

Jenkins	Moore	Shadegg
John	Moran (KS)	Shaw
Johnson (CT)	Morella	Sherman
Johnson, E.B.	Murtha	Sherwood
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Shimkus
Jones (NC)	Nadler	Shows
Kanjorski	Napolitano	Shuster
Kaptur	Neal	Simpson
Kasich	Nethercutt	Sisisky
Kelly	Ney	Skelton
Kennedy	Northup	Slaughter
Kildee	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Kilpatrick	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Kind (WI)	Obey	Smith (TX)
King (NY)	Olver	Smith (WA)
Kingston	Ortiz	Ose
Kleczka	Owens	Snyder
Klink	Packard	Souder
Knollenberg	Pallone	Spence
Kolbe	Pallone	Spratt
Kucinich	Pascrell	Stark
Kuykendall	Pastor	Stearns
LaFalce	Paul	Stenholm
LaHood	Payne	Strickland
Lampson	Pease	Stump
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Largent	Peterson (PA)	Sununu
Larson	Petri	Sweeney
LaTourette	Phelps	Tanner
Leach	Pickering	Tauscher
Lee	Pickett	Tauzin
Levin	Pitts	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Pombo	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Terry
Linder	Porter	Thomas
LoBiondo	Portman	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Thornberry
Lowey	Pryce (OH)	Thune
Lucas (KY)	Quinn	Thurman
Lucas (OK)	Radanovich	Tiahrt
Luther	Rahall	Tierney
Maloney (CT)	Ramstad	Toomey
Maloney (NY)	Rangel	Towns
Manzullo	Regula	Traficant
Markey	Reyes	Udall (CO)
Martinez	Reynolds	Udall (NM)
Mascara	Riley	Upton
Matsui	Rivers	Velázquez
McCarthy (MO)	Rogan	Visclosky
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers	Vitter
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Walden
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
McGovern	Rothman	Wamp
McHugh	Roukema	Waters
McInnis	Roybal-Allard	Watkins
McIntyre	Royce	Watt (NC)
McKeon	Rush	Watts (OK)
McKinney	Ryan (WI)	Waxman
McNulty	Ryun (KS)	Weiner
Meehan	Sabo	Weldon (FL)
Meek (FL)	Salmon	Weldon (PA)
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez	Weller
Menendez	Sanders	Wexler
Metcalfe	Sandlin	Weygand
Mica	Sawyer	Whitfield
Millender-	Saxton	Wicker
McDonald	Scarborough	Wilson
Miller, Gary	Schaffer	Wolf
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Minge	Scott	Wu
Mink	Sensenbrenner	Wynn
Moakley	Serrano	Young (AK)
Mollohan	Sessions	Young (FL)

NAYS—7

Danner	Latham	Tancredo
Hill (MT)	Nussle	
Hulshof	Roemer	

NOT VOTING—25

Campbell	Lewis (CA)	Sanford
Chenoweth-Hage	Lipinski	Shays
Clay	McCollum	Stabenow
Franks (NJ)	McIntosh	Talent
Hansen	Miller (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Hilliard	Moran (VA)	Turner
Houghton	Oxley	Wise
Jones (OH)	Pelosi	
Lazio	Rodriguez	

□ 1259

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.

□ 1300

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4635, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4635, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4635) 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, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 638, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 18, 2000, at page H10083.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

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

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring before the full House of Representatives the conference report on H.R. 4635, making fiscal year 2001 appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies. So that we can move as quickly as possible, I will keep my comments brief.

This conference report was developed after difficult and somewhat prolonged discussions with our counterparts in the Senate as well as representatives of the administration.

While there are some parts of this bill that I frankly would like to have done differently, it is in the aggregate, a very good bipartisan bill that will serve the American people well.

Let me mention just a few highlights that illustrate this point. The bill fully funds veterans' medical care, with a

\$1.355 billion increase over last year's record level and provides increased funding for medical research, major construction, and cemetery administration operations.

Just as important, we have begun an effort to conduct better oversight of how much medical care funding goes for medical care per se and how much goes to maintaining buildings and facilities.

All veterans, no matter where they are located, deserve the best facilities we can provide. Expiring section 8 contracts at HUD are fully funded, and we have included language to push the Department to do a better, faster job getting these funds out of Washington to the people who need them the most.

In addition, funds have been added to provide an additional 79,000 new housing vouchers.

Mr. Speaker, we have fully funded the Community Development Block Grant entitlement programs and have fully funded all other HUD programs.

AmeriCorps has been funded at \$453.5 million, less than the budget request, but a slight increase over the fiscal year 2000 funding level.

EPA's core operating programs have been fully funded while the various State grant programs, which assist States in implementing the Federal laws, have been more than fully funded.

The Clean Water State Revolving Program, gutted in the budget request, has been restored to \$1.35 billion, while State and local air grants and section 319 non-point source pollution grants have been increased significantly.

Perhaps most important, we have proposed over \$172 million, an increase of \$57 million over last year's, for section 106 pollution control grants. These grants offer the States the maximum flexibility to deal with the difficult TMDL issues facing the States.

