by a family occupying a dwelling unit in public housing during fiscal year 1996 does not exceed the maximum monthly rental amount, which shall be established for the dwelling unit by the public housing agency that owns or administers the unit and may not exceed an amount determined by the agency based upon—

(1) the average, for dwelling units of similar size in public housing developments owned and operated by such agency, of any monthly amount of debt service and operating expenses attributable to such units;

(2) the reasonable rental value of the unit; or

(3) the local market rent for comparable units of similar size.

(d) DEMOLITION AND DISPOSITION.—

(1) INAPPLICABILITY OF REPLACEMENT RULE.—With respect to any application under section 18 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for the demolition or disposition of public housing, including an application submitted under paragraph (3), that is approved during fiscal year 1996, the provisions of subsection (b)(3) of such section shall not apply with respect to—

(A) the approval of such application; or

(B) the demolition or disposition of any public housing pursuant to such application.

(2) CONFORMING PROVISION.—The requirement under section 18(d) of such Act that a public housing agency satisfy the conditions specified in section 18(b)(3) of such Act as a condition of taking action to demolish or dispose of public housing shall not apply with respect to any application under such section 18 approved during such fiscal year.

(3) AUTHORITY TO RESUBMIT APPLICATIONS.—Any public housing agency that, before fiscal year 1996, submitted to the Secretary an application under section 18 of such Act for demolition or disposition of public housing may (regardless of whether such application has been approved) at any time during fiscal year 1996 submit an application subject to the provisions of this subsection that covers some or all of the property covered by such previous application and, to the extent the same property is covered by both applications, the Secretary shall treat the latter application as replacing the previous application.

(e) APPLICABILITY.—In accordance with section 201(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the provisions of this section shall apply to public housing developed or operated pursuant to a contract between the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and an Indian housing authority.

SEC. 202. RENTAL ASSISTANCE UNDER SECTION 8 OF UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937. (a) INCREASE OF FAMILY RENTAL PAYMENT.—Notwithstanding sections 3(a) and 8(o)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, effective for fiscal year 1996—

(1) public housing agencies shall increase to 32 percent the percentage of the family's monthly adjusted income used in determining—

(A) the amount of monthly rent required to be paid by each family who is assisted under the certificate or moderate rehabilitation program under section 8 of such Act; and

(B) the amount of the monthly assistance payment for each family who is assisted under the voucher program under section 8 of such Act; and

(2) owners of housing assisted under other programs for rental assistance under section 8 of such Act shall increase to 32 percent the percentage of a family's adjusted monthly income used in determining the rent required to be paid by each family assisted under any such program.

(b) MINIMUM RENTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section or sections 3(a) and 8(o)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, effective for fiscal year 1996 and no later than October 30, 1995—

(1) public housing agencies shall require each family who is assisted under the certificate or moderate rehabilitation program under section 8 of such Act to pay for monthly rent an amount that is not less than the sum of $50 and the cost of any utilities for the unit;

(2) public housing agencies shall reduce the monthly assistance payment on behalf of each family who is assisted under the voucher program under section 8 of such Act so that the family pays for monthly rent an amount that is not less than the sum of $50 and the cost of any utilities for the unit; and

(3) owners of housing assisted under other programs for rental assistance under section 8 of such Act shall require each family who is assisted under such program to pay for monthly rent an amount that is not less than the sum of $50 and the cost of any utilities for the unit.

(c) FAIR MARKET RENTALS.—The Secretary shall establish fair market rentals for purposes of section 8(c)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, that shall be effective for fiscal year 1996 and shall be based on the 40th percentile rent of rental distributions of standard quality rental housing units. In establishing such fair market rentals, the Secretary shall consider only the rents for dwelling units occupied by recent movers and may not consider the rents for public housing dwelling units or newly constructed rental dwelling units.

(d) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 8(c)(2)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437f(c)(2)(A)) is further amended—

(1) in the third sentence by inserting ''and fiscal year 1996'' after ''1995''; and

(2) in the last sentence by inserting ''and fiscal year 1996'' after ''1995''.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE FEES.—Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 8(q)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for fiscal year 1996, the portions of the fees for costs incurred by public housing agencies in administering the certificate, voucher, and moderate rehabilitation programs under section 8 shall not exceed 7.0 percent of the fair market rental established for a 2-bedroom existing rental dwelling unit in the market area of the public housing agency.

(f) DELAY OF ISSUANCE AND REISSUANCE OF VOUCHERS AND CERTIFICATES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a public housing agency administering certificate or voucher assistance provided under subsection (b) or (o) of section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall delay—

(1) until October 1, 1996, the initial issuance of any such tenant-based assistance representing incremental assistance allocated in fiscal year 1996; and

(2) for 6 months, the use of any amounts of such assistance (or the certificate or voucher representing assistance amounts) made available by the termination during fiscal year 1996 of such assistance on behalf of any family for any reason, but not later than October 1, 1996.

SEC. 203. PREFERENCES FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE. (a) PUBLIC HOUSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal year 1996, dwelling units in public housing that are available for occupancy shall be made available—

(A) without regard to the requirements regarding preferences set forth in section 6(c)(4)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended; and

(B) subject to a system of preferences that the public housing agency for the public housing may establish, which shall be based upon local housing needs and priorities, as determined by the agency.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to projects or portions of projects designated for occupancy pursuant to section 7(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for which the Secretary has determined that application of such paragraph would result in excessive delays in meeting the housing need of such families. In accordance with section 201(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the provisions of this subsection shall apply to

public housing developed or operated pursuant to a contract between the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and an Indian housing authority.

(b) SECTION 8 ASSISTANCE.—During fiscal year 1996, the selection of families for assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended—

(1) shall not be subject to the requirements regarding preferences set forth in sections 8(d)(1)(A) and 8(o)(3)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended; and

(2) shall be subject to a system of preferences that may be established by the public housing agency administering such assistance, which shall be based upon local housing needs and priorities, as determined by the agency.

(c) CONFORMING PROVISIONS.—Each reference in sections 6(o), 7(a)(2), 7(a)(3), 8(d)(2)(A), 8(d)(2)(H), 16(c), and 24(e)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, sections 212(a)(3), 217(c)(2)(B), 225(d)(3), 455(a)(2)(D)(iii), 522(f)(6)(B), and 522(j)(2)(A) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, section 226(b)(6)(B) of the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, section 203(g)(2) of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, and section 655 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, to the preferences under section 6(c)(4)(A), 8(d)(1)(A), or 8(o)(3)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall be considered, during fiscal year 1996, to refer to the applicable preferences established (if any) under the subsections (a)(1)(B) and (b)(2).

(d) NEW CONSTRUCTION/SUBSTANTIAL REHABILITATION HOUSING.—During fiscal year 1996, dwelling units in housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (as such section existed before October 1, 1983) and projects financed under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act) shall be made available for occupancy without regard to section 545(c) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act and no other provision of law relating to Federal tenant selection preferences shall apply to such housing.

(e) RENT SUPPLEMENTS.—During fiscal year 1996, section 101(k) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 shall not be effective.

SEC. 204. MERGER LANGUAGE FOR ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 OF SUBSIDY CONTRACTS AND ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING.—All remaining obligated and unobligated balances in the Renewal of Expiring Section 8 Subsidy Contracts account on September 30, 1995, shall immediately thereafter be transferred to and merged with the obligated and unobligated balances, respectively, of the Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing account.

SEC. 205. EXTENSION OF HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGE PROGRAM.—Section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20(g)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''September 30, 1995'' and inserting ''September 30, 1996''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''25,000'' and inserting ''30,000''.

SEC. 206. DEBT FORGIVENESS.—(a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall cancel the indebtedness of the Hubbard Hospital Authority of Hubbard, Texas, relating to the public facilities loan for Project Number PFL–TEX–215, issued under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. Such hospital authority is relieved of all liability to the Government for the outstanding principal balance on such loan, for the amount of accrued interest on such loan, and for any fees and charges payable in connection with such loan.

(b) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall cancel the indebtedness of the Groveton Texas Hospital Authority relating to the public facilities loan for Project Number TEX–41–PFL0162, issued under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. Such hospital authority is relieved of all liability to the Government for the outstanding principal balance on such loan, for the amount of accrued interest on such loan, and for any fees and charges payable in connection with such loan.

SEC. 207. DELAYING OUTLAYS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.—During fiscal year 1996, a public housing agency or Indian housing authority may slow the rate at which it develops a project that the Secretary has approved under 24 C.F.R. Part 941 in order to slow the rate at which such agency or authority takes actions resulting in outlays of amounts appropriated under the head ''Annual contributions for assisted housing'' in this title or any prior appropriation Act, and the Secretary may allow such agency or authority to develop a project at such a slow rate, notwithstanding 24 C.F.R. Sec. 941.405(d).

SEC. 208. ASSESSMENT COLLECTION DATES FOR OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT.—Section 1316(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4516(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) TIMING OF PAYMENT.—The annual assessment shall be payable semiannually for each fiscal year, on October 1st and April 1st.''.

SEC. 209. SPENDING LIMITATIONS.—(a) None of the funds provided in this Act may be used during fiscal year 1996 to sign, promulgate, implement, or enforce any requirement or regulation relating to the application of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601, et seq.) to the business of property insurance, or for any activity pertaining to property insurance.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended by the Department for the purpose of finalizing the Department's proposed rule dated July 21, 1994 regarding amendments to Regulation X, the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Regulation, or for the purpose of developing or issuing any interpretive rule with respect to any of the four issues denominated in the preamble to the proposed rule.

(c) None of the funds provided in this Act may be used in fiscal year 1996 for the remuneration of more than seven Assistant Secretaries at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, notwithstanding section 4(a) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act.

(d) None of the funds provided in this Act may be used in fiscal year 1996 for the remuneration of more than 94 schedule C and noncareer senior executive service employees at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary to take, impose, or enforce, or to investigate taking, imposing, or enforcing any action, sanction, or penalty against any State or unit of general local government (or any entity or agency thereof) because of the enactment, enforcement, or effectiveness of any State or local law or regulation requiring the spoken or written use of the English language or declaring English as the official language.

(f) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 210. CLARIFICATIONS.—For purposes of Federal law, the Paul Mirabile Center in San Diego, California, including areas within such Center that are devoted to the delivery of supportive services, has been determined to satisfy the ''continuum of care'' requirements of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and shall be treated as:

(a) consisting solely of residential units that (i) contain sleeping accommodations and kitchen and bathroom facilities, (ii) are located in a building that is used exclusively to facilitate the transition of homeless individuals (within the meaning of section 103 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302)) to independent living within 24 months, (iii) are suitable for occupancy, with each cubicle constituting a separate bedroom and residential unit, (iv) are used on other than a transient basis, and (v) shall be originally placed in service on August 1, 1995; and

(b) property that is entirely residential rental property, namely, a project for residential rental property.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, numbered 63.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STOKES: Page 22, after ''Secretary:'' on line 14, insert ''*Provided further,* That if authorizing legislation is not enacted into law by December 31, 1995, the amount provided for voucher assistance may be reallocated by the Secretary to public housing modernization, drug elimination grants, and section 8 incremental rental assistance:''

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides $862 million for new and unauthorized vouchering out activities under the section 8 program. The funds provided are contingent upon authorizing language being enacted.

I have a perfecting amendment that is quite simple. It would insert language stating that:

If authorizing legislation is not enacted into law by December 31, 1995, the amount provided for voucher assistance may be reallocated by the Secretary to public housing, modernization, drug elimination grants, and section 8 incremental rental assistance.

You have to remember that this is a new program totaling $862 million being created through an appropriations bill. At the rate we are going with our legislative calendar this year, I think my colleagues would agree that giving further direction as to how this money should be spent in the event that no authorizing legislation is enacted is certainly reasonable.

The sum $862 million is a lot of money to be unobligated by an agency that is being reduced by $5 billion. There are millions of persons, primarily our elderly, the children, and the poor, who could benefit from HUD utilizing this money. Modernization funds are reduced by over $1 billion in this bill, and new incremental rental assistance is eliminated. Certainly restoring funds to these critical areas is warranted.

Furthermore, our communities and law enforcement officials desperately

need all the assistance they can get to help eradicating the drug problem in our communities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good and sensible amendment. I think Members on both sides of the aisle would like the committee to address these issues on behalf of millions of Americans. I would ask that this amendment be considered at this time as perfecting the $862 million provision for vouchering out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. STOKES, there were—ayes 5, noes 5.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, No. 47.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts: Page 20, line 25, strike ''$10,041,599,000'' and insert ''$10,361,589,000''.

Page ?4, line 16, strike ''$320,000,000'' and insert ''$0''.

Page 39, after line 17, insert the following new subsection:

(c) EXEMPTION OF ELDERLY AND DISABLED FAMILIES FROM RENT INCREASES.—Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply with respect to any elderly family or disabled family (as such terms are defined in section 3(b) of such Act) who, on October 1, 1995, is receiving rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or is occupying a dwelling unit assisted under such action.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment protects our Nation's senior citizens from rent increases that are ordered under the bill. This bill would raise the rents on 2.7 million assisted housing tenants. The Kennedy-Frank-Stokes amendment simply asks that our senior citizens who live in assisted housing today are protected against these rent increases.

About 1 million elderly households will have to pay between $150 and $400 more a year in rent, and they simply cannot afford it. These new rent increases will affect only the poorest seniors and seniors that have no place else to go. The only seniors that are affected by this rent increase are by definition seniors on fixed income. The fact is that they have no corresponding increase in their fixed income to keep up with the rent increases that have been ordered by the bill as it has been filed.

Therefore, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and I have drafted this amendment to provide some small relief to this group of vulnerable Americans, whose rent increases will mean them having to choose between food and medicine or heat and shelter.

The cost is small, it is only $77 million. It will provide a little bit more security to our seniors, and I hope that the Members on both sides of the aisle would vote for its passage.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment really goes to the heart of the kind of policy differences that the Nation is being presented with at this time. This amendment deals with the rents that are charged to some of the poorest people in this country. We have programs, subsidized housing programs, for older people. We are being asked in this bill to raise the percentage of their income from 30 percent to 32 percent of their income. Understand that that is not a 2 percent rent increase, that is a 6⅔ percent increase. Two percent of 30 percent is 6⅔ percent.

Under current law, if Social Security pays people a 3-percent cost of living increase in December, elderly people's rents would go up by 3 percent. Some of them are angry at this. They say you are giving with one hand and taking with another. Many of us have talked to older people, who felt that this policy of their rent going up by the same percentage of the cost of living was a serious problem.

Well, the Republican Party is going to change that. No longer, under this bill, if you are an elderly person living in subsidized housing, will your rent go up by the same amount as your Social Security. If this bill passes, your rent will go up by three times as much in percentage as Social Security, because if we get a 3 percent cost of living increase, under this bill the rent will then go up in that 1 year 9⅔ percent.

Now, this is a habit that the Republicans have. The last time they were able to control the budget of this House, in 1981, in the Gramm-Latta bill, the rents that people in subsidized housing, and we are talking about elderly people, older people, including some who only live on Social Security or Social Security and a small pension, and they are living in subsidized housing, and they were in 1981 paying 25 percent of their rent. Under an amendment named for a Republican Senator, Ed Brooke, it was the Brooke amendment, the Republican Party, when they had control in 1981, changed that and went from 25 percent to 30 percent. Now they want to do it again.

So it is very clear. We now have a pattern. Every time the Republican Party is in a position to control the budget of this House, poor, elderly people see their rent go up by a significant amount more than their income goes up. It will make them two for two. Of course, the House budget resolution called for an increase to 35 percent. So one assumes that is not their last effort to increase it.

As I have said before, older people who are familiar with the literary history of this country will recognize this, because they are familiar with Dick Tracy. There was a character in Dick Tracy known as Evil-Eye Fleegle who specialized in whammies. His worse effect on you was the triple whammy.

Now, under the Republican budget, the cost of living increase to be paid for Social Security recipients is going to go down. The Republican Party's budget says old people get too much money when inflation occurs, and their budget resolution, enacted by them, adopted by them, calls for a reduction in the cost of living increase later in this century.

□ 1530

So the cost-of-living increase for an order older person living on $10,000 a year will go down. That is whammy one.

Whammy two will be what they do to you on Medicare, when your copayments go up and your part B payments go up.

If you are so poor and you are in such circumstances that you live in public housing, you get the triple whammy, because your rent will go up. And what the gentleman from Massachusetts is saying is that should not happen, that the 30-percent income should stay the same. It does not mean the rent, their rents will never go up. The current law says their rents will go up with their income. The Republican bill says rents will go up more than income.

Originally it was going to do that to people in public housing, too. The managers' amendment fixed that so people who live in public housing will now stay at 30 percent, and I am glad. But their friends, relatives, their peers who live in a section 8 unit, who live in an assisted housing unit, subsidized housing go, who live in 202, their rents will go up by three times as much as Social Security. Their rent will go up from 30 percent to 32 percent of their income.

We are not talking about people with substantial amounts of discretionary income. We are talking about the elderly poor. Raising the rents, raising the percentage of the meager incomes that the elderly poor have to pay to finance a tax cut, to finance a B–2 bomber, to finance a manned space station, to finance all these other things, is, in my judgment, quite wrong. I do not think anything more starkly illustrates the different approaches of the two parties.

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

I rise very briefly to oppose this amendment. Within this account, we

were very, very sensitive about the question of considering raising rents? Should you? When should you? Indeed, this program has been in effect for a number of years now.

There has been one adjustment to that, almost a decade ago. This raises the percentage for rental expenses from 30 to 32 percent. The recommendation of the House-passed Committee on the Budget was 35 percent. The committee chose to back off because of some of the questions that were raised by other Members who are opposing the amendment.

The real effect is somewhere in the neighborhood of perhaps $12 a month. This account is growing so rapidly that if it continues on its present pattern, it will push out any number of other very important housing programs that affect the very same people that we are talking about. It is very important to recognize that there is no free lunch in this process. Everybody has to participate.

The offset that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] provides in his amendment would essentially zero emergency assistance accounts. We do not have as much money in FEMA in this bill as he suggests he uses as an offset. That alone would have easily allowed me to ask you to call this amendment out of order, but frankly I thought we ought to have the discussion. In fact, the Kennedy amendment would eliminate a compromise between what the Committee on the Budget recommended and what is necessary to see that this program remains whole and viable. He cannot effectively offset it against emergency accounts. Indeed, if he did, he would dramatically affect many of the same people that he is trying to help by way of his amendment.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this unworkable amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, first, I would have to respond to my distinguished chairman's comment with reference to the offset that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] uses. In the chairman's earlier amendment this afternoon, he used the same source of funds. He used about $85 million out of the same funding. So I think what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is doing here is proper in the sense that he is utilizing the same funding.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, we did use an offset of $50 million to help housing accounts. That leaves $20 million approximately. We are talking about some $300 million under the recommendation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. We were attempting to help some of these same people by that former offset but also trying to deal with the real world in terms of what is actually available in the account.

Mr. STOKES. Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, over 700,000 households could experience rent increases that would average over $1,000 annually. You must remember that millions of elderly who are often single disabled women depend on section 8 in order to find decent and affordable housing.

Rent increases would cause great hardship for our elderly who are often the least able to bear such expenses. These increases also come at a time when our Republican colleagues want to force the elderly to pay more for their health care through massive cuts to Medicare.

Our seniors are being assailed on all fronts. Elderly Americans could be forced to move into lower cost housing, much of which is likely to be substandard. For those who may fall behind in their rent payments, they may find themselves evicted. Many could also become homeless.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, these increases come at a time when a new study finds that there is a disturbing and growing affordable housing shortage in the United States. This shortage has resulted in most poor renters having to pay rents that consume a very high percentage of their incomes, over 30 percent. In fact, three out of very five poor renters, 4.1 million people, paid at least half their incomes for housing in 1993.

How do we expect our seniors, who are on limited and fixed incomes, to not only pay more rent but also find decent, affordable housing when the supply is diminishing?

Mr. Chairman, I would urge our colleagues to support the Kennedy-Frank-Stokes amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support today for the Kennedy-Frank-Stokes amendment which restores vital funding for HUD low-income housing assistance programs for the elderly and disabled. The amendment will protect seniors from an unfair and unaffordable rent increase.

The rent hikes included in this extreme bill could cost seniors in my district hundreds of more dollars per year. I don't know about everybody's districts, but I know that's a lot of money for seniors in my district.

In my district, the residents of Bella Vista Apartments in New Haven, CT, know all too well about rent increases. Last year, Bella Vista tenants were asked to pay an additional $35 per month in rent, and now, just last week, they were slapped with another rent increase of $45 per month. Mr. Chairman, they simply cannot afford another rent increase.

The tenants of Bella Vista are like seniors all over this country. They live on fixed incomes and struggle to make ends meet. They are often faced with difficult financial choices—they must choose between paying for vital medical services, like prescription drugs, or paying for the heating bill in the winter. They do their best, but sometimes they need our help. Rent assistance is one way to help.

This country has a proud tradition of assisting our seniors in their retirement. This Government has made a deal with our seniors. We say to them: If you work hard all your life and contribute, then we will help you when you can work no longer.

Seniors have kept up their end of the bargain. They worked, they saved, and even fought wars to preserve our freedom. But, now Republicans in this Congress want to walk away from the deal. They want to walk away from Medicare; walk away from Social Security; walk away from rent assistance. It's a disgrace.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Kennedy-Frank-Stokes amendment, and restore decent, and affordable housing to our seniors.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, this will literally result in nearly a 7 percent rent increase for those living in assisted housing. And for someone living, earning maybe $1,000 a month, $12,000 a year income, which is so often what might be the case in terms of these low income, fixed income elderly, that literally results in a $20 increase a month in terms of their rent, $20 a month over the course of the year. As you can begin to understand, we are talking about $240 a year in terms of the rent increase.

Plus, if they get an increase in their Social Security or their pensions or the interest income goes up, that also will be subject not to 30 percent but to 32 percent. Yet we are saying, if you are in public housing, you end up facing about a 30-percent increase.

This is just the camel's nose under the tent. This is the direction that we are going to in fact increase these amounts from these fixed incomes. These are the working poor very often, Mr. Chairman, those that do have a little income. They need assistance in terms of public housing, and what we are doing is pushing them into a level where they no longer will be able to meet their own needs with this assistance and this public housing.

This is after not being subjected to any hearings, no review of this in any of the committees, no discussion by the public, just come out here, put it on the floor. This meets the bottom line in terms of budget. But my question is, What happens to the real people in the district that I represent, the elderly on fixed incomes that need that $5 a week to meet their basic needs?

They are going to be hurt, and they are going to be hurt badly by this kind of amendment and by this process. They deserve better, and we can do better in terms of this process and in

terms of what is going on here. These individuals deserve our support. This amendment deserves our support.

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

Mr. Chairman, Members, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment to eliminate funding for disaster relief programs administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. As the Member of this body who represents the congressional district that has been rocked by the most horrendous of disasters this country has faced, I could not sit in my office and watch this assault on the Agency that stood as the foundation for the relief efforts following the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Building on April 19 of this year.

The response of FEMA to the Oklahoma City bombing is best described in this excerpt from the committee report accompanying the underlying legislation. I quote:

On April 19, 1995, at 9:04 a.m., an explosive device contained within a rented truck was detonated outside the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, thereby killing 168 individuals and injuring another 467. Within minutes of this disaster, FEMA personnel were actively engaged in structuring the Federal response which, coupled with the response of the State and local governmental entities, business and charity groups throughout the area and the country, and thousands of Oklahomans and others from throughout the United States, represents perhaps the finest example of public and private cooperation, during a time of crisis as has been observed in many decades. Despite having no specific experience with this type of disaster, well trained personnel dealing with virtually every aspect of disaster response were quickly and efficiently in place and beginning the difficult job of responding to this devastating event. Starting with FEMA's Director and on down the chain of command in FEMA and numerous other departments and agencies, every individual involved with the response to this disaster deserves the sincere appreciation and gratitude of this Committee for a job well done.

From personal experience, I can say without a doubt that the FEMA response to this disaster was virtually flawless. Their treatment of the good people of Oklahoma City must be commended by all in this body.

I ask my colleagues: Can we be assured that without the funds targeted by this amendment, would FEMA have the ability to react in the manner described in the committee report or that the Nation witnessed in regards to Oklahoma City. I would think not.

Please oppose this ill-advised amendment.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his work. Immediately after, and during the process since, we have been trying to find the funds to respond to Oklahoma City and that disaster. To say the least, one had to actually see what occurred there to begin to appreciate the devastating effect it had upon your community.

Above and beyond that, there are similar problems across the country that involve disaster relief. To have an amendment that looks good on paper but in reality is suggesting that none of the other accounts are helping people who are in dire straits is a disservice to the process. So the gentleman's support is very much appreciated. I appreciate the work the gentleman has been doing for Oklahoma City as well.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, under the original filing of this amendment, we took the funds out of FEMA which would have affected the accounts that the gentleman is suggesting. After the Lazio amendment passed, there were no funds left in FEMA for us to grab, so we shifted into the Manned Spaced Flight Program and shifted a small amount of money out of that into this program. So the gentlemen are talking a lot, but that is not the account that the money comes from. I just wanted to straighten it out.

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

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that under the FEMA programs that it seemed to me that there was a special appropriation that was necessary this year that was passed. So often that happens with disaster relief assistance, that notwithstanding the fact that there are intentions here to meet other needs, that the Oklahoma issue was dealt with through the special rescission bill. Of course it is being signed today.

I would point out that in that instance, over $6 billion was taken out of housing programs last year to in fact fulfill the goals that were that particular bill, not goals I shared, I might say. But I want to be understood that it certainly is not and should not be considered as a slight to Oklahoma and other types of disaster assistance programs.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's point is very appreciated. That is a very valid point. But we must, as I observe the process in Oklahoma City, the effective quick way in which the FEMA people responded, it is necessary that they be funded so that they have the contingency capacity to do in the other parts of the country—heaven forbid that something should occur that requires that kind of response—the incredible job that they did in Oklahoma City.

It was amazing to watch the efficiency of FEMA and the State and local government. It made me proud to be an Oklahoman and an American.

□ 1545

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague. The adoption of this amendment means that the elderly residents with section 8 assistance will not face rent increases that may mean the difference between staying in their homes or searching for something less expensive. It may also mean the difference between buying nutritious meals for a week or paying for medication prescribed by their doctor.

To those of us that are accustomed to having an assured three meals a day, warm clothes in time of cold, comfortable clothes in time of heat, safe roofs over our heads, we cannot visualize, sometimes, that in America we still have not just individuals, children or adults, but families that do not have that kind of a comfort. We still have them among us.

In this case here, Mr. Chairman, it may, as I said and repeat, mean the difference between a meal, and a choice between having a meal or paying for medicines or medications that have been prescribed. The dollar amount may not sound like a lot to us. Our range is in the upper 7- to 11-percent per person field in our society, so that a rental increase in terms of medical costs and Medicare premiums does have an impact.

It could be a lot of cash, and it is, indeed, a lot of cash to senior citizens. I have visited with them, some are those that grew up in the old neighborhood in what we called in San Antonio the West Side, and with whom I shared neighborhoods and living conditions. Many of the elderly with section 8 assistance waited for years for assisted housing. We just do not have that volume of housing. They believed that this move was their last.

Now what our colleagues, the Republicans, are requiring of them is to pay more for shelter, unless this amendment pending is adopted. This amendment means that we will not be overturning longstanding Federal policy of 25 years, which limited a tenant's rent to 25 percent and then 30 percent, and I fought bitterly when that increase of 5 percent went in, of income for people of limited income. Let me assure my colleagues who really do not know what it is to have a very limited income, limited income is a very serious and an awesome terror, day in and day out, for many of our fellow Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I must ask my colleagues if this is this year's rent or increase to 32 percent for section 8, what is going to happen next year? When are they looking for more dollars for tax cuts? Will it once again come out of the elderly's pockets?

The manager's amendment deleted the rent increase for public housing residents, but not section 8 tenants, who are not wealthier. In fairness, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his advocacy of this amendment. I would point out for those who think it is not a lot of money, this is $184 million being taken from these low-income elderly, as best we can calculate. It is $184 million being taken from them and added to their costs.

Mr. Chairman, these are low-income people, many who qualified as being below the 50 percent of the median income that we are taking this from. They are taking this from very low-income, hardworking seniors on fixed incomes who have no ability to make an adjustment to deal with this, and it is a percentage of their income, so it is absolutely against any other increase they might get, whatever it might be.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank my colleague, who is very active and has distinguished himself in his field, since his arrival to this Congress. I want to thank him for adding to this.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding. I rise only to try to clarify a portion of the earlier discussion on the part of the author of this amendment. He referred to an earlier Lazio amendment, and at least implied in that discussion that he really intended that the offset here be from NASA accounts by one way or another.

The reality is that his amendment that is on file, would take it from FEMA accounts. It is a budget-buster in that connection. Literally, those FEMA accounts cannot function when they are reduced to zero. I wanted to make sure that the membership understood that. I presume that the author understood it, but the membership might very well have been confused.

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

I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that I think we need to put out here is this goes directly at the elderly. When we look at the elderly, very many of them are women. When we look at women over 65 that have a pension, there is less than 13 percent of women over 65 who have a pension. That is because women who worked in those days worked in jobs that were very low income, did not have those kinds of benefits, and really are the poorest of the poor.

Mr. Chairman, we see us coming after them on Medicare, we see us coming after them on this. I almost feel like we ought to blow the whistle here. We need a piling-on offense. We need black-and-white-striped referees here, or something. I feel like we are piling on the poor, and we are piling on those that can fight back the least. There is nothing like taking on little old ladies. This is really taking on little old ladies, if Members are going to vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think I understood from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] that the way this would work if we do not pass this amendment, if an elderly person is in section 8 and they get a 3-percent increase, just to take a thing out of the air, for their Social Security, it is possible for their rent to go up 9 percent. I would ask the gentleman, is that correct?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First, Mr. Chairman, understand that under the Republican budget they would only get a 3-percent increase in Social Security if the cost of living increase by current standards was 3.8 percent, because they want to reduce that. However, yes, the gentlewoman is correct. The first year this is implemented the increase in rent that an elderly resident of subsidized housing will pay will be the percentage of Social Security increase plus 6⅔ percent of their income; so on a 3 percent figure, that would be a 9⅔-percent rent increase when they only got a 3-percent increase in income.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for making that point again, because I think that is a very, very essential point. As I say, we are talking about a very high percentage of these people being elderly women who were discriminated against when they were in the work force, who do not have pensions. Maybe they should have had pensions, but they worked in jobs that did not give them pensions, or they had spouses that did not have pensions that they could inherit. They do not want to go home and live with their kids. They are very, very proud people.

All we have to do is look right now at grocery stores where there are concentrations of elderly, and seeing already the very, very high sales of pet food among people who do not have pets. There is something going on there.

If we decide to do this so that their rent could be increased, I think this is just really piling on, so I salute the gentleman from Massachusetts for his amendment. I think all of us ought to think very seriously about, yes, we have to do something about the budget; but is it fair, at a time when this House hires for the first time a ''Miss Manners'' who is going to tell us how to write toasts, that we turn around and say to elderly women and elderly citizens that they can have their rent increased as much as 9 percent?

I do not think that people outside the Beltway will appreciate that, that we are getting a protocol official for all of us. Maybe they are going to tell us in protocol how we tell these elderly people that we just had them bear the brunt of the budget, that it was not B–2 bombers or other things, it was them who caused it, so ''Have a nice day, we are going to raise your rent.'' I hope others will vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Page 20, line 25, insert after the figure ''$10,182,359,000,'' (increase by an additional $331,160,000)''.

Page 37, strike ''(a)'' in line 23 and all that follows through page 38, line 19.

Page 71, line 5, strike ''$5,588,000,000'' and insert ''$5,100,000,000''.

Page 72, line 1, strike ''$2,618,200,000'' and insert ''$2,533,200,000''.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, although this was not in the RECORD, I did share a copy with the majority.

Mr. Chairman, this is the companion to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. What he did addresses this 30- to 32-percent increase for the elderly. This one addresses it for other residents of this kind of housing: families and disabled individuals. It is a similar argument.

The argument is that when we have decided that people are on limited income, and certainly the disabled would be, some of the families would be, when we are talking about people at the lower end of the spectrum, and I want to agree, the majority, and I congratulate the gentleman from California, because I think this reflected what he would like to do in the manager's amendment, he did relieve this for the poorest of the poor, and I acknowledge that. The amendment of the gentleman from California, working with the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, did undo this for the poorest of the poor, the people who live in public housing. We now have a situation where people who live in public housing

will pay only 30 percent, which is fair, but people who are in certificated housing, people who may be a notch or two above, will have to go to 32 percent. This will include families, this will include the working poor.

