

upon his retirement. I wish him a long, happy, and healthy retirement enjoying the animals and outdoors he so loves.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2684, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

**HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, August 5, 1999*

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule for the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill. This bill makes significant cuts in critical housing initiatives and will have a devastating effect on basic scientific research in this country.

This legislation is a string of broken promises—promises to provide for those who need a place to live, promises to invest in research and development, and promises to provide quality health care for our veterans. The bill reported by the Appropriations Committee cuts funding for housing programs, cuts funding for basic research and NASA, and does not provide adequate funding for Veterans' health care.

Last year, Congress authorized 100,000 new Section 8 rental vouchers to help families with worst-case housing needs, people who pay more than half their income in rent every month. This bill provides no new funding for this voucher program, denying 100,000 Americans affordable housing opportunities.

The bill cuts \$250 million in funding from the Community Development Block Grant program. Cities and towns across America will be unable to use these funds to create new jobs, invest in new housing opportunities, and revitalize neighborhoods. In addition, the Committee cut \$20 million from the HOME investment partnership program, \$10 million of which is targeted at providing counseling services to first-time homebuyers.

The Committee also cuts funding for the most vulnerable Americans—the homeless. It is estimated that more than 600,000 people are living in shelters and on the streets of this country. Many are families, children, veterans, and victims of domestic violence. Despite the overwhelming need for more shelter beds and supportive services for the homeless, this bill cuts additional funding from the Homeless Assistance grant program.

Mr. Speaker, taking care of Veterans who bravely served our country should be one of Congress's top priorities. After reviewing this legislation, it is quite clear that Republicans do not believe this to be true. While this bill provides an addition \$1.7 billion for Veterans Medical Health Care, it falls far short of the \$3 billion increase necessary to ensure our nation's veterans with adequate healthcare. Without this additional funding, Veteran Health Care centers across the country will be forced to make even greater cuts in existing programs and will be prohibited from implementing additional programs.

NASA and NSF have also taken a huge hit in this bill. By cutting \$1 billion from the NASA program and \$275 million from NSF, the science community has been dealt a serious blow. It is tragic that a country which prides itself on being number one in space exploration and the technological advances will suffer the devastating effects of these short-sighted cuts for years, and possibly decades to come.

The \$1 billion decrease to the NASA budget is the largest cut since the end of the Apollo program! Several programs have been severely reduced or zeroed out, which virtually guarantees their termination. This bill cancels funding for the Space Infrared Telescope Facility, and decreases funding for the Explorer program, Discovery program, and Mars missions support funding for research and technology for space science. At the same time, there are \$122 million in non-requested earmarks within the bill. Existence of these earmarks worsens the impact of reductions to higher priority programs.

By limiting funds, NASA will be forced to make drastic administrative cuts in ten of its centers and will be forced to close at least two centers. No doubt this will translate into several employees being laid off. By decreasing NASA funds, we will ensure the delay in development of the Crew Return Vehicle (CRV) which will subsequently setback the timetable when crew can board the ISS.

Mr. Speaker, to make a long story short, this is a bad bill. It's bad for science; it's bad for Veterans; it's bad for working class families; it's bad for middle class families; and it's bad for seniors. I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat the rule and oppose this bill in its current form.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2488, TAXPAYER REFUND AND RELIEF ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

**HON. JIM KOLBE**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, August 5, 1999*

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with pride to support the conference report on H.R. 2488, which provides a sizable tax cut for the American taxpayers. I am proud to give taxpayers back their money the federal government doesn't need. That's right; the federal government doesn't need it. Surplus means the amount in excess of what we spend. And the federal government has and will have all it needs plus enough to reform Social Security and Medicare and start paying down the debt, and still leave a small amount to return to the folks who are sending their hard-earned dollars to Washington, DC.

Within hours of the announcement of the conference agreement, my office began receiving letters from groups opposing this tax cut. And what are they saying? Don't give the money back; spend more money on my program.

The Minority Leader suggests that the amount we're giving back is too much; that we have to save the surplus so we have money available for entitlement reform.

Didn't he hear that we're using \$3 to save Social Security and Medicare, to fund programs and to pay down the debt, for each \$1 we are giving back to the taxpayers?

President Clinton says he'll talk about giving a tax cut after we provide for Medicare, debt reduction and federal spending.

Didn't he hear? This bill gives \$3 of the surplus to Social Security, Medicare, government programs, and debt reduction for every \$1 of the surplus that it leaves with the taxpayer. Makes one worry about what he has in mind for federal spending. Is he thinking about more and bigger government programs?

Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers have been paying and paying and paying. The typical American family pays more in taxes than on food, clothing and shelter combined. Our tax burden from all government is the highest since we were financing a world war in the 40s. In fact, without this tax relief bill, the average American household will pay \$5,307 more in taxes over the next 10 years than the government needs to operate.

We have a good economy; unemployment is at record lows. We don't need more government. We do need to scrutinize programs and divert dollars from ineffective and wasteful programs to areas that need additional funding. But we don't need to increase the size of government.

Individuals have the right to choose how to spend their money. They can choose to tutor their kids, or replace a furnace or air conditioner, or help an elderly parent, or support a favorite charity, or even save it for their own retirement. They shouldn't have it taken from their paycheck before they even see it so that government can use it to fund yet another program.

One administration official called these taxpayers selfish.

I call the groups who want to spend more of the taxpayers' money selfish.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill. Let's return a small share of the surplus to the taxpayers. It belongs to them.

THE NATIONWIDE GUN BUYBACK ACT OF 1999

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 8, 1999*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Nationwide Gun Buyback Act of 1999 (NGBA), providing federal funds to local jurisdictions to engage in gun buyback programs like the successful program conducted by the District of Columbia last month. Under the bill, funds would be distributed through the Justice Department after evaluation of proposals, and added weight would be given to jurisdictions with the greatest incidence of gun violence. The NGBA would require that a jurisdiction certify that it is capable of destroying the guns within 30 days, that it can conduct the program safely, and that an amnesty appropriate for the jurisdiction will be offered. Not only individuals, but groups such as gangs could take advantage of the buyback provisions to encourage street gangs to disarm themselves.