CDFI, one of the President's new programs, has been provided \$118 million dollars, an increase over last year's funding level because, after a rocky start, this program is working very well and deserves our support.

Mr. Speaker, likewise, the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, perhaps the most productive and most efficient Federal organization dealing with housing, has been provided their full funding level of \$90 million. Again, they have earned and deserve our support.

National Science Foundation has received an increase of nearly \$530 million over last year, putting them well over \$4.4 billion, their largest budget ever. There is proud bipartisan support for fully funding the NSF.

Similarly, NASA received an increase over last year of nearly \$683 million. Their first substantial increase in several years.

Before I complete my comments, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to set

the record straight with regard to language contained in the Statement of Managers concerning the dredging issue. The Statement contains a direction to EPA to take no action to initiate or order the use of dredging, capping, or other invasive remedial technologies for contaminated sediments until the report from the National Academy of Sciences is completed and its findings properly considered by the Agency.

The conferees have encouraged the National Academy of Sciences to issue a final report by the end of this year, and the Agency should promptly review that report and determine how to appropriately incorporate its recommendations into their remedy selection process.

Mr. Speaker, this direction is similar to language that was contained in the Statement of Managers for fiscal year 1999 and 2000 bills. I am frankly disappointed that the EPA has apparently chosen to ignore this direction in several cases during the past year.

The Agency appears to be relying on a misinterpretation of this direction, one that allows any business-as-usual EPA decision that dredging or capping is an appropriate remedy to qualify as an exception.

In each year, starting with the 1999 bill, the conferees have provided specific exceptions to this direction, primarily limited to cases where a significant threat to public health requires urgent, time-critical response. None of the dredging or capping projects undertaken during this fiscal year meets this test, yet each poses substantial risks to the environment of the kind under study by the NAS. EPA is expected to correct this misinterpretation as it complies with the direction in this bill's Statement of Managers.

The direction in this year's Statement of Managers does not apply to cases where a final plan selecting dredging or other invasive remedial technology has been adopted prior to October 1 of this year or, in cases not requiring adoption of a final plan, where authorized activities involving dredging or invasive remedial technologies are now occurring.

In any such case, such as a pilot or a demonstration, review of the NAS re-

port and consideration of its findings would be required before adoption of a final plan involving dredging, capping or other invasive remedial activity.

Turning briefly to another issue. The conferees included language in last year's Statement of Managers accompanying the conference report regarding a proposed rule to implement new, affordable housing goals for the housing government-sponsored entities, the GSEs: Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

These goals are currently being finalized. I would like to reiterate the direction of the fiscal year 2000 Statement of Managers which encouraged HUD to craft a final rule that ensures regulatory parity for all of the GSEs, including the present composition of their overall portfolio and relative size of multifamily portfolio.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a question has been raised regarding direction of EPA in the Statement of Managers regarding the Agency's issuing of new guidelines with respect to the TMDL program. This direction to the Agency is simply intended to prevent EPA regions or headquarters from issuing new rules or guidelines which are based on the new TMDL rule which cannot by law be implemented before October 1, 2001. Other rules or guidelines relative to the TMDL program which are not based on the rule may still be issued by the Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it would have been very difficult to get this bill this far without the support and assistance of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), my ranking member friend, who brings a great deal of knowledge and foresight to this bill, and the rest of this very hard-working subcommittee.

I truly appreciate all of these Members. I also wish to thank our counterparts in the Senate, specifically, Senator BOND and Senator MIKULSKI. They are both very tough negotiators but are also able to come to fair and equitable agreements.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the forthright and I think good-faith negotiations we had with the White House. There has been a lot of skepticism between the legislative and executive branch over the past number of

years; but in my experience, I think they have always been fair, tough, but willing to compromise on all of these issues. And we would not have resolved these issues especially on the environment, had they not given some ground. We had to give ground; they gave some ground. But I think the conclusion is that this is a good, fair bill that everybody can say they took something home.

Mr. Speaker, while we do not always agree on issues, every effort has been made on both sides to continue this subcommittee's strong history of bipartisan cooperation in crafting this bill. I truly appreciate the help of each of these individuals and our close working relationship.

I would also be remiss if I did not mention the hard work of our staffs, both personal staffs and appropriation committee staff; these are professionals. Their goal is to provide us with the information and the resources we need to craft a good bill to make sure that throughout the negotiation that everybody is kept abreast of the changes, and that, to the best of our ability, to the best of their ability, they get the bill done on time, which requires mountains and mountains of paperwork. So I sincerely thank them all again.

Mr. Speaker, that in a nutshell is the fiscal year 2001 VA, HUD and Independent Agencies bill, which, as my colleagues know, has also been joined in this process with the Energy and Water bill; and I expect we will hear from the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and his ranking member.