These are the families who are here, working poor people. To tell them once again that they will get an increase in their rents of 6⅔ percent, if they are making $20,000 a year, then the 2-percent increase is a $400-a-year increase. I have had my colleagues on the other side say that some of us were not appreciative of how important a $500 tax cut would be to a middle-income family. If you are making $40,000 or $50,000 a year it is very serious. If $500 is a very serious amount of money to a family making $50,000, is $400 a year then for a family making less than half that not even more serious?

That is what we are saying to people. We are saying to precisely those people on whom we were trying to focus public policy attention, people who are above the welfare roles, people we are telling, ''Get off the welfare roles and get into a work situation,'' because very few will go off of welfare into a $100,000 a year job. Many will be in the low-wage jobs. Some will be eligible for this sort of housing.

What we are telling them is getting $18,000, $20,000 a year and trying to support a family, we will now, if you are making $20,000 a year, raise your rent by $400 a year. Think what the disposable income is for a family in that category.

We are not talking, now, as I said, about welfare cases on the whole. The people who are on welfare have probably been protected by the manager's amendment, the manager's amendment which protected the people on public housing, where we were likely to have a higher welfare percentage. We are likelier here to be talking about the working poor, because the average incomes of the people in the assisted housing projects will be higher on the whole than the public housing. We are talking about people who get section 8's.

What we are saying is, ''You have done nothing wrong, you have worked very hard, we know times are tough, and by the way, your rent just went up $400, without any increase in income.'' If their income goes up, then the rent goes up $400 plus the increase in their income. Why? So we can make sure the tax cut extends to people who make $200,000 a year.

My guess is, I have not done the arithmetic, but my guess is if we limited the tax cut to the people who are making only $50,000 a year, we could afford this amendment. This amendment cannot reach the taxes, so I do reduce funds for NASA.

□ 1600

I would have preferred to take a piece of the B–2 bomber, to take a piece of some of the other unnecessary military spending projects to deal with the tax cut.

If and when we get this to conference if people then want to make these kind of adjustments, I would be supportive. But we again come to a fundamental difference, I think, in approach: Tell working people who are making $20,000 a year that as we increase military spending beyond what the President has asked, beyond what anybody needs, as we subsidize the defense of others.

I have to say, because these things are relevant, you may have noticed that the French were very frustrated. They wanted to send some reinforcements into Bosnia but they could not do it without American helicopters. How come France does not have enough helicopters to transport its own troops? Because the American defense budget has been subsidizing it.

Members who want to continue the American defense budget subsidy of the French economy, a very generous act of international cooperation—''Merci,'' I say, on behalf of the people of France—are going to make up for that by telling Americans who make $20,000 a year and live in subsidized housing and who work very hard—we are talking now about hard-working people—who make $20,000 a year with a couple of kids and that are in this kind of housing, they have got a section 8 certificate, and their rent goes up by 2 percent. There is no reason to do that other than, I think, a distorted set of priorities, and I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is presenting a very important amendment.

Just this week, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities came out with a very serious report on ''Unraveling a Consensus.'' That is what we are doing here as we proceed through these bills, unraveling a consensus that we have had across the aisle, a bipartisan consensus that full-time workers should not live in poverty, that that is how we wanted people to get off welfare, that we really wanted to encourage people to work, that we did not want people on welfare, and that full-time workers should not be pushed down into poverty.

So this body proceeded to do certain things, like put in the earned income tax credit, which this points out is greatly under attack, that helped families working at that level. It also linked Medicare to low-income families. You did not have to be on welfare to get Medicare. Now we are going to block-grant it so they are all going to be at the whim of whatever State they are in if there is any at all. We are pulling away that chance of getting some medical care.

There was the issue of child care, trying to help people get out there for child care. Well, we are pulling away that pillar from under them. Now if we do not pass the gentleman's amendment, we will be raising their rent at this level.

These are working families. Of course one of the other things that we piled on these families if you voted for the Republican budget, which I did not do, is we are now going to charge single moms 15 percent to collect their child support—child support that they are owed. So the Government will withhold 15 percent to help pay off the debt.

When you add each of these pieces together and you look at the level of these families that we are talking about here, it all comes crumbling down. At a time I thought we had some kind of a consensus where we really wanted to reform welfare and say work is not a 4-letter word, you are what you do in this country and if you say nothing you are nothing, so we want to help everybody be empowered, we want to help them go to work, we are now pulling all the stops out from programs that were started by President Nixon, carried on by Presidents Reagan and Bush and by the Democratic Congress as kind of a consensus as to how we get there. We were just getting real close to starting to being on that path.

If you go back and look at the history, it was in 1986, 1990, 1993, each of those times, we raised the earned income tax credit. Each of those times we talked about how we should increase the subsidy for people who were in housing but above the welfare level trying to work their way out so there would not be that tremendous line.

This was really the hand up that, yes, you have a chance. Well, we are really cutting the lifeline. You may say, ''Well, this is just one little lifeline,'' but if you voted for the Republican budget, you cut off that other little lifeline, you are going to take a 15-percent chunk out of every single child support payment, that is a lot of money. You are going to cut back their EITC and you are going to cut probably their child care subsidies they were getting in title XX that helped them be able to work. I put this all on top of the fact that we all know the purchasing power for the minimum wage is at the lowest it has been since World War II.

If a person has a minimum wage job and they are trying very hard, here is what kind of support they are getting from us. These are not the people that caused the budget deficit. Why are we unloading on them? Why are we causing them to pay for the budget deficit? I think those are questions we have to ask ourselves. When people get angry on that side of the aisle and yell we are talking about this class warfare and everything, you have got to really wonder. It looks like class warfare. It begins to look like socialism for the rich as we punish everybody who is not rich.

I just think this is one more area where we are pulling the pins out from people who are struggling desperately to get out from poverty, to get out from the stigma of being called a welfare recipient. They want out. There are people out there working two and three jobs. They feel like a squirrel in

the wheel. They run faster and faster and faster, they are exhausted, their tongue is hanging out and they do not get out of the bottom of the wheel, unless they can have a little help, with some medical care for their kids, or maybe some help collecting their child support without the Federal Government pulling a chunk out of it, blaming them for the deficit or increasing their rents or going after any number of other things, the EITC program and other things that were out there.

I think American people want to help people move in this direction. I think they are tired of abuse, but they really want to help people that try. If you try, we should help them. That is what this amendment is about. I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I wonder what has happened in this country. You look back over the last few years and you see these endless attacks on the poor of America, a suggestion that somehow the poor are responsible for the problems that we face. At one point in our country's history we had a war on poverty. Today we have somehow evolved to a point where we have a war on the poor. That is what this bill attempts to do. It attempts to raise the rents on the most vulnerable families in this country.

I offered an amendment different than the one from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] to try to isolate the senior citizens out of the generalized cuts that are affecting all poor people. I offered that not because I think senior citizens are in some elite crowd that ought to be protected versus other poor people, but I just think that they have a better chance of gaining some support from the Republicans.

The truth of the matter is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is a more appropriate amendment, because it does not single out senior citizens that happen to vote. One of the first lessons you learn in politics is that people over the age of 90 vote 90 percent of the time and people under the age of 25 vote 25 percent of the time.

The fact of the matter is that what we have is a situation where people, rather than pursuing policies that will end up providing this country with an educated work force into the future, rather than providing an investment in the real technologies that people are so concerned about, the technological breakthroughs of biotechnology, vote for that, but do not pretend you are voting for a space station for those purposes.

What we are doing in this bill is voting for a space station at the expense and on the backs of the poorest people in this country. At the same time we are providing an enormous tax break to the wealthiest people in the country.

We sit and cut education programs, we cut back on health care programs for our seniors, we cut back on the job training programs that will allow us to have the ability to compete with the Germans and the Japanese for the high-wage and the high-paying jobs that are going to be available to somebody in the future.

There are going to be millions of jobs created in this world in the next 10 years, in biotechnology, in telecommunications, in all sorts of fields that are going to require an education and an educated work force. Certainly there are going to be a few Americans that can go out and pay for it. But since when do we come from a country that only the elite are allowed to do well?

That is why America was started, because people were sick and tired of that kind of system, so they came to America. They established a new kind of nation, where people were allowed to grow to their full human potential, not because of what they were born with but because of what they made of their own lives.

That is what this bill undercuts. It sends a message to the poor and the vulnerable of America, that they are the problem and we are going to cut their benefits, we are going to cut their housing, we are going to go in and strip them of the capability of getting protections from the problems that exist in industry in this country, and we are going to hang them out to dry so the rest of us can walk down the street and feel good about where America is headed.

It is not the kind of compassionate Nation that looks out for the poor, looks out for our seniors, recognizes that a group of senior citizens provided this country with the capability of being called the richest and most powerful Nation on Earth, because they went through World War II, the Great Depression, World War I, the Korean conflict, and at the same time created an enormous amount of wealth.

Many of them did not get rich in the process. They gave their blood and their sweat and their tears for America. They gave their lives for this country. Now they have a little bit of income. They are living on fixed incomes. They are not in public housing, they are in some kind of assisted housing.

The way that hundreds of us go around and visit elderly housing when we need a vote at election time, those are the people whose increased rents are going to be used to balance the budget of this country. It is a shame that we should be taking what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] earlier today claimed was a $500 tax cut. This is a $500 tax increase to the poorest of the poor.

I ask you to please recognize that we need to invest in those people. We need to thank those people, and not condemn them the way that this bill does.

Vote for the Frank amendment. Have some compassion and some caring for the vulnerable people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] for purposes of a colloquy.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, earlier this week, the Committee on Science voted out a NASA authorization bill which included a $10 million line item for spaceports.

Science, aeronautics, and technology is clearly an area where NASA has consistently performed well and thus included an allocation for spaceports.

Spaceports, of course, are the wave of the future. In America we have a healthy booster and satellite market, plenty of launch bases, but not enough launch facilities. The development of launch facilities represents the missing piece of the commercial space puzzle, and America must go forward in supporting spaceports.

□1615

In America there are many States, including California, Florida, Alaska, New Mexico, Hawaii, Virginia, Colorado, that are involved or seek to be involved in the development of spaceports. It is my understanding that the Committee on Appropriations has replaced the $10 million authorization with a $3 million appropriation going exclusively to Florida.

Mr. Chairman, am I correct to assume replenishing this line item will now be done through the conference committee?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is generally correct.

There was an authorization of $10 million. That does not automatically lead to an appropriation of that total amount, as you know. The pressure that was involved in this bill with the tradeoffs between veterans and other accounts was that we had to limit some accounts; there was only $3 million made available.

But indeed it is our intention to review these questions, and we look forward to the conference committee, and indeed, I have in mind the fact that the gentlewoman, and a couple of others, have several programs in mind that have locations that would be appropriate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for the excellent work he has done in this appropriations bill. As indicated in debate this afternoon, it is a very, very difficult task the gentleman was confronted with.

Obviously, there are difficult choices when we have these tight budgetary times. However, I do have serious concerns about funding for native American housing programs.

Mr. Chairman, I think it comes as no surprise that many other Members of this body share those concerns, including two of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, first, the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Arizona about Indian housing and the comments I expect to be made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] expressing concerns over the funding level for Indian housing new construction in this measure.

Mr. Chairman, housing in Indian country is among the worst and most scarce in the Nation. There exists a great need for new construction, as there is a very limited stock of existing housing in Indian country. Still, this Member recognizes that we are facing severe fiscal constraints and that there is a need to scale back even on needed programs like this one. I am concerned about the degree of the cutback or the scale-back.

Funding for the program the last several years has been at $280 million. The measure before us today provides for only $100 million. That is a nearly two-thirds reduction, and I believe it is too severe a cut.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the ranking member, to seek to increase this funding level at conference.

Having said that, I also want to say to the chairman and ranking member, as well as the members of the subcommittee, that I am appreciative of the $3 million in funding for the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program at HUD. I think this modest sum will leverage up substantially and guarantee the private financing of nearly $37 million in housing loans for Indian families.

One of the problems on Indian reservations has been, I think, potentially resolved by a change approved by this House in recent times; and this money will give us a chance to see if, in fact, we can solve this deficiency of loan funds being available to Indian families who live on Indian reservations.

I believe this very limited amount of Federal funding is well spent, and it will be seen as well spent. I commend the appropriators for including it in this measure.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, while it is true that everyone must tighten their belts in order to balance the budget, Native Americans, the people who had the first Contract With America, have taken a hit which is more than we believe is their fair share.

We are focused on special needs housing, which is important, but no more important than living up to our treaty obligations and honoring our special trust relationship with the sovereign Indian Nations of this country.

The need for additional and improved Indian housing is well documented. Considerable difficulties impede private financing of Indian housing. Indian capital is scarce and frequently there is no security for financing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] has expired.

(On request of Mr. LEWIS of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HAYWORTH was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, Indian capital is scarce, because frequently there is no security for mortgage loans or similar financing because titles to most Indian land are held in trust by the United States.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I can tell you that there are few commercial lenders in Indian country, and most lenders are reluctant to extend credit for housing on Indian lands. For these reasons, Indians have turned to various Federal housing programs for assistance, including those administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, HUD, and the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. Chairman, as we proceed in these fiscally lean times, we need to do so with careful contemplation and without acting too hastily to cut the means which will help the sovereign nations of this country to become truly self-sufficient and self-governing.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] if the funding level for Native American assisted housing in this bill represents the final number?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's question. I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] even more for his leadership on this issue and for expressing his concerns about this important matter.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to work with the gentleman from Arizona as we go to conference. Where we can find money between accounts, we would certainly hope to improve upon this one and I appreciate the gentleman's assistance.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] in a colloquy. I would like to address the EPA's Gulf of Mexico Program and the concern expressed about it in the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report recommends that no funding be provided for this program. As you know, I am a strong supporter, in fact, the father of the resolution that created the Gulf of Mexico Program, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

I recognize and share the gentleman's concerns and the committee's concern that the EPA may overstep its bounds in implementing the program and that the individual States should maintain a stronger primary role in it. Since the bill itself does not address the Gulf Program, however, it is my understanding that it can receive appropriations under this bill.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's understanding is correct. The committee is deeply concerned by the EPA's increasing role in management of the Gulf of Mexico Program and the potential encroachment of its management to the entire gulf watershed.

It is the committee's intention to put the EPA on notice that it should conduct a less intrusive program or face stronger budgetary scrutiny in the future. The committee recognizes the values of the Gulf of Mexico and believes the program can be meaningful with proper management controls.

Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman that we expect the Gulf of Mexico Program to be fully funded and I can personally attest that we will address this subject in the conference to ensure that our intent is clear.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a concern with the subcommittee's actions within NASA on an ongoing project, the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network or CIESIN.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am very familiar with the gentleman's concerns about NASA's continuing role in the project known as CIESIN. The VA–HUD & Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee has been very supportive of CIESIN in years past. The committee has recognized the project's potential for the

first-rate science of a type that had not previously been adequately explored.

As the gentleman knows, we are having difficulty with this bill in terms of enough money to go around and so that is why we face the problem that we do at this moment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, my concern is that the action taken in this bill may unduly restrict NASA's ability to provide continuing support for CIESIN.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not provide $6 million directly for CIESIN as a part of Mission to Plant Earth. The project, in its current form, lacks current authorization.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, am I correct then that the gentleman's bill does not interfere with CIESIN's existing contract which would expire in 1998? I known that the Committee on Science has just completed committee action that includes a provision allowing CIESIN to compete for NASA funds in fiscal year 1996 and would the appropriations bill preclude that possibility?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the NASA authorization bill were to be enacted into law later this year, there is nothing in the appropriations bill that prejudices competitive success by CIESIN for NASA funding in future requests or for bids of proposal.

It is not our intention to close the door, but indeed it is an authorization matter that is ahead of us.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for the committee's explanation. Also, I thank him for his gracious handling of our concerns and his kindness in the past.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 48, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 211. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR ELIMINATION OF TAKE-ONE-TAKE-ALL REQUIREMENT.

In order to demonstrate the effects of eliminating the requirement under section 8(t) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, notwithstanding any assistance provided under any program under section 8 of such Act for the multifamily housing project consisting of the dwelling units located at 2401–2479 Sommerset Circle, in Madison, Wisconsin, or on behalf of residents in such project, section 8(t) of such Act shall not apply with respect to such project.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment attempts to solve a problem involving a section 8 housing project in my home community of Madison, WI. Let me say to my colleagues in the room, this does not involve any money. And for those who you were not paying attention, let me say one more time, this does not involve any money.

Mr. Chairman, this is a demonstration project for elimination and exception for what is essentially known as a current HUD regulation called take one, take all. This involves a housing project, a section 8/Mod Rehab project which in recent years has experienced financial problems, a high crime rate and corresponding drug problems.

The project is going to be foreclosed on in the next several weeks and without this waiver, my hometown faces the severe and difficult choice of deciding either to make it entirely a for-profit housing project, cutting out low-income residents, or to essentially stay with the current policy of only allowing section 8 participants, in which case we may find ourselves back in the exact same cycle that we are trying to get out of.

Under this policy, take one, take all requires a landlord who takes one, who accepts one section 8 tenant to accept all the section 8 renters.

This amendment enjoys bipartisan support back in my home State of Wisconsin, including Governor Tommy Thompson, Senators HERB KOHL and RUSS FEINGOLD, who are Democrats, Democrat Dane County Executive Rick Phelps, town of Madison Chairman Mike Theisen.

H.R. 3838, last year's housing bill, contained the repeal of take one, take all, but unfortunately though it passed in this body in July of last year, almost to the date, it never made it through the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], and also the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], for their understanding of the situation back in Wisconsin and for being supportive of this effort. And also for the gentlewoman from Ohio Ms. PRYCE], who in the past has tried to fix similar problems in legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in order, again, for this project to go forward and to avoid a situation where we may see many poor families thrown out in the street, my home State of Wisconsin will need this waiver. It is my understanding that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] will fix this problem later in the fall, but unfortunately the financial and judicial timelines facing this project will not allow us to take advantage of those opportunities under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] unless we are able to accept this amendment today in the House.

Mr. Chairman, one more time for all of my colleagues who may not have been paying attention when we started this discussion, this does not involve any money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I listened with care to the presentation of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and the special manner in which his request has been treated in this appropriations bill.

□ 1630

Now, what I find very unusual about it is that this really is not a matter for the Committee on Appropriations. In fact, as I listened to the gentleman concerning how you wished to handle the section 8 certificates, and I believe you are from Madison, WI, this is really a matter for the authorizers. In fact, you could bring a separate bill to the floor, and what I find really amazing is that the Committee on Rules allowed you to do this and you have been given a special waiver to be included in the appropriations bill for a given project when, in fact, we cannot even get included in the rule governing the debate on this bill major programs, not just a project here or there, but major programs that we are being denied the ability to debate, such as the drug elimination program which I brought up this morning during the debate on the rule.

So I would like to ask the gentleman how is it that you were given this really quite unique opportunity? I think you were one of only two such special inclusions in the appropriations bill.

What presentation did you make to the Committee on Rules and how were you able to get this included? I am very curious.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLUG. You would have to ask the Committee on Rules why they decided to allow the merits of this program to prevail in their deliberations. But I testified in front of the Committee on Rules yesterday, and they though it was an appropriate discussion to have on the floor, because what we are really interested in, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield for a few more seconds, what I think the committee is interested in, as is the Committee on Appropriations ultimately, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], is to make sure we have an opportunity to change the way we have handled section 8 projects across the country, and I think, given what the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] is attempting to do later this fall, it is absolutely appropriate to try one demonstration project to see if it works to build more momentum to change the authorizing legislation.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, I find it interesting your project is defined as a demonstration program. We made a special policy in the Committee on Appropriations we were not going to allow any demonstration programs in the bill. You must feel you really have a lot of pull over there at the Committee on Rules because, in fact, your proposal here is totally out of step with every other Member of this institution but for one other.

I find it quite interesting. Let me ask you, in the demonstration program that you are proposing be included in this appropriation bill, is your program

authorized? You mentioned the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] wants to do it later in the year. Is your program authorized that you are asking for?

Mr. KLUG. No. It is not authorized.

Ms. KAPTUR. Let me further ask the gentleman then, what gives you special privilege on this floor over any other Member?

Mr. KLUG. I went to the Committee on Rules, if the gentlewoman will yield further, and the Committee on Rules voted to allow my amendment to get to the floor. It is no special privilege. It is only the vote of the Committee on Rules which, as you know, determines any amendments which may be brought to the floor, and earlier today, this House supported the rule that came out of the Committee on Rules. So the House essentially has already signed off on the opportunity to bring this to the floor to be debated.

Ms. KAPTUR. I think the gentleman should think long and hard about what he is doing because you are taking a personal privilege, in a sense, going to the Committee on Rules, and obviously your party controls that committee, but for a special project in one place in this country that is unauthorized. You are being given a special privilege when Members here on this floor are being denied the opportunity to debate major portions of this bill which apply to everyone.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The next time you want to fight drugs, you are going to have to ask a Republican to do it for you. Then maybe you will get permission to get your amendment up here.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for that advice.

The amazing thing is I am not fighting for my district. I am fighting for 435 congressional districts. I asked for the opportunity to be heard.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentlewoman will yield further, you may need three or four Republicans.

Ms. KAPTUR. Maybe I need a few more. I thank the gentleman for that good advice.

I would just say to the gentleman this is the type of insertion in a bill that breaks down camaraderie, and the proposal that I want to debate on this floor had bipartisan support in the committee. It is a program that has been operating since 1988.

We are being denied that opportunity, and you are being given special privilege. I really think it is wrong of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin. I do this without venom or vitriol. This is simply not the right place or the right time to be dealing with this issue.

As the gentleman himself pointed out, this subcommittee, ultimately in full committee and in other legislation in that jurisdiction, is the place to deal with this. Certainly, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] made that clear in the previous Congress.

I listened with interest to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, chronicle the difficulties in the other body, but I believe a full and open debate as to the merits or demerits of this policy is required under the jurisdiction rather than in this appropriations process.

So I simply rise in reluctant opposition.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the gentleman's dissertation of the amendment that he has on the floor, and it is my appreciation this amendment is all legislation and no appropriation.

Can the gentleman legislate on an appropriation bill?

The CHAIRMAN. All points of order are waived against this amendment.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Who waived? Because the gentlewoman from Ohio has a great amendment, and her amendment is certainly an appropriation and not a legislation and not dealing with legislation but appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The House waived all points of order against this amendment by adopting the resolution governing consideration of this bill.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Are there any other amendments that the House waived all points of order other than the gentleman's amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, there were two amendments protected.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Can the gentleman inquire in terms of which amendments they are? I mean, because the gentlewoman and I am having some confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will let the Chair answer the question, the gentleman can look in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying House Resolution 201.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I am trying to understand the rules. I am new here. I do not recall the House, is that rule from the Committee on Rules because you said the House waived the rules? I do not recall voting on waiving these rules other than through the rules that we adopted that I voted against. So you are talking about this rule came from the Committee on Rules?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

When the House adopted the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules, the House waived the points of order against the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Which other amendments did we waive?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair has indicated to the gentleman, he can find that information in the report.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. You are not privy to that information?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, and so is the gentleman from Louisiana.

Is there further discussion on the amendment?

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

I wonder if, given the situation which has been acknowledged, and I appreciate the forthrightness of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] with regard to this amendment, I do not disagree with the purposes that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has filed this amendment; in fact, I would support the underlying purposes for which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has attempted to change some of the housing authorization language that is necessary to get his amendment in proper order. The fact of the matter is the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] was trying to get an amendment, which I also support, to continue a program that has been funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for 5 years.

Because the authorizing committee never held a hearing and never wrote a bill, that program is no longer authorized. As a result, when we tried to just continue funding for a program that already has funding, it was denied because a point of order could be raised against the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

So I wonder whether or not we might, if I sought or if the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], if I could just get your attention for a moment and perhaps that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] as well, and it is hard to get the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] on some of these housing issues. But in any event, I wonder if the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] were to ask unanimous consent to be able to bring her amendment forward, given the kind of situation we are in at the moment, whether or not we might be able to get her amendment brought up under UC and have an opportunity to debate the drug elimination program as well.

I would hope that maybe we could find some support by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] for those who perhaps would oppose his amendment because of the way it was brought forward who might be inclined to support his amendment if the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] could be debated as well. I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] might have a comment on that.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLUG. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, with whom I have worked closely over the last several weeks.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate it very much. I support his underlying amendment. I understand that.

Mr. KLUG. That is a discussion I had with the Committee on Rules. I have absolutely no control over what the Committee on Rules did except to make my case like other Members. Imagine that, when a member of the majority party asks the Committee on Rules for an amendment, it is actually approved. Obviously, it never happened any time in the last 4 years.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate what the gentleman is suggesting. I am not going back to the Committee on Rules. I am suggesting if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] were to use the influence that he demonstrated so capably to be able to get this amendment included in the bill to begin with, if he could use that same kind of influence to allow for a unanimous consent to be made in order so that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] could bring her bill forward, her amendment forward, there might be a great deal of inclination for people on our side of the asile to support the amendment if the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] could be made in order and he could use his influence to convince people on the other side to not oppose her amendment for the purposes of this debate.

Mr. KLUG. I will be happy to have the discussion with a member of the Committee on Rules, but I do not see any on the floor right now.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I do not think we need the Committee on Rules to bring it up under unanimous consent. We can ask for unanimous consent. I am just asking you to go to work. If somebody opposes it, that will answer the question as to whether or not we are going to oppose you.

Mr. KLUG. I have no objections. That is not my not decision.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we be allowed to bring up the Kaptur amendment with regard to the drug elimination program.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am not even sure that is appropriate. It certainly does not fit the discussion. For now, I have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, I just wanted to make the point there was some question as to when the authorization lapsed. Someone had suggested that authorization for the drug elimination program had lapsed a long time earlier. The information I received from the very able staff of the minority on the housing subcommittee is that, in fact, this was authorized through 1994.

The question was whether this had been some previous problem. It is the failure of the Congress this year to authorize the drug elimination grants that caused the dilemma the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] has been caught in. That is, through the end of last year it was authorized. So we were not previously appropriating for an unauthorized program, and it was the failure of the housing subcommittee to do anything this year that resulted in that problem.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is correct.

I would look forward to working with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] to see whether we might work out a unanimous consent that would comply with the rules of the House to allow the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] to offer her amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 50 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; amendment No. 63 offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]; amendment No. 47 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; an unnumbered amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]; amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 299, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

AYES—126

Ackerman
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bereuter
Bishop
Blute
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Christensen
Clay
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Ensign
Evans
Fattah
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Furse
Ganske
Gibbons
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hilleary
Holden
Inglis
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Leach
Levin
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martini
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Montgomery
Nadler
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Ward
Waters
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—299

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer

Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—9

Bateman
Collins (MI)
Hall (OH)
Jefferson
Johnston
Meyers
Moakley
Reynolds
Waxman

□ 1702

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Bateman against.

Messrs. BROWNBACK, NETHERCUTT, and ABERCROMBIE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. FLAKE, GOODLATTE, and GOODLING, and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 587, I inadvertently voted ''no'' on the Obey amendment and I would like the record to reflect that I intended to vote ''yes.''

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by division vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 237, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

AYES—187

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—237

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Bateman
Collins (MI)
Dornan
Gekas
Hall (OH)
Jefferson
Johnston
Meyers
Moakley
Reynolds

□ 1711

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 248, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No 589]

AYES—177

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—248

Abercrombie
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—9

Bateman
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Hall (OH)
Jefferson
Johnston
Meyers
Moakley
Reynolds

□ 1720

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 265, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]

AYES—158

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Thompson
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates

NOES—265

Abercrombie
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder

Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lucas
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Bateman
Collins (MI)
Hall (OH)
Hinchey
Jefferson
Johnston
Longley
Meyers
Moakley
Reynolds
Skaggs

□ 1727

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnston of Florida for, with Mr. Longley against.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 348, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 591]

AYES—76

Andrews
Armey
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bunn
Camp
Castle
Chrysler
Collins (GA)
Condit
Danner
Davis
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Fox
Ganske
Geren
Greenwood
Gunderson
Heineman
Hobson
Houghton
Hyde
Inglis
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lincoln
Linder
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
Metcalf
Mica
Minge
Molinari
Morella
Neumann
Obey
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Ros-Lehtinen
Sanford
Solomon
Spratt
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Torkildsen
Tucker

NOES—348

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cardin
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Combest
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Bateman
Collins (MI)
Hall (OH)
Jefferson
Johnston
Martini
Meyers
Moakley
Reynolds
Yates

□ 1735

Mr. HINCHEY changed his vote ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

I would like to have a colloquy with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. I know that the gentleman and I are very anxious to make a contribution to getting our Members out of here as early as possible, either tonight, or maybe even early tonight, but also early tomorrow, if we need to go over to tomorrow. In connection with that, I understand that there has been some effort made to work out time limitations on a number of the amendments; is that correct? And if it is, I will outline those that I understand.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that we have made some offer with reference to having some agreement relative to time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that there are a series of six amendments where there are tentatively agreed time limitations. They would be amendment No. 64 by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. The time limit would be 10 minutes, divided equally.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of California. And amendment No. 65, offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] which strikes

delays, a 10-minute limitation divided equally.

Mr. STOKES. That is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Item No. 69 by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] dealing with the homeless, a limitation of 40 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of California. And item No. 12, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], 20 minutes, 10 minutes on each side.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

This is the first I have heard of this limitation, just in this last 30 seconds. I will have to check with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] who cosponsored the amendment with me. If we could have a minute or two to consult, we will get back to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, let me complete my list. Item No. 44, by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], a 10-minute limitation, 5 minutes on each side.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is my understanding.

Mr. LEWIS of California. And Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio, drug elimination, a limitation of 20 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I should mention that there has been an indication on item 64, the first item of Mr. STOKES, and item 2, there has been some indication that there could be points of order on those two items. I think that is a part of the understanding as well.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, if the gentleman could repeat that.

Mr. LEWIS of California. When the amendments are called up.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I understand with reference to the Kennedy amendment, the gentleman would agree upon 20 minutes on each side. That would be acceptable to our side.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, how about 40 minutes? Twenty minutes on each side?

Mr. STOKES. Twenty on each side, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I will try not to use my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, with reference to item 64, do I understand that the gentleman is waiving a point of order so we might discuss that matter for 10 minutes; is that it?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Which matter is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. STOKES. Amendment No. 64.

Mr. LEWIS of California. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that there is a request to reserve the right to a point of order on two of the two items, No. 64 and No. 2.

Mr. STOKES. That is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman wants to discuss it, and I will do everything I can to see that that occurs.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the House accept these time limitations as they have just been outlined.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman please restate his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the following amendments and all amendments thereto be given specific time limitations as outlined in each of these items:

On item No. 64, 10 minutes, 5 minutes on each side; 65, 10 minutes, 5 minutes on each side; 69, 40 minutes, 20 minutes on each side; 12, 40 minutes, 20 minutes on each side; 44, 10 minutes, 5 minutes on each side; and No. 2, 20 minutes, 10 minutes on each side.

I would state with that that Members have requested the reservation of points of order possible on item 64 and item 2.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, if there are rollcalls on these amendments, as we proceed, that they would all be rolled over and taken at the end of the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has that authority. Unanimous consent would not be needed for that.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, No. 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KAPTUR:

Page 26, after line 13, insert the following new item:

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

For grants to public housing agencies for use in eliminating drug-related crime in public housing projects authorized by the Public and Assisted Housing Drug Elimination Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 11901–11908), and for drug information clearinghouse services authorized by the Drug-Free Public Housing Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 11921–11925), $290,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Page 64, line 16, before the last comma insert ''(reduced by $34,500,000)''.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California reserves a point of order.

□ 1745

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

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

Mr. Chairman, first let me say to the chairman of the subcommittee, no one could be more cordial or helpful than the gentleman has been in committee and in subcommittee as we develop these extremely complex bills, with lots of pressure from many outside interests, as we saw in that last vote.

My problem is not with the committee, Mr. Chairman, my problem is with the Committee on Rules in our attempts to get a freestanding vote on this exceedingly important question of the continuation of the drug elimination program in and around our public housing projects, which affects almost every single metropolitan area and many smaller towns and communities in this country.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong opposition to the rule, because my amendment is one of its victims. We all know that there is no greater scourge affecting our communities than the drug scourge. It has been this way for a while. However, this bill, for the first time since 1988, completely strikes out all of the money for our drug elimination efforts in nearby neighborhoods around public housing.