This is a good bill. It is a fair bill, with solid policy direction while remaining fiscally responsible. We are still \$2.4 billion under the President's request, which I think in the environment that we have negotiated in is remarkable. We are informed that it will be supported by the President when it arrives on his desk, and I strongly encourage the support of this body in moving this measure forward to its completion.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

**H.R. 4635 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2001**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate Reported	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE I</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS</b>						
<b>Veterans Benefits Administration</b>						
Compensation and pensions.....	21,568,364	22,766,276	22,766,276	22,766,276	22,766,276	+ 1,197,912
Readjustment benefits.....	1,469,000	1,634,000	1,664,000	1,634,000	1,634,000	+ 165,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	28,670	19,850	19,850	19,850	19,850	-8,820
Veterans housing benefit program fund program account (indefinite).....	282,342	165,740	165,740	165,740	165,740	-116,602
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(300)	(300)	(300)	(300)	(300)	.....
Administrative expenses.....	156,958	166,484	161,484	162,000	162,000	+5,042
Education loan fund program account.....	1	1	1	1	1	.....
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	.....
Administrative expenses.....	214	220	220	220	220	+6
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	57	52	52	52	52	-5
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(2,531)	(2,726)	(2,726)	(2,726)	(2,726)	(+ 195)
Administrative expenses.....	415	432	432	432	432	+17
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account.....	520	532	532	532	532	+12
Guaranteed Transitional Housing Loans for Homeless Veterans program account.....	48,250	.....	.....	.....	.....	-48,250
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(100,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-100,000)
<b>Total, Veterans Benefits Administration.....</b>	<b>23,554,791</b>	<b>24,753,587</b>	<b>24,778,587</b>	<b>24,749,103</b>	<b>24,749,103</b>	<b>+ 1,194,312</b>
<b>Veterans Health Administration</b>						
Medical care.....	18,106,000	19,381,587	19,354,587	19,381,587	19,381,587	+ 1,275,587
Delayed equipment obligation.....	900,000	900,000	927,000	900,000	900,000	.....
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>19,006,000</b>	<b>20,281,587</b>	<b>20,281,587</b>	<b>20,281,587</b>	<b>20,281,587</b>	<b>+ 1,275,587</b>
Across the board rescission (0.38%).....	-79,519	.....	.....	.....	.....	+79,519
(Transfer to general operating expenses).....	(-27,907)	.....	(-28,134)	(-27,907)	(-28,134)	(-227)
(Transfer to Parking revolving fund).....	.....	.....	.....	(-2,000)	(-2,000)	(-2,000)
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>18,926,481</b>	<b>20,281,587</b>	<b>20,281,587</b>	<b>20,281,587</b>	<b>20,281,587</b>	<b>+ 1,355,106</b>
Medical care cost recovery collections:						
Offsetting receipts.....	-608,000	-639,000	-639,000	-639,000	-639,000	-31,000
Appropriations (indefinite).....	608,000	639,000	639,000	639,000	639,000	+31,000
<b>Total available.....</b>	<b>(608,000)</b>	<b>(639,000)</b>	<b>(639,000)</b>	<b>(639,000)</b>	<b>(639,000)</b>	<b>(+31,000)</b>
Medical and prosthetic research.....	321,000	321,000	351,000	331,000	351,000	+30,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	59,703	64,884	62,000	62,000	62,000	+2,297
General Post Fund, National Homes:						
Loan program account (by transfer).....	(7)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-7)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(70)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-70)
Administrative expenses (by transfer).....	(54)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-54)
General post fund (transfer out).....	(-61)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+61)
<b>Total, Veterans Health Administration.....</b>	<b>19,307,184</b>	<b>20,667,471</b>	<b>20,694,587</b>	<b>20,674,587</b>	<b>20,694,587</b>	<b>+ 1,387,403</b>
<b>Departmental Administration</b>						
General operating expenses.....	912,594	1,061,854	1,006,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	+ 137,406
Offsetting receipts.....	(36,754)	(36,520)	(36,754)	(36,520)	(36,520)	(-234)
<b>Total, Program Level.....</b>	<b>(949,348)</b>	<b>(1,098,374)</b>	<b>(1,042,754)</b>	<b>(1,086,520)</b>	<b>(1,086,520)</b>	<b>(+ 137,172)</b>
(Transfer from medical care).....	(27,907)	.....	(28,134)	(27,907)	(28,134)	(+227)
(Transfer from national cemetery).....	(117)	.....	(125)	(117)	(125)	(+8)
(Transfer from inspector general).....	(30)	.....	(28)	(30)	(28)	(-2)
National Cemetery Administration.....	97,256	109,889	106,889	109,889	109,889	+12,633
(Transfer to general operating expenses).....	(-117)	.....	(-125)	(-117)	(-125)	(-8)
Office of Inspector General.....	43,200	46,464	46,464	46,464	46,464	+3,264
(Transfer to general operating expenses).....	(-30)	.....	(-28)	(-30)	(-28)	(+2)
Construction, major projects.....	65,140	62,140	62,140	48,540	66,040	+900
Construction, minor projects.....	160,000	162,000	100,000	162,000	162,000	+2,000
(Transfer to Parking Revolving Fund).....	.....	.....	.....	(-4,500)	(-4,500)	(-4,500)
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities.....	90,000	60,000	90,000	100,000	100,000	+10,000
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	.....
(Transfer to Parking Revolving Fund).....	.....	.....	.....	(6,500)	(6,500)	(+ 6,500)
<b>Total, Departmental Administration.....</b>	<b>1,393,190</b>	<b>1,527,347</b>	<b>1,436,493</b>	<b>1,541,893</b>	<b>1,559,393</b>	<b>+ 166,203</b>
<b>Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs.....</b>	<b>44,255,165</b>	<b>46,948,405</b>	<b>46,909,667</b>	<b>46,965,583</b>	<b>47,003,083</b>	<b>+2,747,918</b>
Appropriations.....	(44,334,684)	(46,948,405)	(46,909,667)	(46,965,583)	(47,003,083)	(+2,668,399)
Rescissions.....	(-79,519)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+79,519)
(By transfer).....	(61)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-61)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(102,904)	(3,029)	(3,029)	(3,029)	(3,029)	(-99,875)
Consisting of:						
Mandatory.....	(23,396,626)	(24,585,866)	(24,615,866)	(24,585,866)	(24,585,866)	(+ 1,189,240)
Discretionary.....	(20,858,539)	(22,362,539)	(22,293,801)	(22,379,717)	(22,417,217)	(+ 1,558,678)

**H.R. 4635 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2001 — continued**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate Reported	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE II</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT</b>						
<b>Public and Indian Housing</b>						
Housing Certificate Fund.....	7,176,695	9,927,824	9,075,388	8,971,000	9,740,907	+2,564,212
(By transfer) .....	(183,000)					(-183,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001/2002.....	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	
<b>Total funding.....</b>	<b>11,376,695</b>	<b>14,127,824</b>	<b>13,275,388</b>	<b>13,171,000</b>	<b>13,940,907</b>	<b>+2,564,212</b>
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-72,275					+72,275
<b>Rescission of unobligated balances:</b>						
Section 8 recaptures (rescission) .....	-1,300,000		-275,388	-275,000	-1,833,000	-533,000
Section 8 carryover and Tenant Protection (resc) .....	-943,000					+943,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>-2,243,000</b>		<b>-275,388</b>	<b>-275,000</b>	<b>-1,833,000</b>	<b>+410,000</b>
Public housing capital fund.....	2,900,000	2,955,000	2,800,000	2,955,000	3,000,000	+100,000
Public housing operating fund.....	3,138,000	3,192,000	3,139,000	3,192,000	3,242,000	+104,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>6,038,000</b>	<b>6,147,000</b>	<b>5,939,000</b>	<b>6,147,000</b>	<b>6,242,000</b>	<b>+204,000</b>
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing.....	310,000	345,000	300,000	310,000	310,000	
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing (HOPE VI).....	575,000	625,000	565,000	575,000	575,000	
Native American housing block grants.....	620,000	650,000	620,000	650,000	650,000	+30,000
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account.....	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(71,956)	(71,956)	(71,956)	(71,956)	(71,956)	
<b>Total, Public and Indian Housing.....</b>	<b>16,610,420</b>	<b>21,900,824</b>	<b>20,430,000</b>	<b>20,584,000</b>	<b>19,890,907</b>	<b>+3,280,487</b>
<b>Community Planning and Development</b>						
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS .....	232,000	260,000	250,000	232,000	258,000	+26,000
Rural housing and economic development.....	25,000	27,000	20,000	27,000	25,000	
America's private investment companies program:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(541,000)	(1,000,000)				(-541,000)
Credit subsidy.....	20,000	37,000				-20,000
Urban empowerment zones .....	55,000				75,000	+20,000
Rural empowerment zones.....	15,000				15,000	
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>70,000</b>				<b>90,000</b>	<b>+20,000</b>
Community development fund.....	4,800,000	4,900,000	4,505,000	4,800,000	5,057,550	+257,550
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-18,785					+18,785
Contingent emergency (P.L. 106-246) .....	27,500					-27,500
Section 108 loan guarantees:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(1,261,000)	(1,217,000)	(1,217,000)	(1,261,000)	(1,261,000)	
Credit subsidy.....	29,000	28,000	28,000	29,000	29,000	
Administrative expenses.....	1,000	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Brownfields redevelopment .....	25,000	50,000	20,000	25,000	25,000	
HOME investment partnerships program.....	1,600,000	1,650,000	1,585,000	1,600,000	1,800,000	+200,000
Contingent emergency (P.L. 106-246) .....	36,000					-36,000
Homeless assistance grants.....	1,020,000	1,200,000	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,025,000	+5,000
Shelter Plus Care .....				105,000	100,000	+100,000
Communities in schools community development program.....	5,000	5,000				-5,000
<b>Total, Community planning and development.....</b>	<b>7,871,735</b>	<b>8,159,000</b>	<b>7,429,000</b>	<b>7,839,000</b>	<b>8,410,550</b>	<b>+538,815</b>
<b>Housing Programs</b>						
Housing for special populations .....	911,000	989,000	911,000	996,000	996,000	+85,000
Housing for the elderly .....	(710,000)	(779,000)	(710,000)	(783,000)	(779,000)	(+69,000)
Housing for the disabled .....	(201,000)	(210,000)	(201,000)	(213,000)	(217,000)	(+16,000)
<b>Federal Housing Administration</b>						
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(140,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(100,000)	(250,000)	(100,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(+150,000)
Administrative expenses.....	330,888	330,888	330,888	330,888	330,888	
Administrative contract expenses.....	160,000	160,000	160,000	160,000	160,000	
Additional contract expenses .....	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	
Streamlined downpayment requirements .....		7,000			7,000	+7,000
Reduced downpayments for teachers/police (Sec 219) .....				-24,000		
FHA - General and special risk program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(18,100,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(+2,900,000)
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	
Administrative expenses.....	64,000	211,455	211,455	211,455	211,455	+147,455
Administrative expenses (unobligated balances) .....	(147,000)					(-147,000)
Negative subsidy .....	-75,000	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	-25,000
Subsidy .....		101,000	101,000	101,000	101,000	+101,000
Subsidy (unobligated balances) .....	(153,000)					(-153,000)