The Committee on Rules refused to make in order my amendment, which would maintain last year's level of support, which is about $290 million for drug elimination in 1996, and we did so in a budget-neutral way. We transferred money in the amendment from FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, so it is budget neutral.

Let me say again, this program has existed and has been functioning since 1988. It has an excellent track record. It has helped every community in this country deal with the kind of cancer that is spreading throughout our neighborhoods because of these gang leaders and drug lords associated with drugs.

Mr. Chairman, in a few moments the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], our distinguished chairman, will insist on his point of order against my amendment. I have a hunch that the Chair will rule that I cannot bring up my amendment for a full debate before this body. It is my intention to then appeal the Chair's ruling, and a motion will be made to table my appeal. I ask my colleagues to please vote no on the motion to table the appeal, because in effect, that will be the only vote that we have on saving this very worthy initiative.

I guess my basic question, Mr. Chairman, is why should we pull the rug out from under the citizens of our country by taking away the only program that exists to fight drugs and crime in some of the most fragile neighborhoods in

this Nation? To make matters worse, if my amendment does not prevail, what ultimately happens is as this fiscal year winds down and the next fiscal year begins, the money that is so-called being saved, and I put that word in quotes, the money that would be taken from these very worthy initiatives from coast-to-coast, will be frittered away on tax breaks that will be given to the privileged few.

That will not be done in our committee, that will be done over in the Committee on Ways and Means. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, there is really no savings as a result of what is being done here. We are eliminating an exceedingly effective program.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that this program, and I said to the majority leader just now, it is amazing what happens in politics, I am defending a program that was pioneered by Jack Kemp when he was HUD Secretary. This has had broad bipartisan support over the years, and has really helped our community stem the drug tide, because, as we all know, it is not restricted to one neighborhood. The drug lords and those that they hire, they move across communities. They move into the suburbs, into the city.

Since 1989 HUD was given a helping hand to hundreds and hundred of our mayors in towns and police forces across this country. In my own town of Toledo, OH, a medium-size city, our Toledo Police Department saw a 20 percent decrease in just 1 year in drug activity in those areas that received help from this program. Yet, the appropriations bill recommended zero funding, zero funding in this program that is doing so much to effectively combat what drug lords and gang violence is doing all over this country.

I literally walked through the streets of Chicago when Congressman Charlie Hayes served in this body at a time when there were snipers on the roofs of some of the public housing projects in Chicago, projects being controlled by drug lords. As a result of this very worthy effort, that does not happen, that does not happen to the extent that it used to.

Mr. Chairman, what is really amazing is how we could be abandoning a program that has been as universally successful as this one, in giving our mayors, our police departments, our citizens the necessary tools to fight crime. It seems to me we cannot afford to continue them.

Let me remind my colleagues, my amendment would pay for itself through an offset of $34 million from FEMA's disaster assistance account, because this particular program only spends out at the rate of 7 percent a year, and it seems we have found money for everything from the space station to disasters everywhere in the Nation. There could be no greater disaster than what is happening in our communities as a result of the drug trade.

One of the reasons I really beg special consideration here, I offered an amendment in the full committee on this very subject. We got bipartisan support, we came within 5 votes of carrying the amendment, there were 16 Members who were not in the committee when we took the vote. Any objection that could have existed to the amendment as originally offered was worked out.

We went to the Committee on Rules, we made our presentation, and I thought we would be granted the opportunity to offer this amendment. The FEMA account has been dipped into for other purposes since we held that vote in committee. Thus, it seems to me that for $34 million in the next cycle, we have a very worthy proposal that deserves the consideration of our colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I also have a list here that includes communities across the country. Before Members vote on the motion to table the appeal, I want them to come up to me and take a look at this list. Columbus, OH, gets over $1 million a year. Every community of the leadership of this Congress receives help. The community of chairman of the Committee on Rules, Albany, NY, receives help in his program. We can go coast to coast. Every single district in this country benefits from this program.

I would remind my colleagues from the other side of the aisle that this is not a partisan issue. Let me quote what Jack Kemp said in 1991 when he was visiting a project in one of our Nation's major cities. He said, ''Our drug elimination funding represents a substantial commitment'' by the then Bush administration, ''to rid public housing of the scourge of drugs and drug-related crime. Two years ago the bush administration announced a substantial moral and financial commitment to return public housing neighborhoods to the families for whom they were intended. Today this effort is showing significant results.''

I agree with Mr. Kemp, Mr. Chairman. We, as Members of this House, should do everything possible to help our local communities combat the scourge of drugs. I find it the height of lunacy to eliminate an effort that has proven itself in city after city just in order to bankroll through tax breaks largely the Fortune 500 big daddies that will get plenty of good treatment here, come the end of the year.

My colleagues should know that if my amendment is ruled out of order, I will appeal the ruling of the Chair. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on any subsequent motions to table my appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me, and for all of her efforts she has put into this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. If we look at the problems we have in our public housing system across the country, we will find there still exists today, though I think there are Members of Congress, based upon the way we are moving in this legislation, who do not believe that; but I can tell the Members, coming from a district that has a sizeable amount of public housing, there are still problems within the public housing system.

For us to sit here or stand here today and not consider this amendment to me would be absolutely unbelievable. We have already cut out drug free schools and communities out of our schools. We have taken drug education funding out of the school system. Now we are coming to the public housing and taking drug prevention programs and elimination programs out of it. I just do not understand how that makes sense.

Mr. Chairman, in Louisiana, for example, this amendment, if it is not passed, will cost Louisiana somewhere in the neighborhood of about $600,000. We have big housing facilities like the one in New Orleans, LA, for example, DESIRE projects. They are working hard every day to try to eliminate the drug problem that they have.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], insist on his point of order?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 10 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], if I though we were eliminating programs that are attempting to control the drug problem in public housing, I would agree with her. But I do not believe that is the case. I know that the gentlewoman will recall that during the rescission process, we put sizeable numbers of dollars in the public housing modernization accounts. There is $2.5 billion in this bill, another $6 billion in the pipeline, and are providing the kind of flexibility that suggests that these drug elimination efforts should take place through public housing modernization.

The President just signed the rescission bill today. Within that bill there is the authorization to carry forward that sort of activity, so I feel very, very strongly that while there may be this understanding between us, there is certainly no disagreement regarding the importance and the priority of drug elimination efforts.

It is my own view that the Department of Housing has not always effectively carried forward efforts that the Congress outlined for them to carry forward. We are giving them some new direction in this process. We hope to put a different kind of pressure on, and see if it works better. These programs work well in some locations and in other locations they do not work very well.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman, she and I do have a very fine working relationship. As she knows, she made a personal appeal regarding $10 million that involves a health professionals scholarship program, and frankly, I thought the argument was logical, and in my amendment earlier today, put that money back in.

In this case, there is a very specific authorization for an appropriations bill here in the rescission package that allows another approach in terms of drug elimination within housing modernization. I really believe that there is a need to shake this agency, and take those agency subheads over there and rattle them a bit. In no way, shape, or form would the gentlewoman or I take a position that was in opposition to drug elimination grants.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill, and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I respectfully ask for the Chair's ruling on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would like to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I support the provision of the gentlewoman in this bill, and I think the point of order is not appropriate, given all of the other considerations that have been contained in this rule that is before the House of Representatives.

I would further point out that the gentleman from California suggests that the funds for this program could be contained in the HUD modernization program. I would just point out to the gentleman that that program has been cut fully by 30 percent. To suggest that we are going to be able to take money from the drug elimination program and take it out of the modernization fund is complete folly, so I would object to the point of order based on the fact that this whole thing is complete folly on the part of the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest there is $2.5 billion for public housing modernization in this bill and there is $6 billion in the pipeline of unexpended, unobligated funds.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would just point out that HUD modernization funds are much like an aircraft carrier. The fact of the matter is there are billions and billions of dollars in the Armed Services budget that go for programs that are going to be requiring these funds over a period of time. You cannot build bricks and mortar overnight. It takes a while. Therefore, the funds end up in the pipeline. That is no excuse for taking a shortsighted approach.

Once again, it demonstrates the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is no place to authorize funds, because the Committee on Appropriations does not understand how HUD modernization works. HUD modernization draws dollars over a long period of time. They see the money in the pipeline, they say ''Let's go cut it,'' but the fact of the matter is those dollars go to specific projects that need to be modernized, and should not be in competition with drug elimination funding.

□ 1800

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman may proceed on the point of order.

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is what I would like to do. I want to say, first of all, that I think that the work that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] did in helping us to restore the health education scholarships for nurses, for occupational therapists, and so forth, a $10 million program that has existed since the early 1980's, was right for America and it was the proper thing to do with some of the dollars that were given to our committee when other committees worked out their bottom line numbers.

On this particular one, as I mentioned, I am not blaming the gentleman personally for this. I am exceedingly disappointed in the Rules Committee based on what happened.

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman must confine her remarks to the point of order. Regular order has been demanded.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, what does that mean?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's remarks should be relative to the point of order rather than the other subject matter being discussed. Regular order has been demanded.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the point of order; am I not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman must speak to whether or not this is an authorized appropriation.

Ms. KAPUTR. Mr. Chairman, let me say that this program has existed since 1988, and when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] was on the floor a little earlier, the gentleman was asking for a demonstration project that did not even get in the bill. It was not even in the appropriations bill. To me, I am talking about a program that has been on the books since 1988, with a track record, and all of the other programs in the bill are not authorized either, and yet we are appropriating dollars for them.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know by what criteria the Rules Committee decided when things were not authorized what would they put in the bill and why I am classified as unauthorized

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not in a position to state the motivations of the Rules Committee. The gentlewoman should confine her remarks to the point of order which is before the body.

Does the gentlewoman wish to further comment on the point of order?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am a bit befuddled here in trying to understand by what criteria in this point of order we are ruled out of order, saying we are unauthorized when, in fact, everything else in the bill is not authorized either.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has yet to rule.

Ms. KAPTUR. I have a hunch what the Chair is going to do, Mr. Chairman. I have kind of been forewarned, and I am trying to get a definition of why we would be excluded. I hope when the Chair rules he will so state that reason, especially in relation to other programs in the bill that are included but are not authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. LEWIS. By way of clarification, Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure the House understands that the rule states in pertinent part that no amendment to a general appropriations bill shall be in order if changing existing law.

The amendment goes to a program whose authorization expired in fiscal year 1994. The program is not authorized and, therefore, the point of order, and that is what I am asking the Chair to rule upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. CLAYTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear arguments from Members on the point of order. The gentlewoman from North Carolina may proceed.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Chair again to further explain the point of order here. The distinction for the clause that is written into the language said all of these appropriations are subject to authorization, so all of them technically expired. What date did they expire?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard further?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to respond to the gentlewoman's question.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, let me make the point. He made the point that the reason for the point of order was that bills were expired in 1994. I am raising the question, then, all of these bills in the language, according to the drafting of the legislation are subject to authorization. All bills have expired. The question is raised why not a point of order, if that is the reason on all of the bills that we have here?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentlewoman making a parliamentary inquiry?

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, if I need to, I will have it as a parliamentary inquiry. I though I was asking the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will respond to the gentlewoman's question when the Chair rules on the point of order.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I was asking the chairman of the subcommittee, sir, in all deference.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, those items within this bill that have been protected by the Rules Committee can go appropriately forward. This is an item that has not been protected by the Rules Committee and, therefore, is subject to a point of order.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that we learned this process during the past several sessions that I have been in the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Some people are sitting here wondering what is going on. Let me tell you what is going on. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] came to the floor and attempted to have an amendment passed that would allow apartment owners to have some section 8 but not all section 8. That was not authorized by anybody. He legislated on the appropriation.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Regular order is demanded.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, this speaks to the point of order. He went to the Committee on Rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Regular order is demanded. The gentlewoman should confine her remarks specifically to the point of order, as to whether this amendment is authorized. Whatever activity on any other amendment is not relevant.

Ms. WATERS. I think it is relevant.

The CHAIRMAN. Not in the eyes of the Chair.

Ms. WATERS. I will try.

The fact of the matter is it is not authorized because we have had no legislation in committee to do any authorizations and so no one else has been authorized. But a cute little trick took place and the Committee on Rules waived for those they wanted to waive for and they are denying an opportunity.

Whether you say I am speaking to the point of order or not, I am, and it is unfair, and I do not expect that from this chairman because he usually is fair. I would ask him to withdraw his point of order and let the gentlewoman take up this most important measure because she has not had an opportunity to have it authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I would like to make one or two points as relates to the point of order.

First of all, I think the gentlewoman's amendment is in order, one, because it is not legislating according to the rules of the House on an appropriation bill. It is simply providing for an appropriation. It is taking money out of title III of this appropriations bill and it is putting it in title II of this appropriations bill. Title III of this appropriation bill deals with FEMA, so she is simply taking money out of FEMA and putting it into the drug elimination portion.

The last point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is that in doing that it makes this amendment budget neutral, it does not add any additional dollars to the bill, so therefore I think the gentlewoman's amendment should be made in order.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman's statement was pertinent to the point of order.

Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The statutory authority cited in the amendment extends only through fiscal 1994. Absent citation to law extending the authorization through fiscal 1996, the Chair must sustain the point of order. The fact that other waivers have been granted to other amendments is not relevant.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in understanding that the ruling of the Chair would create a situation where we would thus be denied an opportunity to have a vote on the direct question of should we sustain this program for fiscal year 1996? Is that the net effect?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's ruling indicates that the amendment is no longer before the Committee of the Whole.

Ms. KAPTUR. So if the Chair recalls earlier today when the chairman of the Committee on Rules was on the floor and told me that this was an open rule and thus I would have the opportunity to offer my amendment and said I would be able to do that, now, it is proven, what he said has not happened. I have not been offered the opportunity to have a full debate on my amendment here on the floor and be given an up-or-down vote on it. Is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has interpreted the amendment consistent with the rules of the House and the special order.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, tell me would this be in order: We had some conversations here with the leadership on the other side of the aisle and some of the folks here. What if I were to withdraw my amendment at this point perhaps for an hour or two as we are proceeding through the remainder of title II, reserving the right to bring it up at the end of title II?

That would give us more time to discuss this with the full committee chair. It would give us time to discuss with the majority leader since he came over here and talked to us about it.

Would that be in order at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. At this point, the amendment is not before the committee for withdrawal. If the gentlewoman wants to re-offer an amendment at some point, the Chair would have to rule at that time.

Are there other amendments to title II?

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from our neighboring State of New York, the chairman of the Banking Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

I would like to direct this to the gentleman. As the gentleman is aware, I considered offering an amendment to the fiscal year 1996 VA–HUD appropriations bill to give local officials the flexibility they need to select those programs or services most deserving of community development block grants. As the gentleman knows, current law burdens the CDBG program with archaic rules and regulations, tying the hands of local officials and subverting the true intention of block grants. In many cases these regulations preclude the award of grants to those programs most deserving of support. Especially in an era of limited budgets, this Congress should not severely limit the ability of local officials to direct these limited funds to the areas of greatest need.

My amendment was designed to replace section 105(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. This portion of the act lists 25 eligible activities, and imposes a bewildering, Byzantine array of restrictions and limitations that I believe as a former elected official confuses and constricts the use of Federal funds by local elected officials most familiar with their urban challenges.

Mr. Chairman, I fully understand that my proposed amendment would have placed legislative language in an appropriations bill. Nevertheless I believe it is absolutely essential to cut the bureaucratic red tape strangling our communities' ability to respond to local problems. However, before I offered the amendment, I had an enlightened conversation with the gentleman form New York that I believe should be shared with other Members of this House.

May I ask the same questions of the representative from the Empire State?

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be happy to answer his questions.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. To the gentleman, is the Banking Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity presently reviewing proposals to streamline the CDBG process?

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Yes, I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whom I respect and admire, that I am currently preparing a chairman's mark that among other things will attempt to simplify the eligible activities under the community development program into 5 broad program parameters that will include some of the activities noted in your withdrawn amendment. We recognize that the Federal Government in forming partnerships with the State and local governments must develop user-friendly programs that provide as much flexibility as possible to coordinate and implement successful community development programs that actually meet the real needs of the community. This new approach will help communities target funds to help more low and moderate income families.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would ask when the gentleman expects to complete this bill?

Mr. LAZIO of New York. The mark should be completed soon. I will be happy to discuss details of the community development aspect with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and work with him to help satisfy his concerns. I expect the subcommittee markup and passage to occur sometime during this session.

□ 1815

I would like to thank the gentleman for taking the time to share this valuable information, and I commend him for taking these important steps to strengthen and improve the CDBG program.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. LEWIS, chairman of this subcommittee on appropriations, for allowing me to enter this at this time, and I commend the chairman and the committee for providing full funding in this bill for the Community Development Block Grant Program at last year's level.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STOKES:

On page 30, after ''1988,'' on line 6, insert: ''and for the fair housing initiatives program as authorized by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987,''.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

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

The point of order raised against my amendment raises the precise question that has been raised here by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] all day long.

In my case, it is more egregious. I am the ranking minority member of this subcommittee. I have sat in hearings for 4 months, day in and day out. I have never missed a meeting. I have attended every meeting.

I bring to the floor today an amendment that I asked the Committee on Rules to protect; it was not protected. I was here this morning when the chairman of the Committee on Rules said the same thing in my presence that he said in the presence of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR]. That was that the rule did not prohibit any of us from being able to offer amendments to this bill. Yet, I find here I am now restricted not only from being able to present the amendment, but being limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before proceeding further, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise today in strong support of this amendment. It would preserve the Fair Housing Initiatives Program [FHIP], an important and cost-effective tool for fighting housing discrimination in our cities, our suburbs, and our rural communities.

We'd like to think that discrimination in the real estate market is a thing of the past, or at least a declining problem. The facts show otherwise.

For instance, the Federal Reserve has reported that Latino and African-American mortgage applicants in Boston were 60 percent more likely to be turned down for a loan than similar white applicants.

In Chicago, 69 percent of white applicants with marginal credit histories got a mortgage. Only 16 percent of minority applicants got the loan.

HUD reports that Latinos and African-Americans have at least a 50 percent chance of encountering discrimination in housing sales and rentals.

The Fair Housing Initiatives Program is essential for fighting against this persistent discrimination. It recruits nonprofit community groups to provide education, outreach, enforcement, and counseling regarding our Nation's fair housing requirements. Under this program, community groups mediate and resolve fair housing disputes; educate and train landlords, real estate agents, and mortgage lenders; and work with families.

These are critical activities that the Federal Government simply can not pursue on its own. There's too little staff, and too few resources.

Mr. Chairman, I am very well acquainted with the good work that's being done under the Fair Housing Initiatives Program. Through this program, a nonprofit group in my district has discovered and helped combat a persistent pattern of housing discrimination in south Brooklyn.

Over the years, hundreds of Latino housing residents had been forced out of their apartment so that they could be made available for white families. Some were harassed, while others were offered cash payments to move.

Where these inducements were inadequate, landlords simply refused to make repairs. Complaints of collapsed ceilings, broken windows, rotted kitchen cabinets, and leaky pipes were simply ignored. One landlord had compiled up to 84 housing code violations in his effort to displace minority tenants.

I am happy to report that after just 6 months, this one grant is having dramatic results. The inspector general of the city's housing authority has initiated a vigorous investigation of discriminatory housing practices. Long-overdue repairs are going forward in apartments occupied by non-white tenants.

This success story is unfolding through one relatively small FHIP grant in New York City. Other successes are being replayed all across this country. Local advocates and community groups are being empowered to stamp out discrimination in their local housing markets.

FHIP is the kind of initiative that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have always praised. I urge every member of this body to support this amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The bill would seriously undermine fair housing efforts by virtually abandoning support for community-based, nonprofit fair housing activities by zeroing out funding for the Fair Housing Initiatives Program [FHIP]. FHIP is an essential element of a Federal-State-private partnership to combat the serious problem of housing discrimination. Instead, all funds in H.R. 2099 are allocated to the Fair Housing Assistance Program [FHAP], also in the Office of Fair Housing. My amendment would divide the $30 million allocated in the bill between both programs.

FHIP is a competitive grant program that funds nonprofit organizations to enable them to provide education, outreach, enforcement, and counseling concerning fair housing matters.

The activities of FHIP grantees reduce the caseloads of fair housing cases at HUD, the Department of Justice, and State fair housing agencies by promoting voluntary compliance through work with real estate associations, community groups, and advocacy organizations.

Through the FHIP program, community-oriented local fair housing organizations supplement the law enforcement efforts of the Federal, State, and local governments in an inexpensive and effective manner.

Fair housing organizations often work within their communities to mediate and resolve fair housing disputes informally. In these cases, the dispute is resolved to the satisfaction of the parties, and there is no need to file a formal complaint of discrimination.

FHIP agencies provide training and information to landlords, real estate

agents, mortgage lenders, and other members of the real estate industry. These efforts reduce discrimination and help avoid fair housing violations.

Fair housing agencies also work with housing consumers to inform them of their rights and to help them resolve fair housing disputes. Through enforcement efforts, the agencies weed out nonmeritorious cases and develop the evidence for strong Federal civil rights challenges.

FHIP funds testing programs, a critical function in identifying and resolving discrimination practices in housing markets. Testing pinpoints discrimination and gives proof that discrimination occurs. You cannot prosecute if you cannot find discrimination. Testing is a precision tool for ferreting out real discrimination.

The Fair Housing Assistance Program [FHAP] has a different mission, and different mode of operation from the FHIP Program. FHAP provides reimbursement, on a per-case basis, to State and local government agencies that handle legal complaints filed by victims of housing discrimination.

Under the Fair Housing Act, HUD has an obligation to accept complaints from people who believe their right to fair housing has been violated. Through the FHAP program, Congress has provided a mechanism for HUD to delegate many of its responsibilities outlined above to State or local government agency.

Only eight States and five localities—some overlapping—are fully certified fair housing enforcement agencies. These governmental enforcement agencies are generally less than 2 years old. The President requested $15 million for FHAP in fiscal year 1996, up from $7.4 million as a reflection of concerted efforts to increase the number of fully certified agencies and to provide technology and training to improve the effectiveness of the agencies.

The subcommittee bill provides $30 million—a four-fold increase over current year funding. It is unclear how these funds can be spent given the small number of States and localities with certified agencies.

FHAP funds cannot be seen as substitutes for FHIP grants. Eliminating FHIP makes the FHAP program far less effective. Not only do the FHIP grants to nonprofits serve a different function, they specifically target areas where the State or local government has not established a fair housing enforcement agency which would qualify for FHAP funding.

Nineteen States do not have substantially equivalent certification, and therefore, are not eligible to participate in the FHAP program. The loss of FHIP funding would disproportionately affect the ability of victims of housing discrimination to seek redress in these 19 States.

If FHIP were defunded, most fair housing organizations would go out of the fair housing business. Some would go under altogether.

There is very little charitable or other financing available for this type of work.

Governmental agencies generally do not have the authority to do many of the activities FHIP entities perform.

Even where they have the authority, governmental agencies generally have higher operating costs.

My amendment would allow both programs of this important office to continue to perform distinct and much-needed functions. I urge you to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I really had thought that perhaps the chairman of our committee would support this amendment. It does not in any way affect the scoring, it does not change the money, except that it moves half of the $30 million already appropriated from the FHAP program over to the FHIP program. This permits these community organizations to continue to do such an excellent job in terms of being able to help negotiate and mediate fair housing discrimination complaints, to the degree that oftentimes lawsuits and time in the courts is avoided by simply being able to mediate these programs in the community.

My amendment would allow both programs of this important office to continue to perform distinct, much-needed functions. I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York persist in his point of order?

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

> No amendment to a general appropriation bill shall be in order if changing existing law.

This amendment goes to a program whose authorization expired in fiscal year 1994, as was the case of the last amendment. The program is not authorized.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STOKES. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized on the point or order.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, the rationale given was that this was not authorized. I submit to my colleagues that nothing in HUD was authorized. Everything that is before us today has been protected by way of a special order from the Committee on Rules, but nothing in HUD was authorized.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I really do not see any difference in terms of what I am proposing here and that which is contained in the legislation now before this body.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. I think all of us have had a sense that there is supposed to be a new commitment by this House of Representatives to an open process, an open process of an open rule.

We had a long debate this morning with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, about the fact that this was not an open rule. This amendment which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] offers is an important demonstration of this House's commitment to fair lending. There is an enormous body of evidence, supported by bank lending, supported by insurance, jobs, and other major indicators, that discrimination is alive and well in America.

This amendment goes toward the cures to that, which has been authorized year in and year out by the authorizing committee. What we have seen is an abandonment of the basic responsibilities of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman suspend. The gentleman must speak to the point of order.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is whether this amendment is authorized at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking directly to that. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues might not want to hear the words that I am putting out, but the fact of the matter is, I am dealing directly with this point of order. I am dealing with the Committee on Rules, I am dealing with the Republican attempts to muzzle.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not addressing the point of order.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. To muzzle this rule so that we are disallowed from being able to speak on basic discrimination issues, simply because there is no attempt to authorize bills that provide protections against discrimination.

This House ought to be ashamed of what is going on before the American people. Shame on this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, the point has been made that nothing was authorized. Nothing has been authorized. We have not had a piece of legislation proposed by the chairman of the subcommittee, by the Republicans, to authorize anything for HUD.

If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, if nothing has been authorized, how then is it that we have Members from the

other side legislating on the appropriation, when, in fact, this side offers amendments and we are told we are not authorized? Would someone please explain this little move, this little trick, this little manipulation that is being used by which they, somehow, let others have amendments?

As I understand it, we have another unauthorized amendment that is going to be put before this committee tonight. Will someone explain please how they get to do it and we do not get to do it? That is really what this discussion is all about.

Mr. Chairman, people do not mind losing fairly; do not mind being voted down. But to simply have a rule that says some can and some cannot, it is hard for us to accept. So, what I would like to say, somebody needs to explain how it is that the other side can move forward with unauthorized amendments and this side cannot. Please explain that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. For the reasons stated in the Chair's previous ruling, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STOKES. Point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. STOKES. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion about the fact that the point of order rules me out of order, because my amendment is not authorized. I would just like to cite page 103 of the VA–HUD report and I want to cite the language that appears on that page.

It says:

Appropriations Not Authorized by law. Pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives, the following lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law:

Department of Veterans Affairs: Construction; Major Projects; Transitional Housing Loan Program. Department of Housing and Urban Development: All programs.

That is the language that appears there. So, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to understand how this amendment, this important amendment, is ruled out of order by virtue of not being authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

For the reasons stated in the Chair's prior ruling, the Chair sustains the point of order. The statutory authority cited in the amendment extends only through fiscal year 1994. Absent citation to law extending the authorization through fiscal year 1996, the Chair must sustain the point of order. The fact that other waivers have been granted to other unauthorized appropriations is not relevant.

□ 1830

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY:

On page 30, line 15 strike ''951,988,000'' and insert ''839,183,000''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, HUD's fiscal year 1996 budget is being cut by over 25 percent, and we are eliminating 36 individual programs, which I commend, but, amazingly, the appropriation for HUD's administration and management is receiving only a 1 percent cut. We are cutting the substance, but we are keeping the bureaucracy, and to me this makes no sense. How can we justify this to the American taxpayer?

My amendment simply asks that HUD's administrative portion of its budget take the same cuts as everything else in the budget, 25 percent. The Secretary has suggested a plan to reduce HUD's administrative staff from 11,000 to 7,500 employees by the year 2000.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is 2 years and 7,500 employees too late. HUD's budget has grown by 400 percent over the last 15 years. Its bureaucracy is in lockstep with that figure.

We finally are in a position to eliminate the cornerstone of the welfare state. Throughout the year's appropriation process, amendments to cut further funding from such things as the NEA, CPB, and ICC have been defeated. Members have argued they should not be crippled further.

The argument does not hold in this case, because there is no definite plan to abolish this department.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hefley amendment.

The VA–HUD appropriations bill contains $952 million in funding for HUD's management and administration. Now, that is $6 million below the 1995 enacted level.

The Hefley amendment would further reduce funding for HUD's management and administration by $113 million down to $839 million. This additional cut is totally reckless.

HUD has prepared an ambitious but prudent plan to downsize the staff by fiscal year 2000 to 7,500 FTE's. Substantial progress has already been made to set the agency on a responsible glide path toward this target. HUD is already below the 1995 budget level of 11,918 FTE's—1995 FTE's will be below 11,400, and onboard staff will likely be below 11,000 by September 30.

HUD will enter 1996 at a rate over 700 below the 1996 request. Its policies will continue to have reductions throughout the year.

The subcommittee mark itself will force a reduction in FTE's to about 10,500. The amendment, Mr. Chairman, will require an additional reduction of staff of over 1,800 FTE's. This excessive, unwarranted cut would certainly be costly. It would require, without a doubt, a reduction in force of current employees, and the cost of a RIF is substantial. It includes severance pay, unemployment compensation, continued health benefits, and accrued leave payment.

It would also lead to tremendous instability and inefficiency in the remaining work force.

I would hope the Members would vote against the Hefley amendment. I object to it.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to reduce spending for administrative functions in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and let me share with you that it is only logical that a smaller department with fewer programs needs less money to keep going.

We are shortly to vote on a bill which will reduce HUD's overall budget. We are terminating 36 individual HUD programs. Yet as written, this bill cuts the HUD's administrative and management budget by only a paltry 1 percent, and that makes no sense.

If HUD has less to do, as it will, it can do it with less of the American taxpayers' hard-earned resources. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] calls for a streamlined HUD bureaucracy to manage its remaining programs. It reduces spending for administrative functions by 25 percent.

This amendment does nothing to cripple FHA or GNMA or other continuing HUD programs. But fewer, trimmed-down programs can be run by fewer bureaucrats and should be run by fewer bureaucrats, and I think that is simple arithmetic.

Mr. Chairman we cannot implement this year's budget resolution which put us on a glide path toward a balanced budget in 2002 if we do not cut spending.

We cannot cut spending significantly unless we recognize that a government that does less needs fewer people to do it.

Bloated bureaucracy is not the only reason for bloated government, but it is certainly part of the problem. We are cutting HUD program spending, so let us cut administrative and management budget to match those cuts.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think the attraction for streamlining and reducing bureaucracy obviously has a certain ring to it that all of us be tempted to join in the chorus. But I would caution the Members that

simply reviewing the budget in terms of reduced dollars, in terms of programs, does not necessarily translate into reduced responsibilities for a department like HUD.

I would remind my colleagues they are completely responsible, for instance, for administration of the FHA program, for programs like my colleague on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services should be aware of, of the Real Estate Sales Practices Act. They are responsible for a significant amount of oversight responsibilities that deal with important programs that serve the private sector in terms of housing as well as the secondary regulatory role and in many other areas.

So, simply cutting out the expertise here, the administrative capacity is wrong if there is anything that has been demonstrated, incidentally, it is that where we do have failed public housing authorities, as have recently been taken over in Chicago, they are relying upon HUD today to fill that gap. Fortunately, most housing authorities function pretty well, but when they don't the role falls to the Federal HUD.

But the oversight responsibilities for 4.7 million units of public housing is substantial for HUD and must not reduce there capacity without a change in responsibilities.

Vote no on the amendment

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, with a minute I cannot say much.

I do want to share a few facts about how much this department has grown over the last number of years.

Since 1980, we have gone from 54 programs to over 200 programs. HUD funding has increased from $12.7 billion in 1980 to $31 billion last year. It is one of the fastest growing departments in the Federal Government.

I think the time has come to begin to downsize this department. Jack Kemp, the former Secretary of HUD, has agreed that maybe it is time to get rid of the Department of Housing and Urban Development altogether.

Mr. Chairman, I think that eliminating some of these programs is a good first step. But I think if we are going to eliminate administrative overhead here in the House, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] and I recently introduced a bill to reduce some of the overhead at the White House, I think it is reasonable to eliminate some of the overhead at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I think it is a good amendment. I hope Members will join me in supporting it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I can say categorically that this is a matter upon which we have not had any hearings whatsoever in terms of the VA–HUD Subcommittee. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is not a member of that subcommittee, and we have not had the benefit of anything other than the plan which we know is in effect where the Secretary is attempting to downsize the program in a reasonable, logical way.

The plan, to us, makes a lot of sense. We think that this meat ax approach, being taken through this amendment, is wrong to Federal employees, the persons who are loyal to this country and to the Government and to the agency they work for. This is abuse of the worst kind.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just would like to point out to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] that there was already been a reduction of over 2,000 employees at HUD over the course of the last 2 years. There is a commitment and plan filed to reduce the number of employees down to 7,500, a reduction in force of 6,500 people.