**H.R. 4635 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2001 — continued**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate Reported	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Non-overhead administrative expenses.....	144,000	144,000	144,000	144,000	144,000	
Additional contract expenses.....	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	
<b>Total, Federal Housing Administration.....</b>	<b>634,888</b>	<b>865,343</b>	<b>858,343</b>	<b>834,343</b>	<b>865,343</b>	<b>+ 230,455</b>
Government National Mortgage Association						
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	
Administrative expenses.....	9,383	9,383	9,383	9,383	9,383	
Administrative contract expenses.....	40,000					
Offsetting receipts.....	-422,000	-347,000	-347,000	-347,000	-347,000	+75,000
Policy Development and Research						
Research and technology.....	45,000	62,000	40,000	45,000	53,500	+8,500
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair housing activities.....	44,000	50,000	44,000	44,000	46,000	+2,000
Office of Lead Hazard Control						
Lead hazard reduction.....	80,000	120,000	80,000	100,000	100,000	+20,000
Management and Administration						
Salaries and expenses.....	477,000	565,000	474,647	473,500	543,267	+66,267
Transfer from:						
Limitation on FHA corporate funds.....	(518,000)	(518,000)	(518,000)	(518,000)	(518,000)	
GNMA.....	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	
Community Planning & Development.....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	
America's Private Investment Companies Program.....		(1,000)				
Title VI.....	(150)	(150)	(150)	(150)	(150)	
Indian Housing.....	(200)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(200)	
<b>Total, Salaries and expenses.....</b>	<b>(1,005,733)</b>	<b>(1,094,733)</b>	<b>(1,003,380)</b>	<b>(1,002,233)</b>	<b>(1,072,000)</b>	<b>(+66,267)</b>
Office of Inspector General.....	50,657	52,000	50,657	55,500	52,657	+2,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	
(By transfer from Drug Elimination Grants).....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	
Supplemental (P.L. 106-246).....	6,000					-6,000
Rescission (P.L. 106-246).....	-6,000					+6,000
<b>Total, Office of Inspector General.....</b>	<b>(83,000)</b>	<b>(84,343)</b>	<b>(83,000)</b>	<b>(87,843)</b>	<b>(85,000)</b>	<b>(+2,000)</b>
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.....	19,493	25,800	22,000	22,000	22,000	+2,507
Offsetting receipts.....	-19,493	-25,800	-22,000	-22,000	-22,000	-2,507
Administrative Provisions						
Sec. 208 FHA.....	-319,000					+319,000
Annual contribution (transfer out).....	(-79,000)					(+79,000)
Annual contributions (transfer out).....	(-104,000)					(+104,000)
Sec. 212 Rescissions.....	-74,400					+74,400
Sec. 214 Moving to Work.....	5,000					-5,000
<b>Total, administrative provisions.....</b>	<b>-388,400</b>					<b>+388,400</b>
<b>Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development (net).....</b>	<b>25,923,683</b>	<b>32,465,550</b>	<b>29,980,030</b>	<b>30,633,726</b>	<b>30,620,607</b>	<b>+4,696,924</b>
Current year, FY 2001.....	(21,723,683)	(28,265,550)	(25,780,030)	(26,433,726)	(26,420,607)	(+4,696,924)
Appropriations.....	(24,074,623)	(28,265,550)	(26,055,418)	(26,708,726)	(28,254,607)	(+4,179,984)
Rescissions.....	(-2,414,440)		(-275,388)	(-275,000)	(-1,833,000)	(+581,440)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001/2002.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(359,902,000)	(383,217,000)	(382,217,000)	(382,261,000)	(382,261,000)	(+22,359,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(561,076)	(562,076)	(561,076)	(561,076)	(561,076)	
TITLE III						
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
American Battle Monuments Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	28,467	26,196	28,000	26,196	28,000	-467
Across the board rescission (0.38%).....	-108					+108
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board						
Salaries and expenses.....	8,000	8,000	8,000	7,000	7,500	-500
Across the board rescission (0.38%).....	-30					+30
Department of the Treasury						
Community Development Financial Institutions						
Community development financial institutions fund program account.....	95,000	125,000	105,000	95,000	118,000	+23,000

**H.R. 4635 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2001 — continued**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate Reported	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Consumer Product Safety Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	49,000	52,500	51,000	52,500	52,500	+3,500
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-186					+186
<b>Corporation for National and Community Service</b>						
National and community service programs operating expenses .....	434,500	528,700		433,500	458,500	+24,000
Rescission .....	-81,000			-50,000	-30,000	+51,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-1,347					+1,347
Office of Inspector General .....	4,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	+1,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-15					+15
Supplemental (P.L. 106-246) .....	1,000					-1,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>357,138</b>	<b>533,700</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>388,500</b>	<b>433,500</b>	<b>+76,362</b>
<b>Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	11,450	12,500	12,500	12,445	12,445	+995
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-42					+42
<b>Department of Defense - Civil</b>						
<b>Cemeterial Expenses, Army</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	12,473	15,949	17,949	15,949	17,949	+5,476
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-47					+47
<b>Department of Health and Human Services</b>						
<b>National Institute of Health</b>						
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences 1/ .....	60,000	48,527	60,000		63,000	+3,000
<b>Public Health Service</b>						
Toxic Substances and Environmental Public Health 1/ .....	70,000	64,000	70,000		75,000	+5,000
<b>Environmental Protection Agency</b>						
Science and Technology .....	645,000	674,348	650,000	670,000	696,000	+51,000
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund .....	38,000	35,871	35,000	38,000	36,500	-1,500
<b>Subtotal, Science and Technology .....</b>	<b>683,000</b>	<b>710,219</b>	<b>685,000</b>	<b>708,000</b>	<b>732,500</b>	<b>+49,500</b>
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-2,697					+2,697
Environmental Programs and Management .....	1,900,000	2,099,461	1,895,000	2,000,000	2,087,990	+187,990
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-4,733					+4,733
Office of Inspector General .....	32,409	34,094	34,000	34,094	34,094	+1,685
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund .....	11,000	11,652	11,500	11,000	11,500	+500
<b>Subtotal, OIG .....</b>	<b>43,409</b>	<b>45,746</b>	<b>45,500</b>	<b>45,094</b>	<b>45,594</b>	<b>+2,185</b>
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-29					+29
Buildings and facilities .....	62,600	23,931	23,931	23,000	23,931	-38,669
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-238					+238
Hazardous Substance Superfund 2/ .....	1,170,000	1,337,473	1,170,000	1,300,000	1,170,000	
Delay of obligation .....	100,000		100,000	100,000	100,000	
Transfer to Office of Inspector General .....	-11,000	-11,652	-11,500	-11,000	-11,500	-500
Transfer to Science and Technology .....	-38,000	-35,871	-35,000	-38,000	-36,500	+1,500
<b>Subtotal, Hazardous Substance Superfund .....</b>	<b>1,221,000</b>	<b>1,289,950</b>	<b>1,223,500</b>	<b>1,351,000</b>	<b>1,222,000</b>	<b>+1,000</b>
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program .....	70,000	72,096	79,000	72,096	72,096	+2,096
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-240					+240
Oil spill response .....	15,000	15,712	15,000	15,000	15,000	
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-26					+26
State and Tribal Assistance Grants .....	2,581,650	1,838,000	2,108,000	2,365,000	2,620,740	+39,090
Categorical grants .....	885,000	1,068,957	1,068,957	955,000	1,008,000	+123,000
<b>Subtotal, STAG .....</b>	<b>3,466,650</b>	<b>2,906,957</b>	<b>3,176,957</b>	<b>3,320,000</b>	<b>3,628,740</b>	<b>+162,090</b>
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-20,885					+20,885
<b>Total, EPA .....</b>	<b>7,461,659</b>	<b>7,164,072</b>	<b>7,143,888</b>	<b>7,534,190</b>	<b>7,827,851</b>	<b>+366,192</b>
Rescissions .....	-28,848					+28,848

1/ FY 2000 & FY 2001 Request were part of Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

2/ FY 2000 & FY 2001 Request modified to reflect comparable new accounts in Dept of HH&S.