I think that, again, this is the problem with the appropriators getting involved in dealing with authorization issues. We have got to have somebody who has some understanding of what is going on at HUD before people come in here willy-nilly throwing amendments around when they do not know what the heck is actually going on at the agency. There are vast reductions taking place. We are getting this department under control from the kinds of abuse that took place when the Republicans ran HUD and ran the thing into the ground.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the VA–HUD Subcommittee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding this time to me.

I frankly would just like to say, as an aside to my colleague from Massachusetts, I have learned a lot from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] over the years. I would suggest there is an appropriator who knows a lot about HUD. I am just trying to learn the process. But I think he is pretty good.

As a matter of fact, I agree with him on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has expired.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the Hefley amendment.

I would just like to make a couple of comments in closing of this debate. Jack Kemp, the former Secretary of HUD, who I do not think anybody would say is any sort of slackard on trying to take care of people in these particular situations and empower people rather than using bureaucracy, has called for elimination of HUD not because good people do not work at HUD. Good people do work at HUD. It is a fairly centralized planning model.

Secretary Cisneros, a very talented gentleman running HUD currently, is making the fourth attempt to reinvent HUD's bureaucracy. This is the fourth time since 1965 that they are trying to reinvent the HUD bureaucracy.

I think it is just time to say we have been there, done that, tried that. We need to send a clear message to the bureaucracy. The centralized management system does not work. We need to give power to the people. Send this message through by cutting back on the funding to HUD, the bureaucracy, not the programs, and that is why I think the Hefley amendment is an important step in sending that important signal of change forward.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that is endorsed by the Council on Citizens Against Government Waste.

What we are talking about is just cutting approximately $113 million from the administrative accounts of HUD to correspond with the 25 percent we cut on the program side of HUD.

Now, what I would like to see us do is put HUD on a glide path to extinction. I would like this to be one of the departments that we do away with down the line.

I think by cutting it 25 percent on both sides this time, in 4 years, if we follow that path, we will be out of business.

I urge support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I realize my time has expired, but at the time that my time expired, I was in the process of attempting to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the VA–HUD Subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, be given 1 minute to speak on this issue.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], but also the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] for not objecting. I think the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] knows that I must unfortunately rise to oppose this amendment largely because we have made a very, very significant cut in HUD, almost 25 percent. We have pushed them to the wall.

This probably takes us to RIF's, and the data before us would indicate that the RIF cost may run as high as $47,000 a year per person. We are not sure we would raise any money.

Our objective is to try to be as sensitive as we can from this point forward.

I understand where the gentleman is coming from. I would hope he would continue to support the rest of our efforts to cut back government. We have gone a long way with HUD already.

I would resist and urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] will be postponed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am doing this for a very brief colloquy with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], whom I promised we would have this an hour ago. He has been very patient. I appreciate it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in 1993, my amendment was passed on the floor of this House that encouraged greater cooperation between NASA and USDA.

The amendment directed NASA and the Department of Agriculture to work together to make better use of NASA's remote-sensing data for agriculture. Our space program has resulted in development of remote technology that could greatly improve agriculture. Using remote sensing, we will be better able to, one, anticipate potential food, feed, and fiber shortages or gluts; two, predict impending famines and forest infestations and try to prevent or mitigate them; three, provide information on condition of crops and croplands; four, assist farmers in the application of pesticides, nutrients, water to maximize crop yields and protect the environment; and, five, to provide farmers with better information to decide what kind of crops to plant to meet market demands.

□ 1845

The amendment supporting that effort was part of the NASA authorizing bill in both 1993 and 1994 and had the support of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] of the Committee on Science, as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] of the Committee on Agriculture.

As we reduce funding for agricultural programs by $13 billion and move towards a free market, it makes sense to use all available information and technologies for farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the effort of the Committee on Appropriations in the report language on commercial technology programs. This program makes available dollars for allowing NASA-developed technologies for commercial use. I hope in some small way that we can also allow American agriculture to expand exports to world markets by assuring that American farmers and ranchers have the information available through NASA technology to predict supply and demand more accurately, and we are more able to do that, and I compliment the technology we have achieved, and I am hoping that the chair of the subcommittee supports that effort.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do, and I appreciate my colleague bringing forward this because it is my intention to see that we make extra effort to tap every resource that is available through the work of NASA. This includes the research that is taking place both in areas like the space station, but also work in other NASA programs. I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] working on this particular issue to assure greater utilization of available remote-sensing information to be used by the agricultural industry of this country and to insure an adequate and wholesome supply of food and fiber for our citizens. I and others are interested in making NASA-based technologies available to farmers and ranchers to provide timely information on crop conditions, projected food, feed, and fiber production, and on any other available information.

I would like to tell my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], that I agree and encourage the administration of NASA to increase its effort, and will bring this issue up in a conference committee to include in the report language specifically addressing the issue that the gentleman brought up today.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STOKES:

Amendment No. 65: Page 41, strike line 1 through ''(2)'' on line 5.

Page 45, strike line 22 through page 46, line 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will strike legislation that delays public housing development funds and the issuance of incremental rental assistance. This bill includes two different proposals that delay programs of critical importance to low-income individuals and families, and to the public housing authorities and landlords that serve them. These programs are public housing development funds and incremental rental assistance. As it relates to public housing development funds, H.R. 2099 includes a provision that would slow the rate at which a housing authority develops a project in order to slow the overall rate at which development funds are outlaid. This burdensome provision is an inept attempt to assist HUD in staying within a newly imposed cap included in this bill for the annual contributions to assisted-housing account.

Mr. Chairman, what the committee has done is to include language in the bill which imposes a spending limitation on assisted housing. This language was added, according to the subcommittee, in order to check the growth in this account.

The Department is going to have a hard-enough time trying to adjust to and live within this limitation. It does not need the Congress telling it how best to do this. Year after year, HUD has battled to meet the development needs that accrue at a rate of about $2 billion annually. An estimated $20 billion is needed presently to eliminate this backlog.

This certainly is not an area where a delay in obligation is needed. All this delay would do is to skyrocket the backlog even further. The 1-year delay on the issuance of vouchers and certificates effectively eliminates assistance for 1 year, causing great harm just as worst-case housing needs are growing and supplies of decent, affordable housing is shrinking.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. He and I discussed our own frustration with what has been going on with HUD accounts across the board. We have spent a lot more money year in, year out, over the years, and yet it seems in many instances the money that we are spending has not really gotten to those people that we want to serve the most.

I am particularly concerned about the accounts that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] addresses in this case, for we are talking about assisted housing. In this bill assisted housing has $19,939,000,000. We have put a cap on that spending amount and are saying to HUD, ''You'll stay within that limitation because this is the account that

has grown way beyond inflation over the years.''

As we have discussed many times today, HUD spending has increased by 50 percent over the last 4 years. In assisted housing, at its current rate and pattern of growth, by roughly the year 2000, this account will have grown to roughly $30 billion. If that is the case, it will eliminate other programs that have worked very well. It literally will sequeeze out CDBG, homeless assistance, grant programs like public housing operating subsidies, and the HOME program.

We have to get HUD to do more than talk about getting control over their own agency. This cap is designed to force them to have very tough accounting, make sure they know what is going on in this program during the next year. If we do not do that, then all these programs are going to suffer.

It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, in an attempt to get some control over excessive spending and unacceptable growth rates, that we want to have the caps remain. So I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, of course I rise in strong support of my colleague's amendment. These two provisions would strike, make no policy sense. They have no budgetary impact, too, that he addresses. At their worst they represent an effort to thwart any kind of expansion, even the most minimal, in public or section 8 housing in fiscal year 1996 when those of us that get around, not only in our district but throughout the State and the country and meet in those areas of the greatest need in our country, know what the pressing need continues to be. It gives us a devastating feeling.

In other words, I want to again commend my colleague's leadership as he has through the years given us on the level of the Committee on Appropriations. Even when we had more suitable and propitious environments as far as what we thought the votes would be, our problems were perennial and continue to be as far as appropriations are concerned, and despite his preeminent position as chairman, and even going against an overwhelming majority of his colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has always been in favor of what we have diligently had hearings and concluded from those hearings throughout the country and in Washington are the crying desperate needs of a large segment of our population.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back for a moment to address just the latter part of my previous argument. Before doing so, however, the chairman of the committee did state that he and I have on occasions discussed HUD and some of its problems, and indeed we have, and I think that we have both discussed those problems from a vantage point of wanting to help HUD be able to solve the various problems that confront this very important agency. It is just that on this particular issue, again, philosophically we disagree on the approach. I am concerned, very much concerned, about the micromanagement from Congress in terms of this cap.

But in terms of the 1-year delay, Mr. Chairman, let me also say that this delay, even for 1 year, would mean no new incremental assistance would be made available to address national needs including demolition, relocation, litigation, and demixing of elderly and disabled populations. Both of these provisions are budget-neutral and have been added only as another attempt to micromanage HUD. By striking these provisions, we would remove two very cumbersome provisions and be able to keep in place all of the committee's funding recommendations.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. In connection with that what he was just saying:

In other words, if this amendment fails, there will be no new public housing, nor section 8 housing, and the more than 1½ million families on the waiting lists now will continue to wait and wait and wait, and perhaps into many years in the foreseeable future because remember, distinguished comrade, affordable housing is decreasing, it is not increasing.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for yielding this time to me. I think caps in this case are appropriate. Let me tell my colleagues why I say that:

Last year there was a big article in the Wall Street Journal, many of the other newspapers around the country, about Federal investigators from HUD who were going around the country illegally frightening people, saying that if someone demonstrates, they do not want a certain project in their community, why there is a $50,000-a-day fine, 1 year in prison. I remember all kinds of stories circulating in the national press.

Now, the critics of these intimidating investigations point out that such Government action is encroaching on the constitutional guarantees of free speech, assembly, right to protection against Government policies, decisions, and actions, and the critics say all neighborhood political activity, including filing lawsuits, should be declared safe from Government penalty. In others words, there were 34 cases of these where HUD was going around intimidating people, groups, and even the Civil Liberties Union came on and said to protest at the HUD and to Secretary Cisneros because of the HUD free-speech abuses surfacing in all the national press.

This is an outrageous example of an agency run amok when they are so egregious in their violations that even the Civil Liberties Union is saying that this action cannot be tolerated of an agency. I think it is going too far, and I think that is why the caps are important.

□ 1900

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I probably will not use those 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] has made. There have been serious problems raised about the management of HUD and the funds that flow from HUD in local communities; Washington, DC, is one, Baltimore is another. There are a number of others. We do need to carefully review what we have done in the past so that we can correct some of the difficulties in the future. I appreciate my colleague from Wisconsin raising the point, for it is an important consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention in closing that 2 weeks ago an Assistant Secretary at HUD was quoted in a Washington Post editorial as saying that funding in the account that we are dealing with here could consume the Department entirely if nothing is done to curb spending there.

That editorial and quotation essentially made my point here. Assisted housing is important, but it has been growing. It is at $19 billion, almost $20 billion now; it will be at least $30 billion by the end of this century. This cap is designed to assist and help HUD, and perhaps, to put their house in order.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be postponed.

Are there other amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VENTO:

AMENDMENT NO. 69: Page 28, line 3, after the dollar amount insert the following ''(increased by $184,000,000)''.

Page 64, line 16, before the last comma insert ''(reduced by $235,000,000)''.

Page 66, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following ''(increased by $30,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Under previous agreement, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores full funding to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's emergency food and shelter program, a program for the homeless. This is an amendment to try and restore the moneys to at least the 1995 level as far as we can within the authorization of the limits of this bill. It further restores $184 million to fully fund as near as we can, again, to the HUD McKinney Homeless Assistance programs.

Mr. Chairman, these programs and dollars are desperately needed, and I am pleased to have the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the ranking member of the committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] join me in offering this amendment. I know I have the strong support too of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], the ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. Chairman, these are important programs that deal with the poorest of the poor. The fact is that we are taking these dollars out of the FEMA accounts. We have just put $6.5 billion into the FEMA accounts. They have significant amounts of dollars that are unobligated in those accounts. This bill restores or adds an extra $320 million.

What we are concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is dealing with the disaster that is occurring right now, today, on the streets of this Nation, rather than those that might occur in the future. As the Chairman knows, we have serious problems, serious types of issues that occur, whether it has been the west coast or the Midwest or in other parts of this Nation, and in Florida. We have responded with significant amounts of help in terms of disaster assistance. Those accounts have significant amounts of unobligated balances.

We know, Mr. Chairman, that if we reduce the funds for these McKinny programs, for these FEMA homeless programs, and I might say work with the nonprofits, work with the private sector, work with our State and local governments we will be dealing with serious problems that we have with regards to people without shelter. In fact, the population of this number of people is excess of 600,000 persons.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know perfectly what the problem is with regard to this, why we have this problem, but I do know that our nonprofits, for instance, that work with the board of charities, the United Way of America, the Salvation Army, the National Council of Churches of Christ, the American Red Cross, these nonprofits are working on overload. This should be a program that I think all of us should reach out to embrace to try and help the nonprofits, to help these local communities that are striving to meet the needs of the homeless; those families that find themselves, for whatever reason, out on the street.

Mr. Chairman, these programs are working. The program has stood true to its original mandate. It has grown because the nature of our society and the problems of the affordability of housing and the social disruption that has occurred in this Nation for a variety of reasons have persisted.

Mr. Chairman, over the years, several millions of people have been provided assistance. It is not a stable population, it is a population that we are addressing, but they continue to grow. We have almost 2,500 local boards, Mr. Chairman, that need this money. We should not cut them off. They will not have the resources if we do not provide it and we should vote for the Vento-Kennedy-Stokes amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. This amendment will restore $30 million in funding to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Emergency Food and Shelter program to the level of fiscal year 1995 and would provide an additional $184 million to the HUD McKinney Homeless Assistance programs. Under my amendment, offered with Mr. STOKES and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, these funds would be transferred from the FEMA disaster assistance program.

In many respects, I am advocating transferring funds from a natural disaster fund for the future to provide funds for two man-made disaster funds that have a dire need for dollars today. At the very least, some 600,000 Americans, individuals, adults and children, are homeless every day. Millions have experienced homelessness and unfortunately, millions more teeter on the verge of homelessness.

The FEMA Emergency Food and Shelter program has been a program for over a decade. It is a unique program within the Federal Government that in fact is partnered at the national and local levels with boards comprised of the major charities: the United Way of America, the Salvation Army, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, Catholic Charities USA, the Council of Jewish Federations, Inc., and the American Red Cross. These partners are the non-profits that, prior to Federal recognition in the late 1980's of the homeless problems faced by this country, were there responding to homelessness in our cities and towns. They are still there and they are on overload.

The program has stood true to its original mandate: to supplement and expand efforts to provide shelter, food and supportive services to homeless, individuals, and to strengthen efforts to create more effective and innovative local programs. Over the years, it has served millions of people by providing or linking them to appropriate services and by preventing families or individuals from becoming homeless.

Last year, $128.4 million was allocated to 2,489 local boards through 11,010 local recipient organizations. That funding represents over 100 million meals; over 4 million nights in shelter; over 663,000 instances of rent or mortgage assistance to keep someone in their home; and over 214,000 instances of utilities assistance. That phenomenal assistance would be cut by 23 percent in the next fiscal year without this Vento amendment to restore the funds.

That 23 percent cut would result in almost 24 million less meals, close to one million fewer nights of shelter for individuals or families with children, over 150,000 less instances of homelessness prevention through rent or mortgage assistance, and almost 50,000 fewer similar prevention opportunities through utilities payments assistance.

In my own district, Ramsey County would receive $35,156 fewer dollars. Dollars that could help provide over 12,000 meals, 564 nights in shelter, 37 rent or mortgage assistance payments, and 23 utilities payments in this upcoming year.

In restoring the $184 million to the HUD homeless programs, we will reverse the course taken by the Appropriations Committee that could result in approximately 130,000 few Americans being served by the HUD homeless assistance programs in the next fiscal year. That could literally mean an additional 130,000 more Americans abandoned to life on our streets, under our bridges or in our parks instead of being brought back into their communities as productive citizens.

During the Clinton administration, the homeless programs at HUD have begun to work together in a comprehensive fashion at the national and community levels. They have recognized that the problems of homelessness are not just associated with a lack of housing and have appropriately sought our support services to pair with transitional programs. HUD has also recognized that prevention is the key—and that can mean jobs and job skills, education opportunities, temporary mortgage assistance or substance abuse treatment.

HUD has asked our Nation's communities to responsibly identify the needs of their homeless or near homeless communities and to craft comprehensive plans to address those needs. These $184 million in funds I would restore today are critical to continuing that effort.

The numbers of people served by these programs whose funds I would restore cannot be ignored by this Congress. In fact, they represent the fortunate folks who receive assistance and that are given the opportunity to turn their lives around—either before or after a homeless experience. The many bills being considered by this Congress now, including the appropriations bills and other so-called reform efforts, will without question increase the number of homeless Americans. The appropriations bill alone slashes our housing budget that assists so many of the poorest of the poor—practically a formula for increasing homelessness across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to support this amendment. Put in context, restoring these funds will put one small piece of the puzzle back for those organizations that serve individuals and families in need. These programs and the organizations in community after community are facing reduced funds that

will result in reduced quality and quantity of services. Unfortunately, they are not facing reduced demand. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to oppose the Vento amendment.

The amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is designed to provide assistance where we are currently providing assistance. He would add $184 million to homeless assistance grants and $30 million to FEMA's emergency food and shelter grants. The latter was only a $130 million account in the first place. We cut $30 million out of it. We believe it is a good program.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of the homeless assistance grants, I think it should be said that there was a $297 million deferral that came through the rescission process. It would be applied to the amount that is appropriated in this bill. So we have attempted to use that, combined with the appropriated amount, to make this account whole, relative to the 1995 year.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that while these are difficult times, we are concerned about the homeless assistance grants. We wanted to make sure that there was funding to allow them to go forward with the programs in place, still hoping that those programs would be much more effective for the homeless than they had been thus far.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota takes the money from all of FEMA's emergency assistance. I mean literally, he zeroes those accounts. The import that that will have on people who are homeless for other reasons is very real. That is not the account to take it from.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the gentleman to recognize that we have attempted very seriously to balance these accounts carefully. To zero the FEMA accounts in the face of some of those problems that we know exist would be a very big mistake for the House. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] a question.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to respond.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to confirm, are not $297 million that you were speaking of, are not they already obligated?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, no, they are not.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, they are not?

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

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

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman will yield to me, I would suggest that that is correct, that those dollars have already been appropriated. The chairman suggests that somehow releasing and not obligating them and counting them for next year would in fact make these programs whole, that this program will be substantially below what it was last year, even with the dollars I am restoring.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the $297 million was a part of the rescission package which was not signed into law until today. We have awarded most of this money. They had not been obligated because obviously most of the money had not been available prior to the signing of the rescission bill. This funding does flow into next year, it supplements the program, and I think it makes it whole.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is not all that we would like to do, but we are operating with a limited pool of resources. The gentleman and I know very well, if the gentleman looks at Oklahoma City and other places, what zeroing FEMA might mean. So this is taking money from the wrong place when we have tried in very difficult circumstances to make adjustments that at least cause us to get through this year in a reasonable way in these accounts.

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

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

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just point out, we cannot count it twice. It will be obligated in this fiscal year. It takes time with the grant and application process to, in fact, process this.

The gentleman says it is a disaster only if it is big enough. But if somebody is out of their home, it is a disaster for that individual. The point is that the FEMA money we are putting in here and the homeless money can be directly used in that way. We are suggesting that we avoid not just the natural disasters, but some of the man-made disasters that occur with regard to people being homeless.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in support of the Vento-Kennedy-Stokes amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are privileged to live in the greatest country in the world. I think all of us are proud to live here. But I think one thing that must hurt or pain any American is to walk through the streets, as I have walked through my city in Cleveland and other cities throughout the country, and see people on grates, lying in doorways.

I recall just a few years ago when the homeless problem began to gain greater attention, we used to see a single individual in a doorway, a single individual on a grate, lying on a lawn. Now we see whole families. We see mothers, fathers, and children. Many of them were hard-working people. Many of them are dislocated workers and others who, by one reason or another, have come upon some very hard luck. In many cases, there are mental problems involved. At any rate, it is something that certainly ought to pain every American, and in America, the richest country in the world, there ought not be any homeless people.

Mr. Chairman, this bill devastates our Nation's efforts to prevent homelessness. It guts the McKinney Homeless Assistance Grants Program through a massive 40-percent reduction. Homelessness is a devastating experience to families, to parents, and children alike. Homelessness disrupts virtually every aspect of life, damaging the physical and emotional health of family members, interfering with the education of children and the development of children, resulting in the devastating separation of family members.

Mr. Chairman, the cuts to HUD overall jeopardize an already fragile affordable housing situation in this Nation. Just this week reports about the disturbing growing affordable housing shortage in the United States has been released. Now we want to add further instability to poor people's lives by slashing homeless assistance grants.

Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge my colleagues to support the Vento amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I served as a chairman of this Subcommittee on Housing for a few years and took advantage of that to travel from one end of the country to the other, from California to New York, and from the Canadian border to the Mexican border. We visited the slums and we visited the better neighborhoods in our country.

Mr. Chairman, I will never forget, not only here in the District where I witnessed a man frozen to death on the streets downtown, a homeless man one cold night, and in New York we had several occurrences of that kind. So we went out and had hearings and a result of those hearings, we forged the present constellation, so to speak, of laws that target this kind of problem. Those were the first hearings we had on that matter, and as I said, they were comprehensive, and we tried to go from the rural and the remote to the most urban and dense.

Mr. Chairman, homelessness is not just about housing, but about supportive services as well. HUD once called it a continuum of care, which I thought was, as fancy as it seems, a very appropriate phrase. They recently announced $900 million in grants for this year, more than 800 projects across the country. Unless this amendment passes, these funds will be cut by more than one-third.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support restoring funds to the FEMA emergency food and shelter program. In my home State, this program has been invaluable. If the funds are not restored in Texas, nearly 1.5 million fewer meals would be served, nearly 66,000 nights in shelters would be lost, nearly 3,400 families would not receive assistance.

□ 1915

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I Yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT], a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here and listening to this debate on the housing part of this bill for the last 2 to 3 hours, and getting more and more distressed, and, to be honest, very saddened by what we are engaged in.

There is not a person in this body who does not own a home. Most of us own two homes. We have a home here in Washington and a home in our home districts. I am told that some of us have three, and four homes. In addition to our Washington home and our district home, we have a mountain home and a beach home, and all of us get a tax subsidy for the interest that we pay on those homes. Notwithstanding that, we are here depriving people, the most vulnerable people, of a place to live.

Well, I cannot understand what we are doing. I do not understand what it is we are trying to achieve. How can we expect to improve our Nation and the things that our Nation stands for when a significant number of our citizens do not have access to any housing, much less one, two, three or four homes?

How can we expect to achieve our destiny as a nation when many of our people are living on the streets? We have got Members of Congress who are sleeping in the buildings here, even though they can afford homes. We do not let homeless people come into our buildings and sleep here, but our Members can get that tax free. And we take advantage of it.

So what are we doing here? We are passing a bill that cuts $400 million from public housing operations. That means that the housing authorities in my district, which are barely functioning now, cannot do an adequate job of maintaining and preventing deterioration of the housing stock that we own as the American people.

We are cutting $1.2 billion in modernization funds so that people continue to live in these rotting, terrible housing conditions, in a nation that is prospering.

We are cutting the drug elimination program, wiping it completely off the books, at the time when drugs are spreading, and they are particularly spreading in public housing and around lower income neighborhoods.

These are the funds that our housing authorities, those in my congressional district, have used to try to beef up security and do some drug training with the young people in the neighborhood to keep them out of drugs and get the police to come in and do joint efforts with them, to try to attack this devastating problem. And we are cutting out the money for the homeless people, the most vulnerable people in America.

I want to urge my colleagues, please consider what we are doing and vote against this bill and in favor of the Vento amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of restoring funds to the McKinney homeless programs. We are facing such extreme cuts in housing programs in this bill. This is really a mean-hearted bill. It is a callous disregard for the pain that people are suffering.

Further, we are cutting out approximately 40 percent from the homeless program itself, a program that effectively serves rural communities such as mine, the poorest of the poor, and those Americans who are most dependent on these to help them.

In fact, given the discussion we have had on the point of order, this whole bill may not ever be spent, not one dollar may be spent on housing because of the clauses in the appropriation. It says all of these housing expenditures are subject to the authorization.

In any event, we should know that we are doing wrong. On any given night, at any given time, at any back alley of any city in this country, or on any crowded street, or on any gutter, we can find more than 700,000 Americans who sleep there and make that their home.

There is no shame in being homeless. Those people you see have no shame. The shame is with us, with us as a society, in allowing homelessness to exist in America, an America where we are very prosperous. But there is greater shame in having a solution to homelessness and failing to respond. We know what we must do, and we are failing to do it.

Homeless programs are working well. They are working well in North Carolina, they are working well in Greenville, Charlotte, Wilmington, and in Cumberland County, all across this country and other parts of this United States. But we if we fail to pass this amendment, we will fail more than 150,000 to have a place to call their own.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would say they are working so well, and I would remind my colleagues, all of these homeless funds are matching funds. When you cut $100 million, you are cutting $200 million. We are cutting back on the local participation at the same time.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just close by stating some have reminded us a careful reading of our Bibles will reveal that Mary and Joseph both were homeless. They were faced with a situation that was not their choice, but their fate.

So there are those who indeed are down on their luck. It is not by choice, but it is their fate. We should surely be more responsive and responsible. We should never let that happen in America. Surely there is money, we can find the money.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge us to be responsible and support the Vento amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to share with the gentlewoman my own concern about the subject area, because I think she expresses very well what should be the concern of all of us.

We have, since I have been in the House, truly seen an explosion in the spending for housing, in programs that proliferate in many forms. Some have worked very well, and some have not worked so well.

My concern is this: While housing has increased by 50 percent over the last 4 years, since 1990 homeless funding has tripled. There are some homeless programs that have worked very well; there are many that have not worked at all. You clearly can see across the country, in urban center after urban center, growing numbers of people on grates in the wintertime sleeping in the cold. All of us have to be concerned about that.

My consternation is the fact that we have spent so much on housing in general over the last decade. Yet this problem has come upon us, and we have not found a solution. We are helping some individuals, but the problem seems to grow.

That is another reason I feel we need to shake this agency, to rethink the way they are using dollars. I am very concerned about this.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire of the gentleman if he thought that the problem is with the agency, or there is a problem really with society as well we are facing?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I take the

problem back to those of us who have served in state legislatures who may have made some bad judgments about this whole subject area. People of very good heart years ago in California were concerned about people being institutionalized in mental institutions, and we closed those down and suggested that people could go back to their communities and receive clinical service. We never kept the promise of clinical service.

A high percentage of the people who are in the streets are people who have mental difficulties, people who suffer from various kinds of addiction. We need to rethink those past policies to help HUD do a better job. I, frankly, think that HUD has failed to think the problem through carefully.

I empathize with the gentlewoman's concern, and because she was expressing that concern so well, I wanted to share this exchange.

Mrs. CLAYTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to thank the gentleman for acknowledging my position. I would hope my expression of concern would penetrate sufficiently that he indeed would support the amendment that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is presenting.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one minute.

Mr. Chairman, on the point that my friend and colleague from California was making, last term the Speaker appointed me and I chaired a task force. As the gentleman may know, I have been working very long and hard on this particular problem, and have been associated with it since it has been considered by Congress. I would just tell the gentleman that the questions he raised are in that report. They are in the report that Andrew Cuomo led last year.

These are good programs. We passed a reauthorization bill to consolidate many of the homeless programs. They are working. They are programs that are dealing with the problem. And it is not something we lay at the feet of any particular administration, it is a social problem.

I would say with regards to the mental illness issue, a question posed to me by a sociologist in Arizona I think answers that question. The question is how long can a person be on the street and maintain their mental well-being and balance? It is a good question.

I agree with the gentleman, because I worked in the legislature when we did the programs in terms of deinstitutionalization. Minnesota is proud of having had many institutions for those with disabilities. Unfortunately, it has led to a more severe problem in many respects with the SLIC programs. The gentleman is exactly correct about the lack of funding for those programs.

Mr.Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], who has been a strong advocate, and, although new to the Congress, has worked hard on this project.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his outstanding leadership on this issue, and, as well sharing the time for an issue that I think, as I have heard the chairman mention, has to be a bipartisan issue.

I thank the ranking member [Mr. STOKES] for being persistent on the question of homelessness. I would say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], that as we are suffering under the heat of the summer, many citizens are about to take their vacation or they have been on their vacation, and they have had the opportunity to enjoy cool weather and warm weather.

However, I would say, that homeless Americans face the condition of homelessness, no matter whether it is cool or hot. They do not have an opportunity to take a vacation. They suffer under whatever the conditions are all year long. Many times they suffer from the intensity of the heat or the viciousness of the cold weather.

I do not know how many people who are housed will be taking a vacation to homeless encampments, but I have seen those encampments in my city of Houston. I have seen the families, the elderly, the individuals in fact who have worked all their life, and, because of conditions that they find themselves in, they are now homeless.

In fact, I would simply say, that I came upon a gentleman who was a veteran, who had worked in a steel mill, and he was yet living in a homeless condition because he was not able to access his pension or his benefits, and he remained there for a long period of time.

□ 1930

However, he was able to be helped. But the next person living under torn sheets in the same encampment could not access any benefits, was not suffering from mental illness, in fact had family but had fallen upon hard times because there was no employment.

What you find in the community is that people have come together like United Way, like the Coalition for the Homeless and other community groups to fight homelessness. They have, in fact, brought people together and in using the McKinney Act funds have provided housing for the homeless. Why cut these homeless funds by 50 percent, I support the Vento amendment, therefore I am withdrawing the Jackson-Lee amendment to join in creating an additional $184 million for homeless assistance and an additional $30 million for FEMA emergency food and shelter program.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] who has been a leading advocate of the homeless veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, homelessness has been created more by government policy than by any fault of the individuals that find themselves in that condition. We, through the stroke of the pen that will be done by the House of Representatives this evening, will create more and more homelessness.

The notion that we in this committee today will end up striking 40 percent of the Nation's homeless funds is a fact that every single Member should recognize when they vote on the Vento amendment. Cutting the money that sustains homeless shelters, that takes families and our Nation's veterans and gives them a little hope that maybe somebody cares, that maybe their country cares about them enough to bring them off of a cold grate in the middle of winter and put them into a shelter and give them a hot meal, and we are going to be saying, no, we do not care.

We are going to be turning away people at homeless shelters because we do not have the courage to stand up to a tax cut, to stand up against these abusive cuts that have taken place to our Nation's homeless and housing programs.

Please vote for the Vento amendment. Vote against homelessness in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

Amendment No. 12: Page 46, strike ''(a)'' in line 17 and all that follows through line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement of today, the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. KENNEDY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I first of all want to thank and recognize the tremendous work that the gentlewoman from California, [Ms. WATERS], in particular, has done on this issue. She has been a leader in fighting discrimination in this country throughout her entire political career, and she continues it in the most distinguished fashion in her work on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and dealing with our Nation's housing ills.

I also want to thank the chairman; well, I wish he was still chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], for the efforts that he has made throughout his career but most particularly on this housing bill. It has not been a very encouraging series of amendments that we have voted on so far today. Nevertheless, he continues to persist and we appreciate his efforts.

This amendment tries to deal with the harmful and damaging provisions that are contained in this legislation that sabotages the access of minority Americans to ownership of homes in our country by preventing HUD from fighting insurance redlining. This amendment has no cost associated with it.

Mr. Chairman, the Speaker of this body often talks about creating an ''open society'' here in America. I wholeheartedly agree with the Speaker in his efforts to achieve this goal, and I share his vision of an America of truly equal opportunity where a person achieves according to merit.

But, unfortunately, we do not live in that society. Today we live in a society where you, if you happen to be a person of color, you are 60 percent more likely to be turned down for a home mortgage than a white person coming from the same income, the same neighborhood, and with the same credit history.

If you are a person of color, if your home or business is located in a predominantly minority area, you are more likely to be denied insurance or you will be forced to pay more for the insurance without regard to the actual risk associated with the insurance policy.

I want to repeat that statement because it is very important.