**H.R. 4635 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2001 — continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate Reported	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Executive Office of the President</b>						
Office of Science and Technology Policy .....	5,108	5,201	5,150	5,201	5,201	+93
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-19					+19
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....	2,827	3,020	2,900	2,900	2,900	+73
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-11					+11
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>7,905</b>	<b>8,221</b>	<b>8,050</b>	<b>8,101</b>	<b>8,101</b>	<b>+196</b>
<b>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation</b>						
Office of Inspector General (transfer) .....	(33,666)	(33,660)	(33,661)	(33,660)	(33,660)	(-6)
<b>Federal Emergency Management Agency</b>						
Disaster relief .....	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	
(Transfer out) .....	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	(-35,500)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-12,416					+12,416
Emergency funding .....	2,480,425	2,609,220		2,609,220	1,300,000	-1,180,425
Pre-disaster mitigation .....		30,000				
(Transfer out) .....		(-2,600)				
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:						
State share loan .....	1,295	1,678	1,295	1,678	1,678	+383
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(19,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	
Administrative expenses .....	420	427	420	427	427	+7
Salaries and expenses .....	180,000	221,024	190,000	215,000	215,000	+35,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-50					+50
Office of Inspector General.....	8,015	8,476	8,015	10,000	10,000	+1,985
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-50					+50
Emergency management planning and assistance .....	267,000	269,652	267,000	269,652	269,652	+2,652
(By transfer) .....	(2,900)	(5,500)	(5,500)	(2,900)	(2,900)	
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-218					+218
Radiological emergency preparedness fund.....	-1,000					+1,000
Emergency food and shelter program .....	110,000	140,000	110,000	110,000	140,000	+30,000
Flood map modernization fund .....	5,000					-5,000
(By transfer) .....			(30,000)			
National insurance development fund .....	(3,730)					(-3,730)
National Flood Insurance Fund (limitation on administrative expenses):						
Salaries and expenses .....	(24,333)	(25,736)	(25,736)	(25,736)	(25,736)	(+1,403)
Flood mitigation .....	(78,710)	(77,307)	(77,307)	(77,307)	(77,307)	(-1,403)
(Transfer out) .....	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	
National flood mitigation fund (by transfer) .....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	
Cerro Grande fire assistance (P.L. 106-246) .....	500,000					-500,000
<b>Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency</b> .....	<b>3,838,421</b>	<b>3,580,477</b>	<b>876,730</b>	<b>3,515,977</b>	<b>2,236,757</b>	<b>-1,601,664</b>
Appropriations .....	(870,730)	(971,257)	(876,730)	(906,757)	(936,757)	(+66,027)
Rescissions .....	(-12,734)					(+12,734)
Emergency funding .....	(2,980,425)	(2,609,220)		(2,609,220)	(1,300,000)	(-1,680,425)
<b>General Services Administration</b>						
Federal Consumer Information Center Fund.....	2,622	6,822	7,122	7,122	7,122	+4,500
<b>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</b>						
Human space flight .....	5,510,900	5,499,900	5,472,000	5,400,000	5,462,900	-48,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-23,000					+23,000
Science, aeronautics and technology.....	5,606,700	5,929,400	5,579,600	5,837,000	6,190,700	+584,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-25,805					+25,805
Contingent emergency (P.L. 106-246) .....	1,500					-1,500
Mission support .....	2,515,100	2,584,000	2,584,000	2,584,000	2,608,700	+93,600
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-3,076					+3,076
Office of Inspector General.....	20,000	22,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	+3,000
<b>Total, NASA</b> .....	<b>13,852,700</b>	<b>14,035,300</b>	<b>13,658,600</b>	<b>13,844,000</b>	<b>14,285,300</b>	<b>+632,600</b>
Rescissions .....	-51,881					+51,881
<b>National Credit Union Administration</b>						
Central liquidity facility:						
(Limitation on direct loans) .....		(600,000)	(3,000,000)	(600,000)	(1,500,000)	(+1,500,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds) .....	(257)	(296)	(296)	(296)	(296)	(+39)
Revolving loan program .....	1,000		1,000		1,000	
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-4					+4
Community development credit union revolving loan fund.....		1,000				

**H.R. 4635 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2001 — continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate Reported	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>National Science Foundation</b>						
Research and related activities.....	2,966,000	3,540,680	3,117,690	3,245,562	3,350,000	+384,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-7,538					+7,538
Major research equipment .....	95,000	138,540	78,600	109,100	121,600	+26,600
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-1,500					+1,500
Education and human resources.....	696,600	729,010	694,310	765,352	787,352	+90,752
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-5,728					+5,728
Salaries and expenses .....	149,000	157,890	152,000	170,890	160,890	+11,890
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-100					+100
Office of Inspector General.....	5,450	6,280	5,700	6,280	6,280	+830
<b>Total, NSF .....</b>	<b>3,912,050</b>	<b>4,572,400</b>	<b>4,046,300</b>	<b>4,297,184</b>	<b>4,426,122</b>	<b>+514,072</b>
Rescissions.....	-14,866					+14,866
<b>Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation</b>						
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation .....	75,000	90,000	90,000	80,000	90,000	+15,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-285					+285
<b>Selective Service System</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	24,000	24,480	23,000	24,480	24,480	+480
Across the board rescission (0.38%) .....	-91					+91
<b>Total, title III, Independent agencies .....</b>	<b>29,571,997</b>	<b>30,369,144</b>	<b>26,212,139</b>	<b>29,908,644</b>	<b>29,714,627</b>	<b>+142,630</b>
Appropriations .....	(26,590,072)	(27,759,924)	(26,212,139)	(27,299,424)	(28,414,627)	(+1,824,555)
Rescissions .....	(-191,514)			(-50,000)	(-30,000)	(+161,514)
Emergency funding .....	(2,981,925)	(2,609,220)		(2,609,220)	(1,300,000)	(-1,881,925)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(25,000)	(625,000)	(3,019,000)	(625,000)	(1,525,000)	(+1,500,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(257)	(296)	(296)	(296)	(296)	(+39)
<b>OTHER PROVISIONS</b>						
H.R. 202 - Preservation of Affordable Housing .....	-14,000					+14,000
<b>TITLE V</b>						
Filipino veterans provision.....					3,000	+3,000
<b>Grand total (net).....</b>	<b>99,736,845</b>	<b>109,783,099</b>	<b>103,101,836</b>	<b>107,507,953</b>	<b>107,341,317</b>	<b>+7,804,472</b>
Current year, FY 2001.....	(95,536,845)	(105,583,099)	(98,901,836)	(103,307,953)	(103,141,317)	(+7,804,472)
Appropriations .....	(95,176,893)	(102,973,879)	(99,177,224)	(101,023,733)	(103,705,317)	(+8,528,424)
Rescissions .....	(-2,685,473)			(-325,000)	(-1,863,000)	(+822,473)
Emergency funding .....	(3,045,425)	(2,609,220)		(2,609,220)	(1,299,000)	(-1,746,425)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001/2002.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	
(By transfer) .....	(236,727)	(53,660)	(83,661)	(53,660)	(53,660)	(-183,067)
(Transfer out) .....	(-203,061)	(-20,000)	(-50,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(+183,061)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(349,860)	(999,985)	(3,243,985)	(999,985)	(1,899,985)	(+1,550,125)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(359,902,000)	(383,217,000)	(382,217,000)	(382,261,000)	(382,261,000)	(+22,359,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(561,333)	(562,372)	(561,372)	(561,372)	(561,372)	(+39)
<b>Total mandatory and discretionary .....</b>	<b>95,274,918</b>	<b>109,399,099</b>	<b>102,928,836</b>	<b>107,304,953</b>	<b>107,138,317</b>	<b>+11,863,399</b>
Mandatory.....	21,306,626	24,581,866	24,611,866	24,581,866	24,581,866	+3,275,240
Discretionary.....	73,968,292	84,817,233	78,316,970	82,723,087	82,556,451	+8,588,159