If you live in an area with a high concentration of minorities, you will pay significantly more for insurance even though losses you suffer are no different than losses from similar white neighborhoods.

This, my colleagues, is called discrimination. And in the area of housing and property insurance, it is HUD's job to investigate to try to resolve and where necessary begin legal action to prevent such discrimination.

But if we do not support this amendment that is before us now, this discrimination will go on unchallenged, uncorrected, and unpunished.

Almost everyone in this body has heard of the American Family Insurance case. Management literally punished agents for writing too many policies to blacks. But the sad fact is American Family was only the most obvious about doing what most insurance companies do.

Again, the evidence is clear. The National Association of Insurance Commissioners did a study of the availability and the price of homeowners insurance in 25 metropolitan areas in the 13 largest States. The findings were clear:

Average premiums are higher, and availability more limited, even when loss costs are taken into the account, in areas of minority concentration.

An extensive study put out by the Missouri Insurance Commissioner in May of this year shows: ''low income minority neighborhoods in both Kansas City and St. Louis pay higher premiums but incur lower claims than similar white urban areas for all homeowners insurance policies sold.''

Among the 20 largest Missouri homeowner insurers, 5 firms have minority market shares of less than one-twentieth of their share of white markets.

The impact of this discrimination is clear. Without access to homeowners insurance, people do not have access to homes. Let me quote a recent court decision: ''no insurance, no loan; no loan, no house.''

The fact is that the Republican Party has a tremendous tradition of standing up against racial discrimination. It was the Republican Party that gave us Abraham Lincoln. It was the Lincoln Republicans that led the charge to fight against discrimination in America.

The Republican tradition needs to come back to life. Instead of fighting the ability of HUD to go out and get rid of this cancer of racial discrimination, please support the Kennedy-Waters-Stokes amendment. Fight any attempt for whatever reasons and rationale the Republicans will come up with to end up opposing this amendment, and recognize that discrimination in this country needs to be ferreted out.

That is what this amendment will do. It will allow HUD to do its job and allow people to gain stature because of their own individual merit, not because of the color of their skin.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. chairman, I, too, would like to thank the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for his leadership and work that he has done in this area. I would like to thank the ranking member of this subcommittee, of the Committee on Appropriations, for all that he has done over the years in the area of fair housing.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kennedy-Stokes-Waters amendment. This amendment would strike legislation contained in this appropriations bill which would have a devastating impact on our effort to fight discrimination.

The Fair Housing Act is the law. The courts have ruled that part of HUD's responsibility under the Fair Housing Act involves property insurance. The language in this bill would strictly prohibit HUD from implementing this part of its mission.

Let's be clear. Legally, HUD's responsibility to enforce fair lending supercedes the Federal Government's general noninvolvement in insurance matters under the McCarren-Ferguson Act. Since the Fair Housing Act was updated in 1988, HUD has investigated, negotiated settlements, and represented complianants in cases of property insurance discrimination. This amendment would stop HUD in its tracks on this whole range of activities.

Without this amendment:

Individuals who have been victims of discrimination would be denied their basic rights under the Fair Housing Act.

HUD would have to cease its ongoing investigations at the end of the fiscal year. If ongoing settlement negotiations stopped, many of their statutes of limitations would expire before new authority for HUD could be reinstated.

Administrative hearings for cases underway would cease.

Recent cases of discrimination could not be investigated by HUD.

HUD could not engage in any research or educational activities that would clarify solutions to discrimination problems for insurers, consumer and community groups, and State regulators.

HUD would be required to stop any voluntary programs, like those they are currently engaged in with the mortgage banking industry.

Why would this Congress want to prevent one of our primary antidiscrimination agencies from enforcing a civil rights law? Insurance redlining is a problem, Mr. Chairman. HUD has years of experience enforcing the Fair Housing Act. Property insurance compliance is part of that law.

I am deeply offended that this Appropriations Committee would, without hearings, without consulting the authorizing committee, without any public discussion—place a strightjacket on HUD's ability to enforce an important antidiscrimination law.

A few weeks ago, the Banking Committee debated a similar rollback of the Fair Housing Act. That discussion was heated, it was emotional, and it was intense. At the end of that discussion, after several hours, the Banking Committee resoundingly voted to uphold the Fair Housing Act. I think it was wrong then to try to take away people's rights without a proper airing of the view; without a proper forum. I think it would be wrong now.

I would ask this House to use reason. I would ask that we act with fairness. Do not vote to curtail basic civil rights. Support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that a flier is going around signed by two of

the Members of this House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING], and they say things such as: Everyone agrees that proper insurance underwriting is based solely on factors of economic risk, not on race, not on sex, not on ethnicity. They deny that there is any redlining.

I live in a redlined area. I live in what is known as south central Los Angeles. It is not fiction. It is not imaginary. I know that there is redlining and there is discrimination.

Before we completed our debate in the committee on fair housing, at one point I asked the chairman of that committee to please provide some leadership. I asked the chairman if indeed we were going to sit there at 11 at night and undo fair housing laws in this country without any airing, without any hearings, without any authorization.

Let me tell my colleagues something. It was a proud moment because the chairman took over and gave some direction. And do my colleagues want to know what? Republican Members of that committee said no, this is not right.

□ 1945

We are not going to do it. It is not fair to sit here and dismantle fair housing and civil rights laws. Guess what? Because of a bipartisan effort, we stopped the madness and we got a grip. We got a handle, and it did not happen. I am going to say this evening, I hope reason will prevail. I am going to ask that some leadership be provided; not let us move into this kind of dismantlement of civil laws in this country.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to mention that there is not any way in this legislation that we are undoing the fair housing law. Indeed, the States and the country have to be responsive to that law. This item that is before us does not relate to that body of law. I understand the gentlewoman's point, and the gentlewoman and I sometimes know that both of us make our point in excess. Nonetheless, this bill does not relate to undermining the fair housing law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, obviously, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. I know that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] favor another idea, but I would ask them to listen to some of the things I want to say. The gentlewoman from California has already mentioned some of the things, but I think they bear repeating, and I will add some things.

Mr. Chairman, let me start out by saying that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has absolutely no business regulating property insurance. This is just another example of the Department's tendency to stray into other jurisdictions while failing to address the glaring problems in its own core missions.

To begin with, and first of all, Mr. Chairman, 50 States and the District of Columbia already have laws or regulations which prohibit unfair insurance discrimination. Let me repeat that, because I think it needs to be repeated. All 50 States and the District of Columbia already have laws or regulations which prohibit unfair insurance discrimination. I think we can all agree that proper insurance underwriting should be based solely, and I will repeat this and some may not agree, but it should be based on factors of economic risk; I will repeat, not on race, not on sex, and not on ethnicity.

However, the plain fact is that Congress never, never intended for HUD to regulate property insurance. The Federal Government, through the Fair Housing Act, expressly governs the practices of home sellers, landlords, mortgage lenders, and real estate brokers as they relate to housing discrimination. It makes no mention of property insurance.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the McCarran-Ferguson Act, which is the linchpin of our current system of insurance regulation, says that unless a law, and I am quoting. ''* * * specifically relates to the business of insurance, that law shall not be deemed applicable to insurance practices.'' On a more practical level, HUD cannot handle even the responsibilities it now has, let alone assuming new ones. It cannot seem to keep its own house in order. Now it is taking on new responsibilities.

The Department currently has over 150 programs on the books, and the entire Department has been listed by the GAO as being, and I am quoting, ''at risk'' of waste, fraud, and abuse. This is not a question of discrimination. I know that is a very sensitive point, but this is not a question of discrimination. It is a question of jurisdiction. Unless we think HUD would make a great insurance regulator, Members should vote against the amendment. Congress never intended for HUD to have the authority to get into the insurance business.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make the point to the gentleman that the reason this enforcement is contained in HUD is because the Fair Housing Act is contained in HUD. The reality is that when we were looking last year at where the best organization was, the Justice Department, the Department of Commerce, every single Federal agency looks to the HUD testing program for direction. It has been singled out time and time again as having by far and away the greatest capabilities of any group or organization in enforcing fair housing throughout the entire Federal and State government. I would suggest to the gentleman that of course there are anti-discrimination laws filed in 50 States. That does not mean that there is not discrimination. What we have to recognize is simply because we pass a law here, and I appreciate the gentleman allowing me to continue to speak, but simply because we pass a law here in the Congress of the United States does not mean that that law gets implemented at the State level.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Reclaiming my time briefly, the gentleman said let HUD do its job. That is not HUD's job.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Kennedy-Waters amendment to strike section 209. I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], for including this important language in the bill at the request of nine members of the Illinois delegation.

Mr. Chairman, there are not too many industries left in our economy which are not heavily regulated by the Federal Government, but property insurance is one of them. Under the McCarran-Ferguson Act, regulation of the insurance industry has been left to the States. This is greatly responsible for the stable, reliable insurance system we have today, which every American counts on in difficult times.

Unfortunately, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, an agency laden with waste and fraud, has recently decided to go beyond its authority by getting the Federal Government involved in regulating property insurance. HUD is currently writing regulations aimed at addressed the so-called practice of redlining, despite the fact that the States are already addressing this issue where needed. HUD has no authority to write these regulations, and I strongly support section 209 of this bill, which will prohibit HUD from writing or implementing redline regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind the body that in the last Congress, controlled by the other party, they tried to pass a bill that would have allowed HUD to take on this responsibility and could not get the job done, and came back with a bill which allowed HUD to collect statistics on redlining, and that bill failed in the Senate.

As if that were not enough, HUD has also awarded hundreds of dollars in taxpayers' money to liberal special interest groups to prepare studies on so-called redlining practices. HUD is using the questionable studies these groups write as a premise for starting investigations against the insurance industry, which will probably lead, for all of us, to expensive litigation.

Again, all this activity is taking place, despite the fact that HUD has no authority in this area. The insurance industry, which every American counts on every day of their lives, is a success story in part because the Federal Government has kept its hands off.

The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], would reverse this historic situation by allowing HUD to start regulating property insurance, and would open the door to government management of insurance. This Congress will be defined by our efforts to reduce the role and influence of the Federal Government. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against bigger government by voting against this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly make the point that when the gentleman says that the Federal Government does not have the authority or HUD does not have the authority, the fact is that the courts have upheld the Fair Housing Act and HUD's role in the Fair Housing Act time and time again. The only correction that I can see in the department of HUD occurred under Sam Pierce, a Republican, and that has been cleaned up since.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I definitely want to get this straight. We are talking about enforcement of the Fair Housing Act. That is the act that talks about providing housing on an equal, nonracial basis. If people cannot get insurance on the property, they cannot get the loan, and so I am not quite sure how the gentlemen who keep professing that this has nothing to do with equal rights and civil rights, and that HUD has nothing to do with insurance because it deals with housing, how they think HUD could adequately deal with fair housing when insurers are discriminating, and people cannot get housing without insurance, so how are they supposed to deal with their job under the Fair Housing Act?

Mr. Chairman, I do not get it. I cannot understand what this argument is all about. If that were the case, why would it even be necessary to put this provision in the bill? We are striking a provision, this amendment would strike a provision in the bill which prevents HUD from using any money to enforce the insurance laws having to do with fair housing. Therefore, if it did not have anything to do with housing, what is it doing in the housing bill? I do not understand this argument.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

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

Mr. ROYCE. I rise in opposition to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in the interest of time, I'll put my statement in the RECORD at this time.

Section 209 is important in preventing HUD from pursuing duplicative regulations regarding property insurance. Property insurance regulations and authorities are already handled quite extensively in every State by State insurance regulators.

These State regulators recognize that redlining is an intolerable practice and they work to insure that all consumers regardless of ethnicity have equal access to property insurance. So there is no need to have HUD add this unnecessary layer of Federal bureaucracy.

Section 209 will also send a message that Federal agencies should not be promulgating rules or programs beyond the purview they have been granted by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, section 209 goes to the heart of what so many of us have come to Congress to do: Cut duplicative Federal programs, maintain the authority of our States and most importantly section 209 will keep a Federal agency from encroaching on the operations of our small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support section 209 and I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Kennedy-Waters amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding time to me, and let me thank him for all the hard work he has done in the past and is presently doing as it relates to fair housing, as well as the other coauthors of this amendment, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to magnify the point that this amendment is right on target, because this bill prohibits HUD from issuing any enforcement or rules that would apply to fair housing. I think that is simply unbelievable and unconscionable. Let me tell the Members why.

First of all, this whole Fair Housing Act was passed, this portion of the Fair Housing Act that deals with tracking insurance, redlining, was passed under the Bush administration in 1989. I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] makes a very good point. How can one buy a home in America if they do not have mortgage insurance?

I do not know the last time Members have mortgaged their homes or the last time we bought a home in America, but the last time I bought a home in America I had to go to the bank. When I walked into the bank, before they loaned me the money I had to show that I had insurance on the property.

Banks do not loan money to people who do not have insurance on homes, so it just makes practical sense to talk about insurance, protecting individuals so they can get insurance on homes, because in a real sense, what this debate is all about is actually giving them an opportunity to buy the home in the first place.

□ 2000

Mr. Chairman, if you cannot buy a home, if you do not have insurance, it makes practical sense that we put this kind of mechanism in the bill. It is already in the Fair Housing Act. For us to have the audacity to come here on this floor and take it out and be upset with my friends, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], because they are trying to provide some equity to this legislation, to me it is unbelievable.

Mr. Chairman, how do we look constituents in the eyes in America? We know that redlining exists even in the insurance industry. I have people who are in my district, and I have had an insurance agency who called me and said, ''I cannot issue insurance in certain ZIP Codes.'' What can you do about that?

Last year we introduced legislation to deal with that issue. Everybody knows about American families. Insurance redlining still exists today in America and the only way to correct that is by having Federal agencies involved in making sure that everybody is treated fairly in the insurance business.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the former chairman.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me the time, and let me say that I am proud to be associated with the gentleman and with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] on this very important amendment.

I rise in strong support of this amendment and congratulate both of them for the excellent and outstanding leadership they have given, not only in the area of fair housing but against any and all forms of discrimination wherever they have found it.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter that was written to me by Secretary Cisneros. It was written to me in my capacity as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies. It was also written to our friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], as chairman of the subcommittee. I want to refer to what he says about this amendment.

He said:

The fiscal year 1996 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill contains a provision that would bar enforcement by HUD of the Fair Housing Act's prohibition on discrimination for an entire industry. The measure preempts a major civil rights law which has been on the books since 1968. I understand Congressman Kennedy intends to offer an amendment that would strike this

provision, and I wish to express my support for that amendment.

He also says that:

Section 209(a) of the bill would bar HUD from fulfilling its obligations under the Fair Housing Act to persons who have been treated unfairly based on race or other prohibited factor in connection with property insurance. The provision would halt HUD investigations, settlement negotiations and legal proceedings already under way in response to previously filed complaints of insurance discrimination.

He ends his letter by saying:

Barring enforcement of the Fair Housing Act's prohibition on discrimination in the property insurance business, even for a single year, is a serious retreat from notions of fairness and nondiscrimination that I believe we all share.

He said:

I ask you to take swift action to strike from the bill this affront to civil rights.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that anyone here wants to be associated with action that is an affront to the civil rights laws of this country. I recently saw in the Wall Street Journal an article that says home loans to blacks and Hispanics soared last year, though they were still turned down more often than whites, according to Federal regulators.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all understand this provision. I hope we will support the Kennedy-Waters-Stokes motion to strike.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently to the debate tonight regarding housing and I commend the strong work that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and our stalwart, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], have done over the years, and to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and others, but it is appalling to see how those of us on the other side of the aisle want to turn back the clock of time on people who have struggled so hard all of these years.

When we strike at housing laws, we strike at the very heart of discrimination. If we want to put the B word, which is bigotry, into the record, you go to someone's housing. We work at something that keeps them from improving the quality of life, where they live. Not being able to get enforcement in housing is a crime. We can have as many laws on the book as we want to have, but if we do not have an enforcement vehicle, which they have talked about, there is no enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, I worked for 12 years in the Florida legislature in trying to be sure that fair housing laws were enforced. They were never enforced. They never would have been there if these two people had not worked on the Federal level to give us something from the Federal level. The States are not going to enforce this and we know it. That is why we are passing on this ability to the States.

What we are really doing is saying we do not want fair housing enforcement. We do not care about redlining because we are not redlined. We can hold our ears as if we are not hearing what is happening out there, but it is out there. I am saying to the Members, please, please, support this amendment. Please strike down any falling back into the old death throes of segregation and discrimination.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I will not try to deal with this business about HUD has no business. HUD did not just take over this area of responsibility. It is in law, and it was supported by Reagan and Bush. Let me just say this to my friends on the other side of the aisle: You do not know what it is like to be a person of color, to walk into a bank and not be able to get a loan. Even though you look at whites with the same income level, the same credit profile who can get loans. You do not know what it is like to live in a redlined community and not be able to get insurance. I cannot tell you here tonight and make you understand that.

I would simply ask you to get out into America, go into these cities, hold some hearings. Do not do this in the dark of night. Do not undo and dismantle civil rights laws and fair housing laws that a lot of people sacrificed for. Do not take this kind of action simply because you have the power to do it. At least be fair about it. Give us a level playing field. Let us fight in the open. Let us fight in the hearings. Let us bring people out to tell you about racism and discrimination. You give us an opportunity to do that, and we will fight you and we will win. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I know full well the intent of the Kennedy amendment and I have not just empathy for but great concern about fair housing laws and their implementation across the country.

As they operate presently, the legislation regarding fair housing requires that States be responsive to those requirements in place. The subject we are dealing with here, though, that relates to insurance involves the promulgation of regulations by the Department that exceeds their authority and it exceeds the parameters of the fair housing law itself.

Historically insurance laws in this country have been controlled by the individual States because of the great variety of circumstances within the States. The gentlewoman who just spoke and I served in the State legislature together and we worked together to see how best we could get our State to deal with these problems in California. I remember very specific conversations when I was on the finance and insurance committee with the gentlewoman about this problem, and I was concerned about this problem. In many other States there has been responsiveness. I do not now what has happened in Massachusetts, but I would guess that legislature has been sensitive to this problem.

Insurance laws controlled by the States have existed because of the great variety of needs across the country. I personally feel very strongly that we should continue to put pressure on the States where we see difficulties. But to presume a cookie cutter from the Department of Housing in Washington can serve the needs of the entire country, I must say, is a mistaken presumption.

In this case, I strongly support the concern expressed by my colleagues here. At the same time I strongly oppose the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I would urge a ''no'' vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, just trying to understand where we are, I thought we had an agreement we were going to roll three or four votes. I wonder if the Chair could tell me how many votes we are at at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman that it is my understanding there are three short colloquies and the House will then vote on four ordered rollcall votes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], chairman of the subcommittee.

I want to first start by thanking the gentleman for his commitment to solving our international wastewater problems—the gentleman is familiar with those, with the district that I have just south of his district that borders Mexico—particularly the cleanup of the New River, which is the river that flows north in Mexico, through

Mexicali and ultimately into the United States and travels about 50 miles north into the Salton Sea.

As the gentleman knows, it is one of the most polluted waterways in North America and the New River carriers millions of gallons of water per day of municipal and industrial waste into my district. The gentleman has recognized that problem, and has been helping us a lot. We thank the gentleman for that.

On page 54 of the subcommittee report, there is concern expressed over EPA's use of subpoenas to collect data from U.S. companies operating in Mexico. Those companies are companies that are in the Mexicali area. They operate and some of them discharge their waste into the New River which flows north into the United States and then into the Salton Sea. The report questions the authority of the EPA to serve these subpoenas and whether this action may be a violation of NAFTA. After following this issue closely, I just wanted to clarify that in this instance the EPA was in contact with both the International Boundary and Water Commission and the Mexican Environmental Agency throughout the operation. Understanding that any toxics dumped in the New River in Mexico ultimately ends up in the United States, I am supportive and have been supportive of EPA's attempt to solicit voluntary submissions by U.S. companies in Mexico. It was following an inadequate response to this request that the EPA issued the subpoenas in cooperation and consultation with Mexican authorities and the IBWC. I would also note at that time the new agencies established under NAFTA to assist with the cleanup of the border environment were not yet organized. As a result, the EPA worked with the existing international agencies to gather general information on chemical discharges as they are allowed to do under the Toxic Substances Control Act.

I agreed with their position in terms of trying to identify who was putting this toxic discharge into the New River, but I want to let the chairman know that I am in full agreement with his overall conclusion that our agencies, especially the EPA, should not overstep their bounds in the enforcement of our laws. I want to thank him for this opportunity to comment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I appreciate very much the clarification of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] of the facts involved in this circumstance. I understand the complexities involved with international wastewater cleanups. I agree with the gentleman that the EPA's action in this instance was in the best interests of the residents not only of his district but of our State. I look forward to finding a long-term solution to the New River problem. I expect any future actions by the EPA to continue to be in consultation with the appropriate international agencies.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. Congratulations on a long and successful day on this floor.

Mr. LEWIS of California. It is a pleasure doing business with the gentleman.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and if I may, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be happy to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. HEINEMAN. I thank the chairman. I have been working with him and his staff on the need for EPA to construct a new consolidated research facility in Research Triangle Park, NC. Currently the EPA is scattered in 11 separate buildings which are privately owned and in bad shape. I personally toured these facilities earlier this year. Studies have shown that renovating the existing buildings and signing new leases will cost upwards of $400 million.

□ 2015

We can build a new facility for $232 million, and I have been working with the committee in support of this project.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am more than slightly aware of my colleague's support for this project. He has been very persuasive in making his point to our committee.

Today's discussion has indicated the difficulty we are having with money between accounts and because of that, the pressure is very, very great. The gentleman has, indeed, caused all of us to scratch our heads and try to figure out how we can readjust some of these accounts.

We are going to look further between now and conference, but I commit to the gentleman that over the years we are going to make sure that we have carefully analyzed the alternatives to see how we can help.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Why not this year?

Mr. LEWIS of California. EPA has two other major infrastructure projects ongoing, including a new headquarters in D.C. The budget will not sustain 3 projects at one time. There is also a problem with authorization. The building is only authorized for $159 million. To my knowledge, no attempts have been made in past Congresses to address this authorization problem. As the gentleman knows, it is against the rules of the House to appropriate funds for a project of this kind which is not authorized.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have been made aware of this and I have discussed this with key members of the authorizing committee, including the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], the ranking member. I am working with them to update and increase the authorization for this project.

If I may address the authorization problem, can the gentleman assume that he will work to address the appropriations for the facility in fiscal year 1997?

Mr. LEWIS. I can tell you that the gentleman has had a very significant effect in the committee of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] as well as with the chairman himself.

I also know that my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], is very sensitive to this problem; and we are doing everything we can to find a substantial base of funds to see if we cannot overcome the difficulty that you are involved with. I recognize the need for the facility. I think we should find some way to address it.

GSA could be another option, and I understand that they would like to build this facility.

EPA has made this a very high priority, and the gentleman is commended for his thorough work on this project. I just wish I could say, yes, now, but indeed the point is, when an individual Member is concentrating like this to solve a problem in his district, he indeed gets the Congress' attention.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his understanding and agreement.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman, my colleague from California, Mr. LEWIS and stand to give strong support to the bill, H.R. 2099. In particular, I want to support the good reductions in the United States EPA's overall operating budget.

As the gentleman from California knows, we have discussed the concerns of the people of Ohio's 18th Congressional District, people in the State of Ohio and the people in the Midwest who have suffered tremendously under the Clean Air Act and the EPA provisions that directly pertained to our area in Ohio.

The Clean Air Act was a liberal, overzealous, too-far-reaching measure when it spoke, in part, to the concerns dealing with acid rain. There were some merits to the bill, and there is a need to make sure our environment is safe. I want to make that very clear.

There was a study by NAPA which was a 10-year study at a half a billion dollar cost to the taxpayers, stated specifically that, in fact, the changes in the Clean Air Act as pertains to acid rain were not going to make a difference in cleaning up the environment. This was not the problem.

Still, the full thrust of trying to put our people in the Ohio Valley out of work was accomplished in that bill, and I just want to speak a little bit about the truth and what that has done to the Ohio Valley to the tens of thousands of jobs that have been lost for no reason.

I want to let the people in the EPA know, Mr. Chairman, that when we talk about reducing their overall budget of $2.5 billion and the enforcement budget by $129 million, that is a good

start. It is a fine start in my humble opinion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to remind the people in the EPA that, in fact, we are going to be watching for any further problems they want to create as a result of reductions, and we are going to be watching how they treat people in this country. It is fine to have clean air; we want to have that for our children. But we want to point out that one should not retaliate against the people of the United States for no reason. We want them to know that there are consequences for their actions and that people in the Ohio Valley, in the 18th Congressional District, have undergone tremendous suffering amongst their families.

I want to thank the gentleman for his willingness to work with us as this process goes on. It is the first time that I can recall, from my time in government when I was in Ohio, that somebody has been willing to listen and someone is willing to say we have got to use some good sense and not just take actions that in the end do not count for anything. I want to thank the gentleman for that on behalf of my constituents.

Mr. LEWIS. Well, I must say, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY] has been a very, very effective voice in regard to the problems we face with EPA. Literally, across the country we have heard voices that were expressing concern about unnecessary regulation, but indeed, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY] has been one of the leading advocates.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should know that my district is probably the most smog-impacted district in the country. I have chaired a committee in connection with clean air questions in California. I authored the law that created the toughest air quality management district in all of the country.

Having said that, I too find this agency in excess, regulation upon regulation, not just duplication, but useless procedures that get in the way, often, of solving problems. And they cost jobs in the meantime. I very much appreciate the gentleman's voice in this regard and his help and advice has been very, very important in the bill we are considering tonight.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, some of my family moved from Ohio to California, so I was out there quite a lot, and my grandmother and aunts and uncles. My grandmother moved out there, any my aunts and uncles are out there currently. I am concerned about them.

We do have to solve our problem out there and we do have to make it clean in the urban centers across this country, but I appreciate the fact that you have listened to a segment that did not cause the problem and was so unfairly targeted by overzealous bureaucrats. I thank the gentleman for that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to engage the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the subcommittee chairman, in a colloquy, but I first want to thank him as chairman of the subcommittee producing this appropriations bill for his work on the bill under what I know are very difficult circumstances.

As a military veteran myself, I am particularly sensitive to the importance of keeping our promises to our veterans, and I support the fiscal year 1996 VA–HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill.

I believe, however, with the gentleman's indulgence, Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of the legislation that should be clarified.

As the gentleman well knows, I have strongly and consistently advocated for the construction of the replacement Veterans Administration medical center planned for Travis Air Force Base in Solano County in my congressional District. Therefore, I was deeply disappointed that budget restrictions, budget realities, forced the committee to forgo this and other construction projects.

As the gentleman well knows, there is a great need for an additional medical facility in northern California as a result of the closure of the medical center in Martinez, CA, in the aftermath of the 1989 earthquake that we experienced in northern California.

Our veterans in northern California should receive medical care within their designated catchment area and currently some veterans have to drive up to 8 hours to the nearest medical facility.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee, on page 19 of its report, has directed the Veterans Administration to develop a cost estimate for an outpatient clinic, in lieu of a medical center, in time for the funds to be included in this bill at a later stage of consideration.

The Travis Medical Center would have been constructed adjacent to the David Grant Medical Center, a state-of-the-art Air Force hospital. This would have permitted a unique joint venture between the VA and the Air Force. Services would have been provided for both active duty personnel and veterans through a cost-effective medical sharing arrangement.

In fact, in anticipation of construction of the replacement hospital, Federal funds, pursuant to previous congressional appropriations, have already been expended at the Travis site for both a parking lot and a warehouse.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am seeking assurances that the committee is committed to including full funding in this bill to build the outpatient clinic; that funds previously appropriated for the Veterans Administration medical center but not spent can be used for the outpatient clinic; that it will be built, in fact, at Travis Air Force Base; and that it will be able to share medical technology and other essential services in a joint venture with the Air Force hospital.

Given the number of unserved veterans since the closure of Martinez, we need to build, equip, and make operational the proposed outpatient clinic as swiftly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague for his tenacity on this issue. Not a day has gone by when he did not push me and other members of the committee on this matter. Adequate care for the veterans in northern California is clearly a priority for him and for the many members of Operation VA.

I truly regret that budget realities forced us to omit funds for a full medical center; however, in response to the gentleman's specific questions, I can assure the gentleman that he is going in the right direction in the assumptions that he has presented.

The committee will appropriate all the necessary funds in fiscal year 1996 for the clinic with the VA's help in identifying the amounts needed. Any previously appropriated but unspent funds may be used for that clinic. Further, it is the committee's intent that the outpatient clinic will be built at Travis Air Force Base and will be able to share facilities with David Grant Medical Center.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that my colleague has been more than persistent. The gentleman has developed a base of knowledge and understanding of the needs of the people in all those counties in that huge territory of California. The gentleman has communicated that well to me, and also to people in the Veterans' Administration, as well as our committee, and I appreciate it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the subcommittee Chairman's understanding and support in this matter. As the gentleman well knows, we are talking about a veteran population that is the equivalent of something like 28 or 29 States, so I am glad that we are able to provide for them in this bill by construction funding for a modern outpatient clinic that will, again, enhance our ability to serve the veteran population of northern California.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 44 offered by Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado; amendment No. 65 offered by Mr. STOKES of Ohio; amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. VENTO of Minnesota; amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 17-minute vote. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 239, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]

AYES—184

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Geren
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Longley
Luther
Manzullo
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myrick
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Radanovich
Ramstad
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—239

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Callahan
Camp
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bateman
Collins (MI)
Everett
Hall (OH)
Jefferson
Johnston
Largent
Meyers
Moakley
Reynolds
Yates

□ 2047

Mr. SAWYER and Mr. MASCARA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. DICKEY, STENHOLM, CALVERT, MONTGOMERY, WELDON of Florida, BARR, and EWING changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 235, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

AYES—185

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—235

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert

Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Bateman
Collins (MI)
Hall (OH)
Heineman
Jefferson
Johnston
Largent
Meyers
Moakley
Moorhead
Reynolds
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Yates

□ 2055

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnston of Florida for, with Mr. Largent against.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the nays prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 260, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

AYES—160

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Engel
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mollohan
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—260

Abercrombie
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Bateman
Collins (MI)
Fawell
Hall (OH)
Hancock
Jefferson
Johnston
Largent
Meyers
Moakley
Pelosi
Reynolds
Saxton
Yates

□ 2101

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnston of Florida for, with Mr. Largent against.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 594, I was inadvertently delayed while off the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 266, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

AYES—157

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—266

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Bateman
Collins (MI)
Hall (OH)
Jefferson
Johnston
Largent
Meyers
Moakley
Obey
Reynolds
Yates

☐ 2108

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnston of Florida for, with Mr. Largent against.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies as to what the plans are for the remaining part of this evening.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman inquiring. I, frankly, did not intend to discuss it before he and I could sit down and chat about it, because there is not a deal until the gentleman and I have signed off on the deal.

In the meantime, I have, as the gentleman knows, wanted to get through this evening, if at all possible. It is very apparent that we are going to have difficulty doing that before 2:00 in the morning.

So we are attempting to take a series of items and have time limitations on them that could involve the rolling of a couple of votes and then could involve a couple of, three or four items that would be voted on tomorrow, if the authors of the amendments agreed to roll them over.

Having said that, I do want the gentleman and I to talk about the specifics before we go further. That could get us out of here somewhere close to 10:00 tonight, but the unanimous consent request would also include a provision that we could debate on items like the space station item, like the gentleman's amendment that would eliminate language and so on tomorrow and have the debate limited to those amendments that are in the RECORD now so we could start at 9:00 in the morning and be through for certain by 3:00 in the afternoon.

That is the pattern that we are going in. We are looking at time limits, but I want to discuss it with the gentleman personally before we finally agree to that.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman want additional time for he and I to discuss the matter before we bring something of substance to the other Members?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, if we could proceed on the next amendment and the gentleman and I discuss it, I think that would be helpful. I find the gentleman to be very instructive when I have those discussions.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the next amendment would be the Kaptur amendment and a time limit of 10 minutes on each side, and the gentleman and I could have this conversation, as we go forward.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response.

☐ 2115

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman, I would hope to be able to proceed with

the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], for 10 minutes on each side, if we can get that approved, get this agreed to, and then proceed with the gentleman's colloquy, subsequent to the Kaptur vote.

Mr. TORRES. I would be in agreement with that, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will be asking for a broader unanimous consent request in a few moments, but initially I ask unanimous consent to proceed with the Kaptur amendment, with a limitation of time of 20 minutes, 10 minutes on each side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. The vote would roll until tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would tell the gentleman, that authority on rolling the vote already exists.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KAPTUR: Page 20, line 25, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $234,000,000)''.

Page 21, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $234,000,000)''.

Page 64, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $234,000,000)''.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment we are offering has been redrafted from this afternoon, and I doubt that there will be any points of order that will be able to be raised against the amendment. Essentially what this amendment does is to maintain the successful anti-drug program that has existed since 1988 when Jack Kemp, in the Bush administration, began this program.

In the Case bill, Mr. Chairman, this program was completely zeroed out. During the deliberations of the full committee, I attempted to restore these funds, and we came within five votes of doing so on a bipartisan basis. Sixteen members of the committee were absent for that vote. We went to the Committee on Rules attempting to get a rule that would permit us to offer an amendment concerning this program on the floor.

This is what we are attempting to do this evening. Our amendment will shift $234 million from the Federal Emergency Management Agency's disaster relief account and shift it to the public housing modernization account, where it is earmarked for anti-drug activities. This is a budget-neutral amendment, and in fact, even with our amendment passing, this program will have $54 million less in it than in the prior years during which it has been funded.

I do not think any person in this Chamber could agree with me more when I say that there is no greater scourge affecting our country in every city, town, and neighborhood, than the scourge of illicit drugs and drug trafficking. No Member here wants to be in the position of turning back the progress that has been made in this extremely successful program. Every Member, before they vote, should call their mayor, they should call the director of their local housing authority, and ask them how successful this program has been.

I stood in Chicago when Charlie Hayes served in this Chamber and watched snipers on the roofs of those housing projects in Chicago controlling the activities of thousands of people who lived in those buildings and in the surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Chairman, this program cleans up those streets and projects that were out of control.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE KENNEDY, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio. This is a program that has done an enormous amount of good to housing authorities and tenants in those housing authorities throughout the country.

Just this week I visited two separate housing authorities where the tenants have finally gotten control of the drug dealers and the drug pushers that live in those housing authorities, and been able to move them out. This is the kind of self-determination that we want to see take place in tenant ownership and in tenant determination in these local housing authorities that for the first time gives people a sense that they can take control over their neighborhoods.

Why would we go about trying to cut the program that does the most amount of good, of ridding these programs and projects of the worst tenant occupants, of those who are abusing their neighbors, and give the power to those tenants who want to put some order in their lives, who want to take control over their destinies? That is what these drug enforcement grants do. I think the gentlewoman is to be commended for her persistence in trying to get this taken up today.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I proudly yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman on a very well-purposed and very good program for which she is trying to get some money, but I would say, having lived through Hurricane Andrew down in south Florida, my kids having gone through hurricane Hugo in South Carolina, having looked at what has happened in California with the disastrous earthquakes, FEMA, leave it alone. FEMA is so important. It is an insurance policy. We in the Congress say we know that there are going to be disasters, we know we have to be ready, we know we have to sharpen our ability to be able to react to these national disasters. It is absolutely nothing less than good planning, and it is absolutely imperative that we hold this program together.

The problem of drugs is absolutely out of sight. We need to talk more about it. We need to do more about it, but FEMA has absolutely nothing to do with it. It is absolutely nongermane to the subject matter which the gentlewoman and I are both concerned about. Let us leave FEMA alone. FEMA needs to be left intact. It is nothing less than good planning. I would hope that we would soundly defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's opinion. There are sufficient funds in FEMA to cover natural disasters that have occurred. Would the gentleman agree that there are human disasters occurring every day where drug lords control the neighborhoods in which we live?

Mr. SHAW. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct, and as a matter of fact, tomorrow I am introducing a bill that is going to absolutely cut the underpinnings out of Most Favored Nation status for countries that do not cooperate with us in the war against drugs. I know the gentlewoman would want to take a close look at this particular bill, but FEMA must be left intact.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. CHARLES RANGEL, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who knows more about this terrible, terrible problem than anyone I know.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio. It is really educational to see how the good, decent people from the other side of the aisle seem to believe in everything that we are trying to do here, but not in this bill.

There is no one more dedicated in fighting drugs than my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW]. He is going to try to make certain that the countries producing the drugs do not enjoy a friendly relationship with us. However, talking about national disasters, as an American, what is more of a disaster than seeing a child born in public housing, and just because it is a male, a boy, that we can say that that kid is either going to die or end up in jail before he is 15?

What is more of a disaster than to see a human being that has the same dreams that you and I have, to one day move to decent housing, to get an education and be productive, and all the statistics would say ''Because of color, because of background, and because they are in that public housing, they will never be able to break out.'' What a great national disaster. Secretary Kemp saw it, and he did not see it from the high towers in some building, he went into this public housing, he talked with the parents, and he felt their dreams and tried to do something.

For a lousy $238 million, we are going to say that these kids do not deserve it. What are we talking about? No, it is not jails. That would get the Members excited. It is not mandatory sentences. It is not more cops. That gets the vital juices flowing. It is education, it is mentoring, it is giving someone an opportunity to say that it is not just two strikes against you; that in this country, everyone can make it.

For God's sakes, it is Veteran's Day for Korean war veterans. Can we not do something decent? That side already struck out hope for the homeless, they struck out those that just want to get a house and a picket fence, because the house is located someplace that they cannot get insurance. Do not be dictated to and just say what you cannot do, just break out of it sometime tonight and let the conscience that you have say that you are able to do something. Do not wait for some hope or dreams tomorrow. It may be too late.

This money merely says ''Just because of who you are, just because you were born in the projects, the United States of America will not give up to you.'' Members did not give up on these kids when they went in the Army. Do not do it tonight.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair advise me how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

□ 2130

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] for yielding me the time, and I wanted to commend her for an excellent job in fighting for the drug elimination program in this country. If we were sitting here tonight talking about building jails and prisons and housing facilities, or turning public housing into jails and prisons, there would be little debate on the other side of the aisle, but we are only trying to provide kids with hope and opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I was at the Ordonwood Apartment Complex this past weekend in my own district, and I had an opportunity to meet with kids and their parents and also had an opportunity to meet with the management of that facility. They looked me dead in the eyes and said, ''Congressman FIELDS, it is because of programs like the drug elimination program that we are able to run the drug dealers and drug pushers out of our community.''

Now we are here tonight talking about the very program that is benefiting this housing facility and we are talking about cutting it out. I said earlier on the House floor tonight that we are already cutting out drug-free schools and communities. We are telling kids in public school that we are not going to teach you to say no to drugs; we are just going to say, ''Just say no to drugs,'' but we will not teach about drug education. We are telling kids in public housing that they can use drugs by eliminating the drug elimination program.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, let me just say, in response to the gentleman from Florida who spoke about will the FEMA account be whole, I served on the Committee on Appropriations for three terms now. There are funds in the FEMA account. In fact, we have moved other funds from the FEMA account, because they were unexpended, to other purposes within the bill.

In addition to that, these dollars for the drug elimination program do not spend out at a 100 percent rate, they spend out at a 7 percent rate, which means that the drawdown would be very slow and measured. I think it would be very unwise of us, however, to zero out an account that has been in existence and working since 1988 and having success throughout this country in every State in the Union, in towns and cities whose names you will recognize on this list of beneficiary communities.

In my own community of Toledo, Ohio, I can tell you that in one year the presence of this program resulted in a 20 percent reduction in crime associated with drugs in the neighborhoods that benefited from the program. Security cars, police monitoring, work with the sheriff, all of the various patrols that were necessary have made an incredible difference.

Mr. Chairman, I think that for those of our colleagues who may not be familiar with this program, please think carefully before you vote on this. It is likely your community is on this list. If you are not sure, come and see me, but, in any case, over 2,000 communities across this country are benefiting today. The other dollars in the accounts that exist in this bill have been cut substantially by almost 25 percent.

The dollars are not there for your mayors to choose between will they take care of the homeless when those funds are cut by half or will they deal with drug dealers in these neighborhoods. We must earmark these dollars. The money is there in FEMA. We are not asking for a whole lot. This will make a tremendous amount of difference. Let us put these people in jail and clean up our streets. Please vote ''yes'' on the Kaptur amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this earlier, but the intriguing thing about the amendment of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], which is different than the amendment she had earlier, is that she is recommending that one take $234 million and transfer it from FEMA to the public housing modernization account. That is a reflection of my earlier commentary that we are hopeful that that modernization account will become a vehicle for a new war on drugs in these very same facilities that we are worried about. We are all in the same ballpark in that connection.

Mr. Chairman, the problem lies in that if you take all that money from FEMA, suddenly you have no disaster assistance. If we were actually talking about budget authority instead of outlay, we would be busting the budget and it would not be in order at all. Having said that, we do not want to zero FEMA, and let me suggest why we do not need to.

As we said earlier, within the current public housing modernization accounts, in this year's proposal there is $2.5 billion. Left over in former accounts from former years there is another $6 billion. To say the least, those accounts do not just spend out slowly; the agency has not been very good at using those moneys. Now, I think between the gentlewoman and myself and my ranking member we can encourage them to tap some of that money and make sure it is used for this purpose without having to strip FEMA.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to lessen the commitment any more than the gentlewoman does, but we do not want to find ourselves in a position where we zero out FEMA, and, only because of that, I have to ask for a ''no'' vote on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] will be postponed.

Are there other amendments to title II?

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, if he will please engage me.

As the chairman and I have discussed along with the ranking minority member, there is a contentious provision in the VA–HUD appropriations bill which prohibits funding for HUD in certain instances. HUD would no longer have the ability to investigate under the Fair Housing Act any State or local unit of government that has adopted a law or a regulation requiring the spoken or written word of the English language or declaring English as the official language. This comes as a result of a case in the town of Allentown, PA, which has passed a nonbinding English-only resolution.

After HUD reviewed the case, it determined that there was not any discrimination because the resolution was nonbinding and not an ordinance of fact. Therefore, it was not enforced. The Office of Fair and Equal Housing did its job and the system worked.

Mr. Chairman, this provision in the bill seeks to respond really to a nonissue. I am asking the chairman in this instance whether he could provide some assurances of rather than belaboring this issue here late into the night tonight that we might have some resolution in conference.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will yield, first I very much appreciate the gentleman asking me to enter into this colloquy, for I feel very strongly that the gentleman is on the right track. I think he has described the circumstances accurately. There is not an ordinance, or a local law in place. It is not necessary to have this language. It seems to me as we go to conference in view of that, that we ought to be working to eliminate this language. I feel very strongly that the voice of the gentleman ought to be heard in these matters and I am going to do all that I can to see that it is heard.

Mr. TORRES. I thank the gentleman for his assurances to work on this.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman would yield further, you were describing to me earlier some very specific circumstances relative to a danger sign and otherwise. I think it would be helpful to have some of that concern on the record.

Mr. TORRES. The issue here is at the whole question of English-only provisions, where we have instances, as I am talking about now in public housing, where there may be elderly persons, American citizens, who because of their age have not learned exact English, cannot read difficult, intricate instructions; notice of eviction, notices of an impending tornado coming or a hurricane, or perhaps even a sign. The fact that a sign is written in a non-English language really would give rise to this kind of onerous provision. My point is that we cannot begin to impose these kind of English-only provisions where we have lives at stake, where we have the security and the safety of people in effect. This is the basis for this kind of provision which I do not feel has any place at this time.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to engage with the subcommittee chairman in a colloquy about an often forgotten group of Americans, that is, specifically families that live in colonias along the United States-Mexico border.

Today as we consider this VA-HUD appropriations bill on the floor, I ask my colleagues to seek justice, fairness and equity for the poor American families living in these colonias.

I along with other border area representatives have worked hard to educate our colleagues in Congress about how desperately these colonias need basic infrastructure and sanitation, a lot of things that we that live in neighborhoods throughout this country often take for granted.

The colonias are substandard residential subdivisions located along the United States side of the border with Mexico. Most colonias are unincorporated, low income, primarily Hispanic neighborhoods with substandard housing, unpaved roads and inadequate drainage. Even though we are now in the mid 1990s, these American citizens do not have running water in their homes and are forced to use outhouses or substandard septic tanks in their homes.

The human cost is staggering. The Texas Water Development Board estimates that in Texas alone, there are 300,000 residents living in 1,200 colonias.

Last year, with the help of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], we were fortunate to get congressional funding for the first time for colonia water projects and we appreciated the efforts of my friend the gentleman from Ohio very much.

This year as we work to set priorities and reduce the Federal deficit, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman, for demanding a meaningful commitment to improving the health and environmental conditions along the 2,000-mile Texas-Mexico border.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, first I want my colleagues to know that the gentleman from Texas has been very, very effective in advocating his case regarding this problem, communicating to each of us just how serious it is. The committee's action provides a major step in making sure Americans who live in the colonias are truly part of America. I very much appreciate not just your work but the courtesy and intelligence with which you have shared your problems with me. We look forward to continuing to work with you and help in every way we can.

Mr. BONILLA. I thank the chairman. The committee has allocated $100 million for projects that will address many of these water problems along the border. I would also like to thank the chairman for his work for the concerns of many other Hispanic issues along the border from Texas all the way to California, the gentleman's home State. He has been more than understanding and compassionate as we have dealt with these tough appropriations matters in the last year.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. Chairman, on June 24, a community called Pleasantville in Houston, Texas, some 40 years old, 3,000 families, experienced a warehouse fire just behind their pecan trees, a major warehouse fire of some 500,000 square feet, a warehouse filled with drums holding various chemicals including corrosives, flammables, combustibles, plastics and other hazardous items.

These people had been living in their community for quite a long time and were concerned that they were now neighbors to what might be called a hazardous site. As the gentleman might be aware, I have an amendment proposed. However, I would like to make sure that in discussing this issue with you, and I can share with you the anecdotes or the stories about ''Meeting on Fire Does Little to Douse Residents' Worries'' and ''Residents Fear Rebuilding of Burned Warehouses,'' and, of course, ''More Soil Samples Necessary to be Taken to Check for Contamination.''

But the real issue, Mr. Chairman, is the utilization of Superfund dollars to do emergency cleanups near residential areas. When I say ''near,'' I am talking about your backyard looking at the warehouse.

This is a very close community. Before offering this amendment, I would like to see whether or not we can engage in an agreement to emphasize before the Environmental Protection Agency the importance of emergency cleanups near residential areas and the fastness, if you will, of that cleanup.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, in inquiring of the Environmental Protection Agency to assist us, though they have worked with our State agencies and our local government has worked tirelessly, there was a question of resources and a question of speed. But yet I have these 3,000 families, some of them senior citizens, and I was out there on the day of the fire. Immediately upon hearing of this incident, out to the shelter, out into the neighborhood, I could not breathe.

□ 2145

And there is still an air quality problem and there is still a need for soil

samples and wipe samples. So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see whether we can provide some guidance to the EPA but as well work on this issue with reference to conference.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the gentlewoman bringing this matter to my attention. It is obviously a very serious circumstance. I think the gentlewoman heard me say that one of my difficulties with EPA is sometimes they are not nearly so responsive as I might like. But in Superfund, especially, we have had, to say the least, some major problems with the way that program is implemented.

To suggest that Superfund might be able to be used effectively as an advisor as well as a source of revenue and otherwise to deal with a human circumstance like this tells a different story that is a very important story. I would be more than pleased to work with the gentlewoman and communicate with EPA, but to push them also to be responsive to this serious emergency circumstance.

I might further suggest that FEMA, indeed, could be a source as well and I would like to talk with the gentlewoman carefully about various avenues that we could pursue. My ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is more than responsive to me in these kinds of circumstances and it is my guess that working with the gentlewoman, we together could have an effect and I know that we both would be willing to.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that. The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STOKES, has been stellar in terms of issues dealing with communities, but particularly in mentioning this issue to the gentleman, I was very gratified of his concern.

This has disturbed this community now for a number of weeks in the very hot summer. In fact, they are now on their third blaze on this site. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from California and to the ranking member, Mr. STOKES, I would hope that maybe we could also confer before conference to have this possibly referred there and utilized there.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must say, that the gentlewoman is demonstrating a good deal of understanding of the process by raising the question in this fashion, for should we wait for some preliminary action at least all the way through conference, that could take us to September or October, and Lord knows what happens beyond that.

In the meantime, we ought to be acting on this and I intend to do everything I can, along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], and indeed if we have not come close to helping the gentlewoman solve the problem by then, conference is very appropriate.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the gentleman in that and work as we speak, and that means immediately, in order to solve this problem for this community.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his willingness to work with me, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the ranking member, for his leadership. I think we can get this problem solved and get these folks in Pleasantville, in the City of Houston, the service they need with respect to this hazardous fire and the warehouse situation and cleanup as well.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, there are no additional amendments to title II. I would hope that what we might do is proceed to title III and then move to the DeFazio amendment, as per our earlier agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries; $20,265,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That where station allowance has been authorized by the Department of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be authorized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Commission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of such allowance: *Provided further,* That when traveling on business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces serving as members or as Secretary of the Commission may be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members of the Commission: *Provided further,* That the Commission shall reimburse other Government agencies, including the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of personnel assigned to it.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS–18, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, $40,000,000.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 103–327, the Corporation for National and Community Service shall use such amounts of such funds as may be necessary to carry out the orderly termination of (1) the programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (Public Law 103–82); (2) the Corporation; and (3) the Corporation's Office of Inspector General.

COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Veterans Appeals as authorized by 38 U.S.C. sections 7251–7292, $9,000,000, of which not to exceed $678,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997, shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this head in Public Law 102–229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; $11,296,000, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For research and development activities, including procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; and construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; $384,052,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND COMPLIANCE

For environmental programs and compliance activities, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchases of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; and not to exceed $6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and for travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS–18; $1,881,614,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration pursuant to section 118(h)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That from funds appropriated under this heading, the Administrator may make grants to federally recognized Indian governments for the development of multimedia environmental programs: *Provided further,* That for this fiscal year and thereafter, any industrial discharger to the Kalamazoo Water Reclamation Plant is exempt from categorical pretreatment standards under section 307(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, if the following conditions are met: (1) the Kalamazoo Water Reclamation Plant applies to the State of Michigan for an exemption for its industry and (2) the State or the Administrator, as applicable, approves

such exemption request based upon a determination that there exists an operative financial contract between the City of Kalamazoo and the industrial user and an approved local pretreatment program, including a joint monitoring program and local controls to prevent against interference and pass through: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or expended to implement or enforce section 118(c)(2)(C) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for the implementation or enforcement of the stormwater permitting program under section 402(p) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for the enforcement of permit limits or compliance schedules for combined sewer overflows or sanitary sewer overflows under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to implement or enforce section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for the development and implementation of new or revised effluent limitation guidelines and standards, pretreatment standards, or new source performance standards under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That the limitations on the use of funds set forth in the previous four provisos shall have no force and effect upon enactment of legislation which further amends the named sections of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, in each of the previous four provisos: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to impose or enforce any requirement that a State implement trip reduction measures to reduce vehicular emissions. Section 304 of the Clean Air Act, as amended, shall not apply with respect to any such requirement: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to assign less than full credit for automobile emissions inspections programs required under section 182 (c), (d), or (e) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, on the basis of network design equipment unless the Administrator determines, based on data collected from at least two full cycles of the program, that less than full credit is appropriate: *Provided further,* That beginning in fiscal year 1996 and each fiscal year thereafter, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator is authorized to make grants annually from funds appropriated under this heading, subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall establish, to any State or federally recognized Indian tribe for multimedia or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related environmental activities at the request of the Governor or other appropriate State official or the tribe: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to develop, propose, promulgate, issue, enforce, or to set or enforce compliance deadlines or issuance schedules for maximum achievable control technology standards pursuant to section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, for the category proposed to be regulated at Vol. 59, Federal Register, No. 135, page 36130, dated July 15, 1994, and for purposes of this provision, section 304 of the Clean Air Act shall not apply: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or expended to take any action to extend the risk management plan requirements under section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, to the domestic oil and gas exploration and production and natural gas processing industry: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used by the Administrator or the Administrator's designee for signing and publishing a national primary drinking water regulation for radon and other radionuclei: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used by the Administrator or the Administrator's designee for signing and publishing any proposed national primary drinking water regulation for arsenic: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to issue or enforce any requirement not otherwise authorized under existing law or regulation with respect to combustion of hazardous waste prior to promulgation of final regulations pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding under the Administrative Procedure Act or to impose or enforce any requirement or condition of a permit, including the use of an indirect risk assessment, or to deny a permit pursuant to section 3005(c)(3) of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, unless the Environmental Protection Agency follows the procedures governing the use of authority under such section which it has set forth at 56 Fed. Reg. 7145, note 8, February 21, 1991: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to issue or enforce any regulatory standard for maximum achievable control technology (MACT) for hazardous waste combustion under any statute other than the Clean Air Act, as amended, issue any such standard without first determining that in calculating the MACT floor emission levels for existing sources under section 112(d)(3) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, one-half of the currently operating facilities in the group of sources that make up the floor pool for that category or subcategory actually achieve the MACT floor levels for all of the hazardous air pollutants to be regulated: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to promulgate, implement, or enforce sections 502(d)(2), 502(d)(3), or 502(i)(4) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, against a State which is involved in litigation regarding provisions of title V of the Clean Air Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated or expended to require facilities to submit any data pursuant to section 313(a) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act or section 8 of the Toxic Substances Control Act, as amended, that is not specifically enumerated in said sections, including mass balance, materials accounting, or other chemical use data: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to revoke, or require the issuance of, a food additive regulation under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act for a pesticide in processed food where there is a tolerance established under section 408 of said Act for the pesticide on the raw commodity from which the processed food was made, and may not be used to revoke, or deny the issuance of, a section 408 tolerance for a pesticide on a raw agricultural commodity solely on the basis that a food additive regulation cannot be issued or maintained under section 409 of said Act for the pesticide in a processed form of the commodity: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to exclusively regulate whole agricultural plants subject to regulation by another federal agency: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to obtain a voluntary environmental audit report or to assess an administrative, civil or criminal negligence penalty, in any matter subject to a state law providing a privilege for voluntary environmental audit reports or protections or immunities for the voluntary disclosure of environmental concerns.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $28,542,000.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, $28,820,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111 (c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; not to exceed $1,003,400,000 to remain available until expended, to be derived from general revenues: *Provided,* That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further,* That $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the Office of Inspector General appropriation to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding section 111(m) of CERCLA or any other provision of law, not to exceed $62,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to carry out activities described in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of CERCLA and section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 1996: *Provided further,* That no part of any appropriation made under this heading shall remain available for obligation beyond December 31, 1995, unless the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 has been reauthorized.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $45,827,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That no more than $5,285,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further,* That $426,000 shall be transferred to the Office of Inspector General appropriation to remain available until September 30, 1996.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990,

$20,000,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, and to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not more than $8,420,000 of these funds shall be available for administrative expenses.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE/STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

For necessary expenses for capitalization grants for State Revolving Funds to support wastewater infrastructure financing, and to carry out the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, the Water Quality Act of 1987, and section 1443(a) of the Public Health Service Act, $1,500,175,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,000,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; $100,000,000 for architectural, engineering, design, construction, and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commissions; $50,000,000 for grants to the State of Texas, which shall be matched by an equal amount of State funds from State sources, for the purpose of improving wastewater treatment for colonias; $15,000,000 for grants to the State of Alaska, subject to an appropriate cost share as determined by the Administrator, to address wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages; $22,500,000 for making grants under section 104(b)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; $100,000,000 for making grants under section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; $75,000,000 for making grants under section 1443(a) of the Public Health Service Act; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $137,675,000 for making grants for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities and the development of groundwater in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in the House Report accompanying this Act: *Provided,* That of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327 and in Public Law 103–124 for capitalization grants for State Revolving Funds to support water infrastructure financing, $225,000,000 shall be made available for capitalization grants for State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available under this heading for capitalization grants for State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $50,000,000 shall be for wastewater treatment in impoverished communities pursuant to section 102(d) of H.R. 961 as approved by the United States House of Representatives on May 16, 1995: *Provided further,* That appropriations made available under this heading to carry out the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, shall be available only upon enactment of legislation which reauthorizes said Act.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $4,981,000: *Provided,* That the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall reimburse other agencies for not less than one-half of the personnel compensation costs of individuals detailed to it.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

To carry out the orderly termination of the programs and activities authorized by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Improvement Act of 1970 and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, $1,000,000.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DISASTER RELIEF

For necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), $320,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, $2,155,000, as authorized by section 319 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $25,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $95,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire and purchase of motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343); uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS–18; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency preparedness; transportation in connection with the continuity of Government programs to the same extent and in the same manner as permitted the Secretary of a Military Department under 10 U.S.C. 2632; and not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; $162,000,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $4,400,000.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as amended (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 404–405), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, $203,044,000.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

There is hereby appropriated $100,000,000 to the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out an emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of Public Law 100–77, as amended: *Provided,* That total administrative costs shall not exceed three and one-half per centum of the total appropriation.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, and the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994, not to exceed $20,562,000 for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations, and not to exceed $70,464,000 for flood mitigation, including up to $12,000,000 for expenses under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, which amount shall be available until September 30, 1997. In fiscal year 1996, no funds in excess of (1) $47,000,000 for operating expenses, (2) $292,526,000 for agents' commissions and taxes, and (3) $3,500,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) shall be available for any further work on effective Flood Insurance Rate Maps for the City of Stockton and San Joaquin County, California based on FEMA's restudy of flood hazards on South Paddy Creek, Middle Paddy Creek, Paddy Creek, Bear Creek, Mosher Slough, Calaveras River, Potter A Slough, Potter B Slough, Mormon Slough, and the Diversion Channel.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall promulgate through rulemaking a methodology for assessment and collection of fees to be assessed and collected beginning in fiscal year 1996 applicable to persons subject to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's radiological emergency preparedness regulations. The aggregate charges assessed pursuant to this section during fiscal year 1996 shall approximate, but not be less than, 100 per centum of the amounts anticipated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency to be obligated for its radiological emergency preparedness program for such fiscal year. The methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable, and shall reflect the full amount of costs of providing radiological emergency planning, preparedness, response and associated services. Such fees will be assessed in a manner that reflects the use of agency resources for classes of regulated persons and the administrative costs of collecting such fees. Fees received pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts. Assessment and collection of such fees are only authorized during fiscal year 1996.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Information Center, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,061,000, to be deposited into the Consumer Information Center Fund: *Provided,* That the appropriations, revenues and collections deposited into the fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Consumer Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of $7,500,000. Administrative expenses of the Consumer Information Center in fiscal year 1996 shall not exceed $2,502,000. Appropriations, revenues, and collections accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1996 in excess of $7,500,000 shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Consumer Affairs, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $1,811,000: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that Office may accept and deposit to this account, during fiscal year 1996, gifts for

the purpose of defraying its costs of printing, publishing, and distributing consumer information and educational materials; may expend up to $1,100,000 of those gifts for those purposes, in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated; and the balance shall remain available for expenditure for such purposes to the extent authorized in subsequent appropriations Acts: *Provided further,* That none of the funds provided under this heading may be made available for any other activities within the Department of Health and Human Services.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of human space flight research and development activities, including research; development; operations; services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, and modification of real and personal property, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft; $5,449,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided,* That of the funds made available under this heading, $390,000,000 of funds provided for Space Station shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 1996 and shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the conduct and support of science, aeronautics, and technology research and development activities, including research; development; operations; services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation and modification of real and personal property, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft; $5,588,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

MISSION SUPPORT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out mission support for human space flight programs and science, aeronautical, and technology programs, including research operations and support; space communications activities including operations, production, and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, environmental compliance and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); travel expenses; purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft; not to exceed $35,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase (not to exceed thirty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $2,618,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $16,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Human space flight'', ''Science, aeronautics and technology'', or ''Mission support'' by this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations for construction of facilities as authorized by law, the amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended. This provision does not apply to the amounts appropriated in ''Mission support'' pursuant to the authorization for repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and facility planning and design.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Human space flight'', ''Science, aeronautics and technology'', or ''Mission support'' by this appropriations Act, the amounts appropriated for construction of facilities shall remain available until September 30, 1998.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Mission support'' and ''Office of Inspector General'', amounts made available by this Act for personnel and related costs and travel expenses of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall remain available until September 30, 1996 and may be used to enter into contracts for training, investigations, cost associated with personnel relocation, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

No amount appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be used for the lease or construction of a new contractor-funded facility for exclusive use in support of a contract or contracts with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under which the Administration would be required to substantially amortize through payment or reimbursement such contractor investment, unless an appropriations Act specifies the lease or contract pursuant to which such facilities are to be constructed or leased or such facility is otherwise identified in such Act. The Administrator may authorize such facility lease or construction, if he determines, in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next appropriations Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities.

The unexpired balances of prior appropriations to NASA for activities for which funds are provided under this Act may be transferred to the new account established for the appropriation that provides funds for such activity under this Act. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the newly established account and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund to be available for the same purposes and under the same terms and conditions.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall convey, without reimbursement, to the State of Mississippi, all rights, title and interest of the United States in the property known as the Yellow Creek Facility and consisting of approximately 1,200 acres near the city of Iuka, Mississippi, including all improvements thereon and also including any personal property owned by NASA that is currently located on-site and which the State of Mississippi requires to facilitate the transfer: *Provided,* That appropriated funds shall be used to effect this conveyance: *Provided further,* That $10,000,000 in appropriated funds otherwise available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be transferred to the State of Mississippi to be used in the transition of the facility: *Provided further,* That in consideration of this conveyance, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may require such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems appropriate to protect the interests of the United States: *Provided further,* That the conveyance of the site and the transfer of the funds to the State of Mississippi shall occur not later than thirty days from the date of enactment of this Act.

The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall conduct a study of the closing or re-structuring of Space Flight Centers and Research Centers. The study shall include an analysis of functions currently being performed at each Center, the cost of performing each function at its current location and at logical alternative Centers, the schedule for transitioning functions to alternative Centers, and the overall cost savings which will be derived from the closing or re-structuring of each Center. The findings of the study, including a detailed schedule for completion of the re-structuring, shall be submitted to the Congress no later than March 31, 1996. Closure or re-structuring of these Centers shall be completed no later than October 1, 1998.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

During fiscal year 1996, gross obligations of the Central Liquidity Facility for the principal amount of new direct loans to member credit unions as authorized by the National Credit Union Central Liquidity Facility Act (12 U.S.C. 1795) shall not exceed $600,000,000: *Provided,* That administrative expenses of the Central Liquidity Facility in fiscal year 1996 shall not exceed $560,000.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880–1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; $2,254,000,000, of which not to exceed $235,000,000 shall remain available until expended for Polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program; the balance to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided,* That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further,* That to the extent that the amount appropriated is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT

For necessary expenses in carrying out major construction projects, and related expenses, pursuant to the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), $70,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ACADEMIC RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE

For necessary expenses in carrying out an academic research infrastructure program pursuant to the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended

(42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education and human resources programs and activities pursuant to the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $599,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That to the extent that the amount of this appropriation is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary salaries and expenses in carrying out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $9,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $127,310,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under salaries and expenses in fiscal year 1996 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $4,490,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION HEADQUARTERS RELOCATION

For necessary support of the relocation of the National Science Foundation, $5,200,000: *Provided*, That these funds shall be used to reimburse the General Services Administration for services and related acquisitions in support of relocating the National Science Foundation.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), $38,667,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 4101–4118) for civilian employees; and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; $22,930,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by the Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the DeFazio amendment with a time agreement of 10 minutes per side with votes thereon to be rolled, likely until tomorrow.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. Although one amendment was proposed, it was found to not be germane. It will be 10 minutes on the underlying amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there could be a perfecting amendment that would be found out of order.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO: Page 8, line 9, strike ''$16,713,521,000'' and insert ''$16,725,521,000''.

Page 79, line 23, strike ''$22,930,000'' and insert ''$6,000,000''.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the issue before us is the issue of Selective Service, a vestigial bureaucracy of the cold war. The subcommittee in its wisdom eliminated funding for the Selective Service, reduced it by $17 million, with the idea that the agency itself would be eliminated.

My amendment would reduce the funding by $17 million, but put the agency into deep standby; that is, give it an opportunity to enter into the late 20th century and develop off-the-shelf technology in case of the remote happenstance of a conscription in a national emergency, that they could go forward, but not continue the postcard registration that is in effect today.

Mr. Chairman, from the beginning there has been no military necessity for Selective Service and the registration, the roster report. Jimmy Carter's 1979 Director of Selective Service found that 8 to 10 days could be saved by registration, but that because of the bottleneck at the training facilities, not one troop would be delivered one day sooner to the battlefield, and of course that day would not cutback very much on training.

In the Department of Defense a 1993 report found that there was no military necessity for continuing draft registration. This is an opportunity to save $17 million over the outyears, that is $102 million in our 7-year objective to balance the budget, which I support.

For this year, we would move $17 million into the underfunded VA medical account. We would also eliminate an unfunded mandate. It is an unfunded mandate, because every university in every jurisdiction that administers a college or student loan program is required to determine whether or not those students have registered for the draft and are currently registered for the draft and whether their address is current.

So we have an opportunity to eliminate a bureaucracy which has no national security purpose and to save funds. This is a great opportunity for this House to go on record, as the House did 2 years ago for 1 month, until we ceded to the Senate, that this is a bureaucracy whose time has passed. We can save money and remove the burden of draft registration from our young people.

Mr. Chairman, patriotism does not come in a postcard, unless you have some bizarre Publisher's Clearing House view of what constitutes patriotism and Selective Service. This is the postcard every young man between 18 and 25 must fill out every time they move.

It is time to do away with this bureaucracy and cede to the economic realities.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not stand on this floor and protect Federal spending very often. As a matter of fact, in the last several weeks, I have voted to cut projects in my own district because it is so serious that we get this budget balanced.

This is an important issue. This is national defense. The Joint Chiefs of Staff oppose this amendment. The Committee on National Security, the committee of jurisdiction, opposes it. The National Security Advisor opposes it. President Clinton opposes it.

But let me read a letter, just in case my colleagues do not see through the subterfuge of abolishing this department and putting the money into veterans affairs. The American Legion and the veterans organizations do not want that money put over there. They want the program protected.

Mr. Chairman,

The American Legion strongly opposes the amendment proposed by PETER DEFAZIO. The American Legion supports the retention and full funding of the Selective Service registration program as being in the best interests of all Americans.

The Selective Service System is a proven, cost-effective, essential and rapid means of reconstituting the required forces to protect our national service.

Let me read you the most important part:

Removing this rite of passage for a young man would reduce each man's level of consciousness about military service and obligation to defend our country.

I want my colleagues to go home this August break. I want them to go into their offices where the recruitment offices are right next door and I want my colleagues to ask the recruiters. They are having trouble today getting young men and women to voluntarily serve in our all-voluntary military.

Mr. Chairman, these lists are very important tools. We have high schools that will not let recruiters on campus; we have colleges that will not let recruiters on campus. These lists are where we get the names to tell these young men and women what an honorable career it is to serve in the U.S. military in service to their country.

Mr. Chairman, that is why we need to preserve this measly $16 million. It is money well spent for the national security of this country.

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

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and I were at the dedication today on the 42d anniversary of the Korean war where Mr. Clinton delivered a beautifully written speech about how important it was to preserve liberty in South Korea.

I thought it was equally important to preserve it in South Vietnam, but at the end of the debate, when we are out of the Committee of the Whole, I will put in the whole text of Bill Clinton's letter to the Commander of the ROTC on December 3, 1969.

Here is what he says about the draft. He says,

The draft was justified in World War II, because the life of the people, collectively, was at stake. Individuals had to fight, if the Nation was to survive, for the lives of their countrymen and their way of life. Vietnam is no such case, nor was Korea an example.

Clinton had exceptions with Korea in spite of his remarks today, and he certainly had exceptions with Vietnam. But remember, Clinton did register for the draft. His problems came much later.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following article for the RECORD.

TEXT OF BILL CLINTON'S DECEMBER 3, 1969 LETTER TO ROTC COLONEL

I am sorry to be so long in writing. I know I promised to let you hear from me at least once a month, and from now on you will, but I have had to have some time to think about this first letter. Almost daily since my return to England I have thought about writing, about what I want to and ought to say.

First, I want to thank you, not just for saving me from the draft, but for being so kind and decent to me last summer, when I was as low as I have ever been. One thing which made the bond we struck in good faith somewhat palatable to me was my high regard for you personally. In retrospect, it seems that the admiration might not have been mutual had you known a little more about me, about my political beliefs and activities. At least you might have thought me more fit for the draft than for ROTC.

Let me try to explain. As you know, I worked for two years in a very minor position on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I did it for the experience and the salary but also for the opportunity, however small, of working every day against a war I opposed and despised with a depth of feeling I had reserved solely for racism in America before Vietnam. I did not take the matter lightly but studied it carefully, and there was a time when not many people had more information about Vietnam at hand than I did.

I have written and spoken and marched against the war. One of the national organizers of the Vietnam Moratorium is a close friend of mine. After I left Arkansas last summer, I went to Washington to work in the national headquarters of the Moratorium, then to England to organize the Americans here for demonstrations Oct. 15 and Nov. 16.

Interlocked with the war is the draft issue, which I did not begin to consider separately until early 1968. For a law seminar at Georgetown I wrote a paper on the legal arguments for and against allowing, within the Selective Service System, the classification of selective conscientious objection for those opposed to participation in a particular war, not simply to ''participation in war in any form.''

From my work I came to believe that the draft system itself is illegitimate. No government really rooted in limited, parliamentary democracy should have the power to make its citizens fight and kill and die in a war they may oppose, a war which even possibly may be wrong, a war which, in any case, does not involve immediately the peace and freedom of the nation.

The draft was justified in World War II because the life of the people collectively was at stake. Individuals had to fight, if the nation was to survive, for the lives of their countrymen and their way of life. Vietnam is no such case. Nor was Korea an example where, in my opinion, certain military action was justified but the draft was not, for the reasons stated above.

Because of my opposition to the draft and the war. I am in great sympathy with those who are not willing to fight, kill and maybe die for their country (i.e. the particular policy of a particular government) right or wrong. Two of my friends at Oxford are conscientious objectors. I wrote a letter of recommendation for one of them to his Mississippi draft board, a letter which I am more proud of than anything else I wrote at Oxford last year. One of my roommates is a draft resister who is possibly under indictment and may never be able to go home again. He is one of the bravest, best men I know. His country needs men like him more than they know. That he is considered a criminal is an obscenity.

The decision not to be a resister and the related subsequent decisions were the most difficult of my life. I decided to accept the draft in spite of my beliefs for one reason: to maintain my political viability within the system. For years I have worked to prepare myself for a political life characterized by both practical political ability and concern for rapid social progress. It is a life I still feel compelled to try to lead. I do not think our system of government is by definition corrupt, however dangerous and inadequate it has been in recent years. (The society may be corrupt, but that is not the same thing, and if that is true, we are all finished anyway.)

When the draft came, despite political convictions, I was having a hard time facing the prospect of fighting a war I had been fighting against, and that is why I contacted you. ROTC was the one way left in which I could possibly, but not positively, avoid both Vietnam and resistance. Going on with my education, even coming back to England, played no part in my decision to join ROTC. I am back here, and would have been at Arkansas Law School because there is nothing else I can do. In fact, I would like to have been able to take a year out perhaps to teach in a small college or work on some community action project and in the process to decide whether to attend law school or graduate school and how to begin putting what I have learned to use.

But the particulars of my personal life are not nearly as important to me as the principles involved. After I signed the ROTC letter of intent, I began to wonder whether the compromise I had made with myself was not more objectionable than the draft would have been, because I had no interest in the ROTC program in itself and all I seemed to have done was to protect myself from physical harm. Also, I began to think I had deceived you, not by lies—there were none—but by failing to tell you all the things I'm writing now. I doubt that I had the mental coherence to articulate them then.

At that time, after we had made our agreement and you had sent my 1–D deferment to my draft board, the anguish and loss of my self-regard and self-confidence really set in. I hardly slept for weeks and kept going by eating compulsively and reading until exhaustion brought sleep. Finally, on Sept. 12 I stayed up all night writing a letter to the chairman of my draft board, saying basically what is in the preceding paragraph, thanking him for trying to help in a case where he really couldn't, and stating that I couldn't do the ROTC after all and would he please draft me as soon as possible.

I never mailed the letter, but I did carry it on me every day until I got on the plane to return to England. I didn't mail the letter because I didn't see, in the end, how my going in the Army and maybe going to Vietnam would achieve anything except a feeling that I had punished myself and gotten what I deserved. So I came back to England to try to make something of this second year of my Rhodes scholarship.

And that is where I am now, writing to you because you have been good to me and have a right to know what I think and feel. I am writing too in the hope that my telling this one story will help you to understand more clearly how so many fine people have come to find themselves still loving their country but loathing the military, to which you and other good men have devoted years, lifetimes, of the best service you could give. To many of us, it is no longer clear what is service and what is disservice, or if it is clear, the conclusion is likely to be illegal.

Forgive the length of this letter. There was much to say. There is still a lot to be said, but it can wait. Please say hello to Col. Jones for me.

Merry Christmas.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, practically speaking, the draft and draft registration is a waste of scarce tax dollars, a waste of $17 million this year alone. The draft itself will likely never serve our national security needs, especially in an era of high-tech weapons and computerized weapons systems.

That is speaking practically. Speaking philosophically, unless war is declared, indicating an overwhelming support by the American people, a peacetime draft is totally inconsistent with our national tradition.

Many of those who arrived on our shores and built this great land of liberty were escaping despotism, the despotism of their native lands, which more than anything else was signified by the tyranny of conscription. Only during the cold war was a peacetime conscription tolerated in the United States, and even then, after two decades, it was abandoned with the support of Richard Nixon, Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Chairman, it is long overdue that we quit wasting money on this anachronism which has nothing to do with the security of our country and everything to do with egos that are trying to prove a point in an argument that should have ended over 20 years ago.

Finally, the American military is a fine example, a shining example, of volunteerism. The strength of our country is in its love of liberty and freedom. Our military today represents that love of liberty because they are volunteers.

Liberty will be safe as long as our people who serve this country, the brave men and women who volunteer, are willing to do so. We should honor them by trusting our people, and we will be free as long as they stand strong and we stand behind them.

We stand for the principles of liberty and justice and democracy that brought people to these shores 200 years ago at the founding of our country.

□ 2200

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO]. The Selective Service System is working well; it is not broke, it does not need fixing. I would say that the system is an insurance policy against the unknown.

We did not know what would happen in the Persian Gulf war. We almost had to go back to the draft because when you have a war, young men and women do not come in and volunteer.

We need this system; it is in place. It does not cost a lot of money; it costs less than one Apache helicopter. We have 11,000 volunteers around the country working for the Selective Service. They believe in it.

Mr. Chairman, the young men of this country, 98 percent of them, have signed up when their time came. When they have reached 18, they have gone right to the Post Office, they have signed up with the Selective Service System. They like to carry the card; it is a patriotic duty and they appreciate it.

So let us vote down the DeFazio amendment and move ahead with other important issues.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the DeFazio amendment. I support the actions of the full Appropriations Committee to provide $23 million for the Selective Service System for fiscal year 1996.

This funding is an inexpensive insurance policy against the unknown. We ought to keep that policy in force.

It has the bipartisan support of the House Republican and Democratic leadership, President Clinton, and the Department of Defense.

It is also backed by all the Nation's military and veterans organizations, as well as the more than 11,000 Selective Service volunteers across America who will make the process work if it is activated.

And while this is a relatively small amount of money, decisions regarding the future of this agency should not be budget-driven at all. They should really be considered on national security grounds.

Since early in this century, we have always had an organized capability to plan for, and to conduct, a draft in a crisis. It has served us well. Now is not the time to terminate that capability.

Registration is a quick and easy process that has always been accepted among our 18 year olds. The compliance rate has been steady at 98 or 99 percent over the years.

I believe the young people look upon this as a patriotic duty, and that they would be ready to answer the call, if we faced a national crisis.

Funding the Selective Service System does not promote a military draft. I don't support a draft. The all-volunteer force has worked, and continues to work in our Nation's defense. But no one can predict when we might have another war.

If this country were forced into a full-scale crisis, we would need more people than our scaled-down all-volunteer force could provide.

We simply would be unable to quickly mobilize large numbers of people without the Selective Service System.

We all hope our country never again faces an national emergency, but we ought to be prepared for such an action. Selective Service provides us that ability.

It is efficiently run and its computerized data base can mobilize large numbers of people in a short period of time.

If we cut this funding for Selective Service today, it could take a year or more to start up again in a crisis. That might be too late in a national emergency.

Can we afford to gamble that our country will never again face a national crisis? I think the answer is no. We have an inexpensive hedge against such a crisis with the Selective Service System. Let's keep it. Oppose the DeFazio amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the DeFazio Selective Service amendment.

You know, the world is a dangerous place today. We see hot spots all over the world, in a mode of uncertainty for all of us. It is important that we have a ready defense.

Mr. Chairman, let me read from the President's May 18, 1994, letter to the Speaker of the House in which he says,

I have decided that it is essential to our national security to continue draft registration of the Selective Service system. While tangible military requirements alone do not currently make a mass call-up of American young men likely, there are three reasons I believe we should maintain the Selective Service and the draft registration requirement.

Maintaining that system provides a hedge against unforeseen threats.

Terminating this system now can send the wrong signal to our potential enemies.

As fewer and fewer members of our society have direct military experience, it is increasingly important to maintain the link between the all-volunteer force and our society at large.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to the DeFazio amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] in offering this amendment to end peacetime draft registration.

Mr. Chairman, it pains me to oppose my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] on this issue as I consider the gentleman one of the most patriotic Members of this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the VA–HUD appropriations bill includes $23 million for Selective Service. The Selective Service, as we know it today, was created by President Carter to respond to fears that regional conflicts of the Soviet Union would grow and lead to a superpower showdown. The national defense structure at that time had been gutted and allowed the volunteer Armed Forces to fall to dangerously low levels.

No wonder we created a peacetime draft. We could not get Americans to volunteer for service.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the case today. This Congress has made a commitment to a strong national defense. We intend to keep military personnel equipped and ready to fight.

We have over 1 million active duty troops. We have over 1 million trained Select Reservists, and we have almost 800,000 Standby Reservists. We have 3 million volunteers, young men and women ready to give their lives in defense of America's freedom.

In almost 10 years of the Vietnam war, just under 2.5 million Americans were sent to the combat area; one of every four of those young Americans were drafted. In 10 years we did not send the number of volunteers that can be deployed from our shores today.

Mr. Chairman, I use this example to show that the amendment will not leave the U.S. defense vulnerable. We have 3 million volunteers ready to fight. By cutting $17 million, this amendment leaves $6 million to keep an on-the-shelf system that would in a short period of time be able to augment the volunteer Armed Forces. The $17 million will be transferred to add to the veterans' medical care.

Mr. Chairman, let me sum this up. This amendment is prodefense because

instead of feeding a useless bureaucracy, it adds funding to care for the men and women who have defended our liberty. I ask, which is better, to create a strong fighting force or a bloated Federal bureaucracy?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Nation's veterans, vote yes on this amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], a World War II veteran, and both of his sons served in the Persian Gulf war. I am pleased to yield to him.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring another perspective to this debate. One is that I served in the Navy at the end of World War II and then I served during the Korean war. I was in the Reserves in between. One of the regrets of my life is that I never got to register for the draft.

Mr. Chairman, the perspective in my area, though, is we have high schools waiting for ROTC, we have colleges waiting for ROTC. Registering raises the consciousness of our youth, and I think that it is a pride.

Mr. Chairman, I know that there is a technical aspect to it to have to enlist and to be prepared, but it adds to our young people's consciousness that we have a country, that we have fought wars, and that there may be the possibility of other wars.

I think that the money is very little for the effort that is done mostly by volunteers, but I think the young people deserve the opportunity to show that they want to serve their country.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeFazio amendment. It transfers $17 million from the Selective Service account to the VA medical care account.

The opposition to this amendment argues that the Selective Service is a visible symbol of national security, a symbol that we need to protect. Well, $23 million is an awfully expensive symbol. The Department of Defense has stated, and I quote, ''Peacetime draft registration could be suspended with no effect on military mobilization requirements.''

I will repeat that. The Department of Defense: ''Peacetime draft registration could be suspended with no effect on military mobilization requirements.''

Mr. Chairman, the Pentagon goes on the say that with over 1 million trained members in Select Reserve units, plus another 750,000 individual Ready Reserve personnel, we already have the ability to augment active forces through the early days of a major conflict.

If we want a real symbol of patriotism, let us honor those veterans who have made the sacrifice for our Nation. Let us show veterans who have made the ultimate offering that this country has not forgotten them.

Mr. Chairman, we just dedicated a memorial to our veterans of the Korean war, showing our praise and thanks to American servicemen. We must not let them think that in just a matter of hours, we have forgotten the sacrifices they made.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to help VA medical and vote for those veterans to whom we owe so much.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we have lost sight of first principles. This country was founded on the spirit of liberty, that what we give to our country, we give voluntarily.

The Peace Corps voluntary service is voluntary. The draft is not in the spirit of American liberty. It was a concession, a concession to danger and to reality. For most of American history, we did not have it, and then we blessed ourselves as different from the tyrannies of Europe that had it.

Mr. Chairman, for the last 50 years of war, hot and cold, we had to have it, of necessity. But now we do not. We have 2 million men and women under arms, as much as the rest of the planet combined. We would have plenty of time to prepare and to reinstitute a draft if some other nation began arming to match us with supposed danger. There is no danger that justifies this departure from our traditions of liberty.

Mr. Chairman, let us remember what this country is about. A draft, a Selective Service System is obnoxious to the spirit of liberty and ought not to be maintained except as a concession of danger which does not now exist. So I support the amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I am going to reserve the balance of my time to close. I believe I have 1 minute.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER], a Vietnam hero veteran.

Mr. TANNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke yesterday on the floor on what I thought was a short-sighted amendment. But may I say to my friends, and I understand the arguments on the other side, but I would say in this new world order, this is probably one of the most short-sighted amendments we could adopt, and I say that for this reason: None of us can see the future. All of us know, realize, and understand that one of our roles as the United States of America today is as the leader of the free world.

The least we can ask of our citizens, our young people in this country is to register. Most of our NATO allies have compulsory service. We ask only for registration. Mr. Chairman, I say to my friends, that is not too great a price to pay for our liberty.

I would hope that we would reject this amendment out of hand. I used to serve in the Selective Service; we would have a ready pool if something untoward happens in this world. None of us can see the future, and I hope we reject this ill-timed amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield my last minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], a great patriot and a great American.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] on this issue, because I believe that having a Selective Service System in place maintains American readiness, and that is the crucial issue. If we do not have a Selective Service System in place, we would have to reconstitute it, if we had to go to a draft, and it would take a long period of time to do that, at least 2 years.

So I would tell the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] that all those veterans that we all support in terms of health care would much prefer the country being prepared, keeping this tool in place.

What is the compliance rate? Ninety-nine percent of our young people have been willing to register without any objection. So this is a good tool, a good mechanism, and I think it keeps our country prepared.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the outstanding gentleman from New York City [Mr. FLAKE], a longstanding member of this body.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that some would consider this to be a peculiar time and a peculiar moment for me to be standing on the Floor. One of the things I have done is, I have analyzed the problems that have developed in this Nation. For the African-American community in particular, I would suggest that one of the worst calamities ever to happen was the elimination of the draft.

Mr. Chairman, I am a civil libertarian. But I also understand one thing, that when African-American young men can be taken off street corners, put into a disciplined environment, be able to leave their corner and understand there is a bigger world for them; when they come back they have a sense of discipline, they have an understanding of what it means to be able to make a contribution not only to their own lives, but to the lives of others.

□ 2215

They learned discipline. They learned what it meant to be able to take care of their responsibilities, and they got two major benefits: They had an educational benefit so that they could get

an education; and they had an opportunity to purchase their first asset, which was a home.

Mr. Chairman, I believe tonight when we talk about eliminating the Selective Service System, one of the problems I have is when we spend so much money building jails, we ought to consider that we ought to do more to put these young people in a situation where they could do something positive.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, let me just say to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, Mr. FLOYD FLAKE, amen, amen, amen. Yes, they do. They learn a little pride, they learn a little patriotism, they learn how not to use drugs, they even get a little religion. Is that not wonderful for this country?

Please vote against the DeFazio amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, we are getting a little afield here. This is not about reinstating the draft. We are not about that. The military does not want it. In fact, the Department of Defense has said peacetime draft registration, not conscription, could be suspended with no effect on military mobilization requirements.

Ronald Reagan said, ''I believe this proposal, draft registration, is an ill-conceived one and should be rejected. Advance registration will do little to enhance our military preparedness.'' That was from Ronald Reagan and the Department of Defense.

If this is what we think brings patriotism and citizenship to our kids, not good schools, not decent housing, and all the other things we are eliminating here on the floor, this is an opportunity to eliminate an obsolete Federal bureaucracy and put in place a standby system which uses modern computer technology, if indeed a calamity ever comes, and if indeed we ever have to go back to conscription, which I do not believe we will, but we will have that as a standby system.

This is 1940's technology. This is not citizenship, except in some bizarre Publisher's Clearinghouse view of the world where you send in a postcard every time you move. That is not teaching our young people the values that we need to instill.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment to eliminate the Selective Service System. The sponsor says that his amendment does not terminate the program, but puts it on standby. To me, this effectively terminates the program.

How do you put an organization which has a standby function for our armed forces on standby? You don't and you can't—because it destroys the very concept of readiness. If we should require a draft, how would you select people to serve? Would you choose those who are tall? Would you choose those with red hair? No, you would have a fair and equitable system to determine who would volunteer, and that system takes a great deal of time to develop and maintain.

Unfortunately, we have not achieved the goal of world peace. Chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons have created a dangerous atmosphere of conflict and potential for casualties for which DOD may not be prepared. As such, DOD officials recommend the draft as a way to meet such challenges by ensuring a high quality and quantity volunteer force.

Simply put, the DeFazio amendment puts our Nation and our freedom at risk. I urge a no vote on the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida to the amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO: Strike the first paragraph and insert the following:

Page 12, line 2, strike ''$183,435,000,'' and insert ''$195,455,000,''.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired for debate. Does the gentleman from California insist on his point of order?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Is the chairman telling me the gentleman has no time on his amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The time was limited under the unanimous consent agreement to the amendment and all amendments thereto. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, we do not know what the gentleman's amendment does. I think the membership ought to know, in case we want to argue for or against the point of order. The gentleman ought to have a chance to explain.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida, Mr. WELDON, be given two minutes to explain his amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I simply would inquire if the gentleman gets unanimous consent for 2 minutes to offer his amendment, does anybody get a minute or two in case they want to comment or oppose it?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] propounded a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the intent of my amendment was very simple. Although many areas of the country have adequate medical facilities for veterans, some areas do not. My amendment simply would shift the money to the VA construction account instead of the general medical account as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] has proposed. Simply put, my amendment would direct these funds to the most needy veterans, the veterans who currently have no medical facilities.

As a veteran and as a physician who has provided medical care to many of these veterans, I understand the acute need for the underserved communities. Today there are 250,000 veterans living in east-central Florida that are in great need of a veterans medical facility. Without the adoption of my amendment to the amendment, these 250,000 veterans, who gave of themselves for our freedom, and other veterans in underserved areas, will see little improvement in their veteran-scare.

The veterans in these areas are the most underserved in the Nation, and we have a responsibility to fulfill our commitments to them. If we are going to transfer money from the Selective Service to meet the needs of veterans, we should transfer it to serve the most needy veterans. Voting for the Weldon amendment will do this.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, there is a point of order for lack of germaneness against my amendment, so I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time. I appreciate the chairman's recognition.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] will be postponed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment, but pending a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], I will withhold on that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what the amendment was about was adding $429,000 to the Court of Veterans Appeals. The $429,000 was cut by the committee from the 1995 appropriation level. According to the Chief Justice of the Court of Veterans

Appeals, this cut will kill the pro bono legal program for low income veterans, as well as further delay hearings and timely decisions on all claims appealed to the court.

I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] about his intentions regarding the sum of money.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague cooperating, with the time difficulties we have as well as the problem the gentleman is attempting to draw our attention to.

Frankly, the amount of money the gentleman is talking about is a very small amount of money in this entire picture. I am personally willing to commit to the gentleman that I will work very hard in conference to try to restore that money, and bring it to the attention of the appropriate members of the Senate side as well.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, does the gentleman think we have a good chance to capture this money?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, out of all the money we are talking about here, that is almost a drop in the pond. I would be surprised if we could not satisfy the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to language appearing at page 56 of the report for this appropriations bill. The language in question attempts to influence the Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] implementation of the Reformulated Gasoline Program [RFG]. This language tells the EPA that it should refrain from spending any funds on the pursuit of creating a market share for specific oxygenates. This is unfortunate; it is vital that the EPA has the flexibility to deal with renewable fuels in reformulated gasoline in the manner which the EPA feels is most productive.

The tragedy of the situation is that the petroleum industry and this report disregard the importance of renewable fuels and attempt to dissuade the EPA from acting responsibly. In fact, recent technological developments and a range of economic, environmental, and national security externalities have an important bearing on the value of using oxygenates which are derived from a domestically produced source. Every school child knows that there is a very limited supply of easily obtainable fossil fuel. Therefore, developing renewable fuels is vital. Corn-based ethanol has become more abundant; the engineering needed for cost-effective development is emerging. It is a win-win situation when the balance of payments, the environment, the agricultural economy, rural economic development, and reduced dependence on energy from distant, politically volatile sources of petroleum supply can all be promoted at one time.

Unfortunately, most of these factors are not valued in today's market. Nonetheless, there are vast costs which we are absorbing in the form of tax dollars and societal costs.

Report language from an appropriations subcommittee is not the appropriate place to make critical decisions about renewable fuels. Such decisions deserve public input and the attention of the entire House of Representatives. Certainly, the EPA should have the ability to pursue a fair role for renewable fuels in the reformulated gasoline program. This cannot be influenced by obscure, staff-prepared language in a report accompanying an appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, No. 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS: Page 87, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 519. (a) CONTRACTOR CONVERSION.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall cease any further hiring in the Agency's Office of Research and Development, and shall maintain the funding of all existing scientific and technical support contracts at not less than the current level.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 1996, the head of the Office of Research and Development of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to the Congress a report on all staffing plans including the use of Federal and contract employees.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires that the administrator of EPA cease all further hiring in the agency's Office of Research and Development [ORD] for the purposes of the contractor conversion initiative as laid out in last year's VA/HUD Appropriations bill.

This amendment is necessary to prevent EPA from further eroding the employment base of four well respected private sector companies who have been providing contract support to EPA's office of research and development.

Last year, Congress provided EPA with resources and direction in the fiscal year 1995 VA/HUD appropriations bill to improve the agency's contracts management. Unfortunately, the Office of Research and Development has mishandled the resources provided to it and ignored the direction of Congress. My amendment serves to soften the blow to those private sector companies providing contract support.

In fiscal year 1995 EPA received an increase in its authorized personnel ceilings by 900 positions. Of that number, 265 positions were provided to the Office of Research and Development. This increase runs contrary to the administration effort as well as this Congress' efforts to reduce the size of Government and has not addressed the weaknesses in EPA contracts management as it was intended to do. These weaknesses were identified by the Congress and the EPA inspector general.

Of the 265 positions allotted to ORD, only 32 were directed to address the identified contracts management problems. The remaining 233 positions have been used to augment the ORD workforce in four Government labs. During this time, ORD has undergone an internal reorganization by merging these labs into four ''mega-labs''. The 233 positions were directed to the mega labs under the leadership of an EPA employee. This individual had the sole responsibility for coordinating the contractor conversion activities at EPA and they have used their authority to raid EPA's private contractors.

The situation as it stands now is that four well respected private professional service contractors have lost significant business and stand to lose even more if we do not halt ORD's actions. The result has not been improved contacts management or reduced costs for the Government, it has been bigger bureaucracy. This amendment stops this grievous action.

Of the companies raided by EPA, one is a small business and another is minority owned. In the case of the minority owned firm, after 10 years of hard work building a successful business, the firm saw 75 percent of its total workforce hired away by EPA. In the case of the small business, it lost 22 of its 33 employees to the agency's actions. This is a prime example of the big Government that so many of us were elected to stop.

This amendments puts a hold on any further hiring in EPA's Office of Research and Development for the purposes of carrying out the contractor conversion efforts required under the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act of 1994.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support America's small and minority businesses by putting an end to EPA's actions.

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

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] want to amend his language?

Mr. DAVIS. I believe the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has an amendment.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of California to the amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS:

In subsection (a) of the amendment strike the words ''and shall maintain the funding of all existing scientific and technical support contracts at not less than the current level''.

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 2330

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not know what the second amendment is.

Continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] to find out what this amendment is.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes the second part of the first paragraph, the words ''and shall maintain the funding of all existing scientific and technical support contracts at not less than the current level.'' I do not think the chairman would have any problem with that.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as I understand what the gentleman is doing, he is leaving only the first part of the amendment and striking the second part of the amendment and, in striking the second part, he is striking the part which freezes existing contracts; is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to accept the perfecting amendment. I think this amendment clarifies the original intent of my amendment which is to put a stop to EPA's practice of hiring away employees from their contractors.

The language the gentleman strikes from my amendment was intended to ensure that EPA does not take retribution against these same contractors who have been harmed by EPA's inappropriate actions. I would, therefore, like to get the gentleman's assurances, that if EPA does take punitive action against three contractors, the gentleman would be willing to revisit this issue.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman that I would be greatly disturbed if EPA takes any action that could be construed as retribution against these contractors.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I will happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Davis-Moran amendment to the VA, HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill. The amendment would freeze internal hiring in EPA's Office of Research and Development in the hope that current contracting levels would be maintained.

It might be useful to provide a bit of background because this amendment is in direct response to actions taken by the agency regarding the implementation of its contractor conversion initiative. In fiscal year 1995 EPA requested an additional 900 FTE's and $44.6 million for its contractor conversion initiative and received appropriations to start the initiative. This budget request was initially prompted by criticism about EPA's use of contractors, especially with regard to some contractor abuses. I have listened to endless testimony concerning contractor reimbursement of Rolex watches and reindeer suits. No one here believes that taxpayers should be footing the bill for these items. However, it has never been clear to me that the way to ameliorate the problem is to hire more EPA employees. In a time when we are looking to downside the government, we have EPA hiring up. In a time when we are looking to rely more on the private sector, we have EPA relying less on the private sector. This doesn't make a whole lot of sense just because we have accountability problems with a few bad apple contractors.

Now we are not hearing from private contractors that EPA is offering their employees full time government jobs and shutting down their companies. Many of the positions being filled by EPA don't even fit the definition of inherently governmental positions which were the positions of most concern. In a letter from EPA, the agency indicated that contractor size and performance were not factors in the decision-making process, and in addition admitted that the initiative has indeed negatively impacted some small and minority-owned businesses and that only 26 of the 265 positions being filled by ORD were inherently governmental.

Given this information, it leads one to ask—what are we doing? Is this just a quick fix to address some contracting abuses and get Congress off our backs?

I urge my colleagues to support the Davis-Moran amendment and provide EPA a time out to re-examine this conversion initiative.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman. If this bill goes forward in a reasonable fashion and becomes law, I would guess it would be time out for awhile.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that we inform the Members on what is happening here, because I am concerned that some Members may have gotten the impression that there will not be votes yet tonight and unless something else happens there will be. So we need to get this tied down. I wonder if we can do that before we have lots of Members on both sides of the aisle in massive confusion.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this in the middle of somebody's vote on an amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to stop if we can get an understanding that as soon as the discussion on this amendment is completed, we will immediately inform all Members about what is going to happen for the rest of the evening.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to do so. At this moment I would urge Members not to presume there are no more votes tonight. We are attempting to get to that point, however.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the author of the amendment, I want this committee to know what is going on here.

EPA has a long history of having used contractors. Very frankly, the contractors are a sorry lot. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations last year investigated them. I want you to hear what the contractors did with the taxpayers money, the money that we are charged with protecting.

Frankly, this amendment should be called the Corrupt Contractor Protection Act of 1995. It tells EPA that it cannot save money. In fact, it tells in its original form that EPA must spend money on contractors in the office of research and development.

First of all, we found that the contractors were cooking the research. We found that they were playing games politically in support of the Clean Air Act and Clean Air Act in its strongest and, I think, particularly unacceptable form to my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

Now, the contractors, it should be known, enjoyed a very good living at the expense of the taxpayers. They charged the taxpayers with reindeer suits, with clown suits, with Santa Claus costumes. These were all charged to the taxpayers. They charged the taxpayers for golf outings and golf balls. They charged the taxpayers for chocolate bars with the contractor's logo on them. They bought lots and lots of alcohol. They had lots and lots of parties.

They had entertainment of all sorts. They spent money on tickets for Johnnie Limbo and the Lug Nuts. They used the taxpayers' money to finance trips by an assortment of persons to Alaska on fishing junkets.

The money which was spent by the contractors was spent under not only improper circumstances but most curious circumstances, because in many instances they were charged by the former EPA with the responsibility of opening the mail, of negotiating contracts, which they negotiated with themselves. In many instances they paid themselves for work which was not done.

They kept records which were incapable of being audited. They threw Christmas parties. They did work under contracts which never existed and paid themselves lavishly for the privilege.

Now, this amendment in its original form would sanctify that kind of behavior. It would permit those scoundrels who had been doing those things that we are supposed to be cleaning out of the public purse to do the same thing which they had done before under the same conditions.

I do not believe that this House wants to have that kind of situation.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia for striking the language which would keep these scoundrels hooked up to the public teat.

But I do want you to understand one thing, that to foreclose EPA from the privilege of firing them is bad, but to now not allow EPA to retain enough people on its own payroll to see to it that the public work is properly done is enormously unwise.

Let me remind you that the work which is involved here is work which involves research on important questions like air pollution, like whether or not your constituents are violating the air pollution laws or whether what the consequences of a particular Superfund dump might happen to be.

I think those are important questions. And we are entitled to have the utmost integrity, truthfulness and ability brought to bear on those kinds of questions. To allow contractors who can come in here and impose upon Members of this body who know nothing about the history of contractor misbehavior is wrong. To permit them to continue to prosper at the taxpayers expense on the kind of sorry, shoddy record of serious misbehavior which should have sent the whole lot of them to jail is, I think, extremely unwise and improper on the part of this body in which we are a part.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DINGELL moves the Committee do now rise and report the bill back with the enacting clause stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want my colleagues to understand. At issue here is not whether we like contractors or whether we have got them in our districts. It is not whether or not we like government or do not like government. The question is really whether we are going to write law which is in the broad public interest. The question is also whether or not we are going to see to it that corrupt practices in government contracting, investigated by congressional committees and document under oath before those congressional committees, are properly respected by this body and that the recommendations are properly carried out. By driving the money changers from the temple and by seeing to it that EPA can properly administer its affairs.

Those are the questions. Frankly, the amendment, as originally drawn, should be rejected. Very frankly, the amendment as it was amended, and I fought to oppose it, because it is better than what was there. And I am sure my colleagues on this side are going to vote for it in spite of the fact that it is unwise to do so. It is a hard and unfortunate fact, my colleagues, that what is at foot here is just that a bunch of contractors do not like getting shoved away from the public trough. They wanted to stay there and keep on doing the same things which they have done in times past, paying themselves for work not done, doing work without contracts, claiming that there were contracts where in fact none exist, showering upon themselves and their friends the joys of being unsupervised in the expenditure of public moneys, hiring Johnnie Limbo and the Lug Nuts, buying lots of alcohol, dressing in reindeer suits, and pretending to do something of value.

Now, just one little story. When we were working one night late trying to come together between the House and the Senate with my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues alike, we tried to get some of these contractors to provide the information that we needed on a very important question; namely, the question affecting the implementation of the clean air sections of the law. Members should know that we could not find any of them, and we could not get any cooperation.

We finally got information which was carefully cooked, carefully cooked to suit the environmentalists an to write legislation which made it much harder for American industry and American workmen, American business and the American economy. I want Members to understand what happens when these sly, slick, sneaky contractors come in here and they want the Congress to give them special relief.

Congress ought not give them special relief. They do not deserve it. As a matter of fact, what they deserve is a comfortable period of time in an appropriate Federal institution during which they might think of the wrongs which they have done to the taxpaying public of the United States.

The amendment is a bad one, even as amended. I urge Members to support the amendment as amended. And if they really want to do some good, I urge them to vote against the whole darn thing.

□ 2245

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I unfortunately did not know this debate was going to occur, but I rise in support of the gentleman from Virginia and his amendment, as amended or not. I have a great respect for and am a very close friend and ally of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. The gentleman from Michigan has done a great deal of good in ensuring that people who do business with the Federal Government do not in fact defraud the taxpayers of our country, or in fact do not do jobs for which they contract, or do not in any way abuse their responsibilities.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, the situation to which the gentleman's amendment refers is perverse in the extreme, in my opinion. That is that we ask people to contract with the Federal Government, put together their capital, place that capital at risk, hire employees, and undertake an objective that the Federal Government wants accomplished, and contracts towards that end.

Then it has turned around in one of the most perverse ways that I have seen and in fact said, ''We are going to cancel your contract for the convenience of the Government, and guess what? We are going to take all the employees that you recruited, that you paid money to train, that you put on your payroll, and accrue them to ourselves, and you are out of business.''

Mr. Chairman, I do not take a back seat to anybody on this floor, not one, in the defense of Federal employees. On the other hand, I do not take a back seat to anybody in saying that we ought to side with Federal employees against private sector employees. This is a partnership, not a competition, not where we want to choose one side over the other. What we want to do is ensure a compatible, fair, and just environment for both of those groups to effectively perform their duties.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment speaks to a very serious problem, and it is not the problem that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] speaks to. The gentleman from Michigan has been, as I said earlier, one of the great champions of ensuring against fraud of the taxpayer and of our Government.

Are there those out there who would do that? There are. Does the American

taxpayer in this country need a vigorous and tough and hard-as-nail watchdog? It does, and the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, fills that bill. One the other hand, Mr. Chairman, in pursuing that objective to undermine businesspeople who are doing a fair and honest job is wrong. That is what the gentleman from Virginia seeks to address. I applaud his efforts and support them.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been working for 9 months to correct an injustice that was done as a result of this appropriations bill that was passed last year. I have been trying to find out what the source of the problem was, and it became apparent tonight who is responsible for it, but I am glad I had an opportunity to hear from my very distinguished chairman and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, on what motivated him to do this, because I do not disagree with any of the points that the gentleman from Michigan made.

I had an amendment that I offered before the Committee on Rules, it was not made in order, that went much further than this particular amendment. I suspect that the gentleman from Michigan would have gotten much more excited had it been made in order. However, it is the gentleman from Michigan who should be making this amendment. Let me explain why.

Last year this appropriations bill provided 265 positions to correct just the very contract management problems that my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, identified through his oversight Committee on Energy and Commerce. That was the purpose of those positions, hard-fought-for positions; unprecedented to give an agency in a time of reinventing government 265 more positions.

Do Members know what the Environmental Protection Agency did once they got those 265 positions? Obviously, they had the same big smile that is on the face of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, tonight, because they sent out a guidance memo internally within EPA that said, ''These positions are not to be used to correct contract management performance problems.''

Had they been used for the purpose for which they were appropriated, this amendment would not be necessary and there would not have been any injustice done, but they were not. What happened is that EPA went out after four small contractors and they raided them. Listen to this, now.

One of those was a minority contractor for 10 years. They had put their company together. They went in and bought out 75 percent of his employees. Another one that served EPA for 20 years had gotten a top quality award just last year. In September they had their contract renewed for another year. The appropriations bill passed in October. EPA went immediately to those employees, after the contract had been renewed, took their private pay stub, and converted it to a Federal paycheck. They hired all but 12 of this contractor's people. They had received a quality award. They were not guilty of any of these problems, but they went in and hired them. This company had been worth $50 million, and it is virtually worthless today. Imagine if you were that small business employer, and the Federal Government had come in and raided your employees?

There is one individual in EPA, and I think this probably best explains why EPA went about this the way they did. He had a small office. He was responsible for monitoring these contracts. He now has 160 people reporting to him, and they are people that were working in the private sector who had been converted: scientists, engineers; not management people, not the people that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] was after. They were scientists and engineers that had been gathered to perform a specific function, and EPA went in and bought them out, telling them that they had no choice. Mr. Chairman, he told them they had no choice, they would lose their jobs if they did not become Federal employees.

At a time when we are trying to reinvent government, we have the Federal Government going in, raiding four firms, four small contractors, all of them with top performance ratings, and that is how they used the 265 people. There was a gross injustice, it was a perversion of what was intended, and it should be overturned by supporting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and to enter into a discussion, a colloquy, some people say, but a personal conversation with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, and I have been endeavoring to try to put on some reasonable debate on a variety and mix of amendments in order that we could accomplish a couple of things; originally to get us out of here by 10 o'clock tonight, and that was very successful; but also to have the Members help us realize that the more we can restrain ourselves tomorrow, the more likely it is, even if we should come in at 9 o'clock tomorrow, that we will be able to get out of here by 3 o'clock in the afternoon. I thought that we were going toward limiting a certain number of amendments that would give us an assurance of being out. I think instead now we are going to ask for some time limitations. I know full well we will be coming back in with a full plate in the morning and encouraging the Members to restrain themselves then.

Otherwise, while I will be urging that the Speaker and others limit 1-minutes in the morning very severely, I would further be suggesting that we might have to work late into the evening, for we do intend to finish this bill tomorrow. It is not necessary that we go beyond 3 o'clock, but there is a tendency for us to multiply amendments when we take 12 hours to think about them.

With that, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and I have discussed this between ourselves and with friends.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each of the following amendments and any amendments thereto be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and opponent of an individual amendment: The first is amendment No. 48 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for 20 minutes, 10 minutes on each side; the second is the amendment No. 26 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], for 20 minutes; and in all these cases, it is divided equally on each side; third, amendment No. 57 offered by the gentleman form Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], for 50 minutes; fourth, amendment No. 66 offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], for 90 minutes; fifth, amendment No. 55 or 56 offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] or the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], for 20 minutes; sixth, amendment No. 7 offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], for 40 minutes. There is no particular order, but nonetheless, those would be the amendments being considered, and it does not limit other possibilities of amendments.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, that is right. So we have a complete understanding, these are the amendments upon which we have a time limit, is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I would say to the gentleman, that is right.

Mr. STOKES. We do not go further than that. The gentleman has already stated that the manner in which he read the agreed-to amendments will be in no prescribed order?

Mr. LEWIS of California. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, that meets our agreement.

Mr. DINGELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I do not think I will, I did not hear some of the other amendments raised.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, that is because we are doing nothing with the other amendments. They are printed in the RECORD, they are subject to discussion, and we will be talking about those with the gentleman in the morning. It is an open rule.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman forgive me about being sensitive?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I have learned very much from the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I feel my amendment might just get lost in the shuffle, but I am sure the gentleman will want to assure me that the amendment I want to offer on the Superfund will not be foreclosed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. It will not be foreclosed, and certainly the last person I want to get lost in the woods or the shuffle is the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I doubt that I will object, but I did want to ask the chairman, at what point will our amendment No. 2, the one that was rolled until tomorrow morning concerning drug elimination, at what time in the proceedings might that come up tomorrow, please, in view of these recently announced time limits?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, we have actually not talked that through, but I can tell the gentlewoman that it would be my intention to have us in a circumstance where there are no more than four amendments, that were being packaged together, and the gentlewoman's would be among the early package, so sometime shortly after we get moving in the morning. I am informed it is up the discretion of the Chair, but if the gentlewoman would be some indication as to what she would prefer, I certainly would work toward that end.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it should also be pointed out in this conversation that because it is apparently the understanding that there will be no votes before 10, that that may affect in some way the number of votes that do occur at one time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I could.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 2300

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, just one additional question.

In our early discussions, I had mentioned to you the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS], which he wants to propose. That is not one of the agreed-upon amendments, but have you been advised of his intention to propose that amendment?

Mr. LEWIS of California. That is correct.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman for responding. I would hope that, as you discussed, that our amendment concerning drug elimination would be one of the first votes in the morning, since we discussed that at length today and I think the Members are waiting for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Since the Chair would determine the order of the votes, the gentlewoman's amendment would be the first amendment voted on.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the Chairman. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, just so Members can understand, my understanding is that if this unanimous-consent is agreed to, there are no additional votes tonight.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I need to include in this unanimous consent request the rolling over of those amendments, those votes outstanding, but that would be my intention.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has that authority and, obviously, would be very compassionate in that regard.

Mr. SABO. Is that the intent of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it would be the intent of the Chair. There are two votes pending at this time that had rollcall votes requested, the amendment of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] and the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Ms. KAPTUR. To further clarify, Mr. Chairman, in no case would either of those votes occur before 10 o'clock tomorrow morning; is that my understanding?

The CHAIRMAN. At this point that is the Chair's understanding. The Chair was not a party to any decision on that, but at this point that is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, it would be a part of the request, but, Mr. Chairman, further, I want the Members to know that presuming this is approved and there would be no further votes tonight, there would be a colloquy between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], and that would be the end of the business this evening.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it needs to be understood by Members that the understanding was that the majority party wished to come in at 9 o'clock tomorrow, and that in return for that happening, there would be an agreement that while there might be discussion of the amendments cited by the gentleman from California, that, in fact, there would be no votes occurring before 10 a.m.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request is amended to reflect that no votes will occur before 10 a.m.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. Chairman, in the current budget climate, all federal agencies need to reevaluate their priorities, the efficiency of their regulations, and their relationships with States. We cannot afford to expend limited resources without achieving commensurate environmental or public health gains.

One area of concern, that I believe requires congressional action involves EPA's development of new ''Phase III and Phase IV land disposal restrictions'' requirements under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. On March 2, 1996, when the Agency proposed the Phase III requirements, EPA itself pointed out that:

> [T]he risks addressed by this rule, especially [underground injection control] wells, are very small relative to the risks presented by other environmental conditions or situations. In a time of limited resources, common sense dictates that we deal with higher risk activities first, a principle on which EPA, members of the regulated community, and the public can all agree. Nevertheless, the Agency is required [by a court decision] to set treatment standards for these relatively low risk wastes and disposal practices during the next two years, although there are other actions and projects with which the Agency could provide greater protection of human health and the environment.

I understand that my esteemed colleague from Ohio, Congressman OXLEY, has introduced a corrections bill, H.R. 2036, that would overturn the Chemical Waste Management court decision, which required EPA to undertake this rulemaking.

Mr. OXLEY. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct in his understanding. Section 2 of H.R. 2036 is designed to prevent the imposition of burdensome requirements on wastewater treatment systems and deep injection wells that already are thoroughly regulated and

permitted by the States and EPA under the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act. Essentially, my bill would authorize EPA to take the course of action that it originally chose. When the Agency first issued its LDR regulations, the Agency concluded that imposing treatment requirements on these types of nonhazardous waste management systems ''would not provide further protection to human health and the environment,'' and would cause ''considerable disruption at facilities that EPA generally considers safe.''

Mr. MCINTOSH. How much does EPA estimate that it would cost to impose the rule required by the court's decision, which would provide little or no environmental or public health gains?

Mr. OXLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, EPA's regulatory impact analysis places the cost of this rule at somewhere between one-half billion dollars and three-quarters of a billion dollars each year. That is too steep a price to pay for wasteful and duplicative regulation when those resources could do so much more to protect human health and the environment if used elsewhere. Frankly, if the supermandate in H.R. 1022, the Risk Assessment and Cost-Benefit Act, were law, we would not be facing a rule which EPA, itself, believes is so extraordinarily wasteful.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Again, Mr. Oxley, I commend you for introducing H.R. 2036. Hazardous waste land disposal restrictions should not be imposed on wastes being managed in units that are permitted under the Clean Water or Safe Drinking Water Acts; nor should land disposal restrictions intended for hazardous wastes be imposed on nonhazardous wastes. Your bill would allow EPA to redirect its scarce resources to actions and projects that would achieve the greatest overall benefit for the costs incurred.

I commend the gentleman for that legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. COMBEST, 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. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–208) on the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON H.R. 2127, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–209) on the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

□ 2310

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2092

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 2092, the Private Security Officer Quality Assurance Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA ON CASTING HIS 14,000 VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and privilege that I rise to announce that U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, senior senator from West Virginia, earlier today became the first U.S. Senator in history to cast 14,000 votes in the Senate. This 14,000th vote gives Senator BYRD a 98.7 percent voting average over his 37 years of service in the Senate.

This voting record covers only Senator BYRD's Senate service, not the years he also served in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Senator BYRD's first vote in the Senate, cast on January 8, 1959, was very fitting: It was a vote on Senate procedures. Since then, Senator BYRD has become a national celebrity, is recognized as the Senate's ''historian in residence,'' and he is recognized as the uncontested expert in the country on the Senate as an institution, about which he has published four volumes, and as a nationally known expert on parliamentary procedure in that body.

During the 37-year period in which the 14,000 votes were cast, Senator BYRD has served as: Secretary of the Senate Democratic Conference. Senate Majority Whip, Senator Majority Leaders, Senate Minority Leader, and President Pro Tempore.

Senator BYRD is not only a giant among men in the Senate, he is a giant among men in the Nation. He has been an integral part of the high drama and history of the second half of the 20th century, including the cold war, Vietnam, Watergate, Iran-Contra, and the collapse of the Soviet Union. He has served in the Senate under nine Presidents—through assassinations and resignations.

Today, the Senate paused to recognize and honor Senator BYRD for his extraordinary leadership and for having attained the milestones in his legislative career that brought him to his 14,000th vote.

Those milestones are: Being only one of three U.S. Senators in American history to have been elected to seven 6-year terms; being the first sitting Member of either House of Congress to begin and complete the study of the law and obtain a law degree while serving in the Congress; being the first person to carry every county in the State of West Virginia (55 of them) in a contested statewide general election; being the only person in the history of West Virginia to ever serve in both chambers of his State legislature and both Houses of the U.S. Congress; obtaining the greatest number, the greatest percentage, and the greatest margin of votes cast in statewide, contested elections in his State; being the first U.S. Senator in West Virginia to win a Senate seat without opposition in a general election; and serving longer in the U.S. Senate than anyone else in West Virginia history.

Mr. Speaker, all these milestones of achievement are remarkable in and of

themselves, and we honor Senator BYRD for them.

But his greatest feat will always be the dignity he has brought to the U.S. Senate every day of his life, throughout his tenure there.

He is a gentle but firm leader, who has the ability to share, in his writing and vocally, his deep and abiding reverence for the Senate as an institution. Each week, Senator BYRD offers a history lesson on the floor of the Senate, addressing his colleagues on the floor and the Nation that may be watching C-SPAN, on the importance of knowing, and observing and above all respecting, the traditions of the Senate, its rules of engagement and the parliamentary procedures, that govern it as an institution.

Tonight I wish to join my voice with the voices of his Senate colleagues, those in his beloved West Virginia and all our Nation in paying tribute to West Virginia's senior Senator.

And so it is with great personal honor, and with the highest esteem, that I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia for having become the first U.S. Senator in history to cast 14,000 votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, a gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON MEDICARE

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. Mr. Speaker, it was 30 years ago today that Medicare passed the House of Representatives, and even in 1965 Republicans did not support the program.

Their record on Medicare has been clear and is illustrated with this chart that we have here. At the time when Medicare was voted upon in 1960, 97 percent of Senate Republicans voted against creation of the Medicare Program; in 1962, 86 percent of Senate Republicans voted against creation of the Medicare Program; in 1964, 85 percent of Senate Republicans voted against creation of the Medicare Program; and then in 1965, 93 percent of the House Republicans voted to replace Medicare with their voluntary, no guarantees substitute. The rest of the chart indicates the remainder of the Republican record 30 years ago.

Even the lead Republican presidential contender today, Senator BOB DOLE, voted against the passage of the Medicare Program when he was in Congress 30 years ago this very day. And now that the Republicans are in control of Congress, one of their first acts is to dismantle the program that has assisted so many senior citizens in living a longer and decent life.

As many know, the Republicans seek to cut $270 billion from the Medicare Program, costing senior citizens over a $1,000 in additional costs per year. Republicans claim that these cuts will not hurt senior citizens, but if health costs continue to rise faster than the growth in Medicare to seniors, then they will either get less services or pay more money. It is that simple.

Of course the Republicans have not discussed the specific details of their Medicare plans, because they are afraid to tell seniors what will happen with the $270 billion in cuts that they have proposed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge senior citizens to ask their Congressmen how these $270 billion in cuts will affect them, because if these cuts were not going to hurt seniors, then the plans would have been announced before a budget number was chosen.

Instead, the Republicans are reforming Medicare backwards by arbitrarily picking $270 billion, the largest Medicare cut in history, and hiding the true facts from seniors. When Medicare was passed 30 years ago today, most Republicans said that it was not needed. Mr. Speaker, the facts could not be more clear.

I would like to illustrate the positive impact that the Medicare Program has had on the lives of senior citizens through a few illustrations that we have here today.

The first chart talks about the poverty rate for the age, which has dropped since 1967. If you look at the figures, for the general population and the senior population since the time Medicare was enacted, you can see the significant drop in the poverty rate for senior citizens.

□ 2320

Mr. PALLONE. Next we would like to show the drop in the death by stroke, which is indicated on this chart. For those over 65, rates have fallen by 63 percent in the years between 1960 and 1991, basically the 30-year or so period that we are talking about since the beginning of Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, death by heart disease has also dramatically decreased. For those over 65, rates have fallen by 40 percent in the years between 1960 and 1991, again from the beginning of the debate on Medicare until relatively recently.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the next chart will show the number of seniors who have health coverage. In 1959, only 46 percent of America's seniors had health care coverage before Medicare was enacted, and of course this year in 1995, after Medicare and after 30 years of the program, 99 percent of America's senior citizens now have health care coverage.

Mr. Chairman, instead of realizing these benefits, unfortunately, Republicans want to gut Medicare to meet their other backward promises. One plan that the party is floating is the voucher plan, which would basically limit the health care coverage of senior citizens. This plan will give seniors substandard health care, unless they have the ability to spend money out of their own pocket to pay for better coverage.

Mr. Chairman, another plan would force seniors into managed care. Some people know them as HMO's. Many seniors are happy with their doctors and are not ready to be told which doctors they can or cannot seek, which is often the case with HMO's or other managed care programs.

Life before Medicare for senior citizens was a world of poverty, low life expectancy and despair. Medicare has played an integral role in seniors' lives by not forcing them to choose between health care, food or shelter. Unfortunately, the Republicans want to take us back to the days when seniors had to make those unfortunate choices.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to read one story from a New Jersey resident who submitted testimony for the record during the Committee on Ways and Means debate on Medicare during the early 1960's, because I think it illustrates the problems that many senior citizens had before the enactment of the Medicare program. This person testified before the committee on Ways and Means and said, ''I hope and pray that I do not live long enough to be a senior citizen. It is very hard for me to beg. I would rather do without, whether it is food, medicine or a doctor. Only severe pain or an emergency would get me into a hospital. I control my condition with pills''.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just hope and pray that the Republicans realize how vital Medicare is to every senior citizen. Those who cannot remember the past are unfortunately condemned to repeat it, but hopefully, we will not see it repeated with the Medicare Program being gutted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FRANK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. UNDERWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MINK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair at.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF EMERGENCY MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON RULES ON H.R. 1555, TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPETITION AND DEREGULATION ACT OF 1995, AND S. 21, BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA SELF-DEFENSE ACT OF 1995

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the minority, we are announcing that there will be an emergency meeting of the Committee on Rules tomorrow morning on two bills, H.R. 1555, the telecommunication legislation, and S. 21, the Senate bill concerning Bosnia. Those two hearings will follow the defense appropriation bill and the health and human services appropriation bill hearings tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. We would notify the Members again tomorrow morning.

We would also call attention that if Members do have their amendments filed in the record of tomorrow, Friday, that they could very possibly receive preferential treatment in the Committee on Rules and/or on the floor by the manager of the bills.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 12:30 p.m. and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 8 p.m., on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAHALL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWNBACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SEASTRAND, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EHRLICH.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. MARTINI.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, in two instances.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, in two instances.

Mr. DREIER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAHALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SKELTON in two instances.

Mr. FILNER.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. FROST.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WYDEN.

(Mr. DORNAN, and to include extraneous material, immediately following his remarks on the Selective Service amendment to H.R. 2099 in the Committee of the Whole today.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 28, 1995, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1268. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in June 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1269. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report entitled ''Leadership for Change: Human Resource Development in the Federal Government,'' pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1270. A letter from the Director, Financial Services, Library of Congress, transmitting the activities of the Capitol preservation fund for the 9 months of fiscal year 1995, which ended June 30, 1995, and comparable data for the same period of the previous fiscal year; to the Committee on House Oversight.

1271. A letter from the Chairman, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting the 1994 annual report for the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation [PADC], pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 880(a); to the Committee on Resources.

1272. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's 16th annual report to Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 18a(j); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1273. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the 82d quarterly report on trade between the United States and China, the successor states to the former Soviet Union, and other title IV countries during January-March 1995, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2440; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1274. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement aspects of the Department of Transportation budget request for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2126. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–208). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2127. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 2123. A bill to accelerate capitalization of the savings association insurance fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. PORTMAN):

H.R. 2124. A bill to enhance the competitiveness of the United States in the global economy through the establishment of the U.S. Trade Administration as an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, Banking and Financial Services, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. COX, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. BAKER of California):

H.R. 2125. A bill to provide for the termination of the present Small Business Administration and certain of its functions, to establish a Small Business Administration in the Department of the Treasury and an Office of Small Business Advocacy in the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida;

H.R. 2126. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 2127. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CANADY of Florida (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HOKE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BONO, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DREIER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MICA, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BASS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. BALLENGER):

H.R. 2128. A bill to prohibit discrimination and preferential treatment on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex with respect to Federal employment, contracts, and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Government Reform and Oversight, and House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 2129. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that the requirement of marking of imported articles and containers not apply to spice products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 2130. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to improve the efficiency and operation of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation in order to better to ensure that farmers, ranchers, and rural home owners will have access to a stable and competitive supply of mortgage credit now and in the future; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FIELDS of Texas (for himself, Mr. FRISA, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 2131. A bill to amend the Federal securities laws in order to promote efficiency and capital formation in the financial markets; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 2132. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals who are active participants in neighborhood crime watch organizations which actively involve the community in the reduction of local crime; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MINETA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. JACOBS):

H.R. 2133. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to improve the effectiveness of administrative review of employment discriminations claims made by Federal employees; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DOOLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DORNAN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2134. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to allow employees in classified positions in community colleges to serve in certified or other academic capacities; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 2135. A bill to provide for the correction of boundaries of certain lands in Clark County, NV, acquired by persons who purchased such lands in good faith reliance on existing private land surveys; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2136. A bill entitled the ''Yellowstone Brucellosis Free Management Act''; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself, Ms. DUNN of Washington, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H.R. 2137. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to require the release of relevant information to protect the public from sexually violent offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution condemning the refusal of the Indonesian officials organizing the World Archery Championships in Jakarta, Indonesia, in August 1995 to permit a team from Israel to participate in the competition under the name of Israel and under the flag of Israel, and urging the Government of Indonesia to join in condemning this manifestation of racism and anti-Semitism; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution regarding recognition of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 359: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 390: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 528: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 530: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 784: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. FORBES, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 820: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 862: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 873: Mr. BASS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. Rivers, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 995: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 1073: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 1074: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 1133: Mr. COBURN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 1386: Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1446: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1500: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 1533: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1662: Mr. WILSON, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MCHALE, and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1733: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1744: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 1762: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1818: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1840: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1856: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ROTH, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 1898: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1963: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1972: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1986: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 1994: Mr. FORBES, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2013: Mr. FORBES and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2019: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 2026: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2039: Mr. KING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 2072: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. KLECZKA.

H. Con Res. 47: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. DINGELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Res. 36: Mr. FILNER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2092: Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2099

OFFERED BY: MR. DORNAN

AMENDMENT NO. 71. Page 88, line 3, add ''Sec. 519. None of the funds under this Act shall be used for the Senior Environmental Employment Program.''

H.R. 2099

OFFERED BY: MR. ENSIGN

AMENDMENT NO. 72. Page 87, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 519. The amount otherwise provided in title I of this Act for ''DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS—VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—MEDICAL CARE'', the amount otherwise provided in title III of this Act for ''NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT'', and the amount otherwise provided in title III of this Act for ''NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES'' are, respectively, increased to a total of $16,961,000,000, reduced by $89,500,000, and reduced by $100,000,000.

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 1. At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the procurement of Army projectiles, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such procurement is in compliance with the Competition in Contracting Act.

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. CARDIN

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill (before the paragraph designating the short title of the bill), insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in the administration of section 7299a of title 10, United States Code, to carry out a policy with respect to solicitation of offers for ship depot maintenance work that defines the concept of the ''homeport area'' of naval vessels in a way that would preclude a port that is within 160 miles of a naval facility that is the home port of a vessel from being treated as being within the homeport area of that vessel.

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. DORNAN

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the appropriate place in title VIII of the bill (relating to general provisions), insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer any policy that permits the performance of abortions at medical treatment or other facilities of the Department of Defense, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. GUNDERSON

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of title II, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following section:

SEC. . Of the funds made available in this title under the heading ''HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES'', $9,426,000 is available for carrying out the activities of the Office of Rural Health Policy. Of the amount made available in this title under such heading, $824,092,000 is available for carrying out the program for the Health Centers Cluster.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. GUNDERSON

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of title II, after the last section (preceding the short title) the following section:

SEC. . Of the amount appropriated in this title under the heading ''AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH—HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH'', $9,426,000 is transferred and made available for carrying out the activities of the Office of Rural Health Policy.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 21, strike lines 1 through 7 (relating to OSHA ergonomic protection standards).

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 59, line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through ''Act'' on page 60, line 1 (relating to NLRB and salting).

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 60, line 1, strike the colon and all that follows through ''evidence'' on page 61, line 2 (relating to NLRB section 10(j) authority).

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. POSHARD

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of title II, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following section:

SEC. . Of the funds made available in this title under the heading ''HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES'', $9,426,000 is available for carrying out the activities of the Office of Rural Health Policy. Of the amount made available in this title under such heading, $824,092,000 is available for carrying out the program for the Health Centers Cluster.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. POSHARD

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of title II, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following section:

SEC. . Of the amount appropriated in this title under the heading ''AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH—HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH'', $9,426,000 is transferred and made available for carrying out the activities of the Office of Rural Health Policy.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in titles I, II, and III of this Act may be used to provide any direct benefit or assistance to any individual in the United States when it is made known to the Federal official to whom the funds are made available that—

(1) the individual is not lawfully present in the United States, and

(2) the benefit or assistance to be provided is other than emergency medical assistance, public health immunizations, or short-term emergency, in-kind no-cash disaster relief.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) None of the funds made available in titles I, II, and III of this Act may be used to provide any direct benefit or assistance to any individual in the United States when it is made known to the Federal official to whom the funds are made available that—

(1) the individual is not lawfully present in the United States, and

(2) the benefit or assistance to be provided is other than emergency medical assistance, public health immunizations, or short-term, in-kind no-cash emergency disaster relief.

(b)(1) Each Federal official receiving funds under title I, II, or III of this Act shall take reasonable actions to determine whether any individual who is seeking any benefit or assistance subject to the limitation of subsection (a) is lawfully present in the United States.

(2) In the case of any filing, inquiry, or adjudication of an application for any benefit or assistance subject to the limitation of subsection (a), no Federal official or agent may discriminate against any individual on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability.

(c) PUBLIC POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—The Congress finds:

(1) Federal or State provision of taxpayer-supported non-emergency services of all types to aliens not lawfully in the United States encourages the violation of federal immigration laws and is contrary to the public policy of the United States;

(2) Denial of such services to aliens not lawfully in the United States would operate harmoniously with the Federal immigration laws, and would be an effective method of dealing with urgent demographic and economic problems;

(3) One of the purposes of Federal immigration law is to conserve Federal and State taxpayer resources;

(4) Upholding Federal immigration policy in this way would improve the quality of education, health care, and other services in the States for citizens and aliens lawfully in the United States;

(5) Provision of such services by the Federal Government or the States encourages illegal immigration, imposing severe burdens on the economies of the States that are the principal destinations of aliens not lawfully in the United States, and reduces the amount of funds available for legal residents and citizens of the United States; and

(6) Provision of such services by the Federal Government or the States ultimately imposes serious costs on the Federal Government, by virtue both of the Federal role in providing funds for State health, education, and other services and of the increased demand for Federal funds created by the economic dislocation caused by illegal immigration;

(7) The determination by the Federal Government or any State not to reward illegal immigration with taxpayer services of any type for aliens not lawfully in the United States is fully consistent with the objectives of Federal immigration law and furthers legitimate Federal and State goals.