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. I am pleased to report that the report before us today represents a major improvement over the bill that left the House with far better funding levels. It was worked out through a lengthy and constructive process involving both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol. I believe that the resulting conference report is worthy of the support of this House, and we have been advised that the President will sign it.

Let me briefly describe some of the highlights. Mr. Speaker. First, the conference report provides the full \$1.3 billion increase proposed in the President's budget for veterans' health care. It also includes a \$30 million increase for VA medical and prosthetic research and a \$10 million increase for grants for construction of State extended care facilities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in the veterans area, I am also very glad to report that we were able to remedy a long-standing injustice affecting former residents of the Philippines who served with the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. Under current law, these Filipino veterans receive just half the benefits paid to American veterans even if they live in the United States as U.S. citizens or permanent residents.

Under this conference report, these Filipino veterans living in this country will receive the same benefits as other World War II veterans.

Science funding is strongly supported with a 14 percent increase for the National Science Foundation.

For NASA, the conference report includes a 5 percent funding increase, providing \$250 million above the President's budget request.

Within the HUD budget, we provide the full amount needed to renew all expiring section 8 housing contracts so that no one loses their housing assistance under this program, and the agreement also provides increases for several other high priority housing programs, including a 13 percent increase for home grants to States and local governments for affordable housing development, a 4 percent increase in CDBG formula grants and a 9 percent increase for housing for the elderly and disabled and a 10 percent increase for homeless assistance grants.

□ 1315

While on the subject of assistance for those in acute need, I should also mention the \$30 million increase in funding provided for FEMA's emergency food and shelter program, a very efficient program that relies on private, charitable organizations to get help to where it is most needed.

The conference report also funds another 79,000 new Section 8 housing assistance vouchers to help make a reduction in unmet needs for housing assistance. This is 41,000 fewer new vouchers than sought by President Clinton, but 19,000 more than were added last year. We look forward to working with HUD to ensure full utilization of Section 8 vouchers.

The impressive commitment to housing programs in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a testament to the strong advocacy of HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo, who has worked tirelessly for those who benefit from these housing programs.

The bill also includes generous funding for activities for the Environmental Protection Agency. The \$7.8 billion provided in the final agreement represents a \$664 million increase over the amount requested by the President, and \$395 million over last year. A total of \$3.6 billion is provided for important clean water and sewer projects under the State and territorial assistance grants program.

In addition to the funding provided, the conference report has eliminated or significantly modified a number of environmental riders. All of these changes have been accepted by the White House. As Members know, the House bill did not provide any money for the Corporation for National and Community Service, including the President's signature AmeriCorps program. The final package which we present today provides \$464 million for the Corporation, \$70 million below the budget request, but an increase of \$25 million over fiscal year 2000.

I should also note that this conference report is being used as a vehicle to send back to the President the energy and water appropriations bill, this time without the provision that led to the veto. We are pleased to be able to be of assistance in bringing that part of the appropriations process to a successful conclusion, and I will defer to the leaders of that subcommittee for an explanation of the details of the package being presented here today.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) for his leadership and cooperation in fashioning this conference report. He has done a tremendous job. He has been a good friend throughout this process, and very responsive to minority concerns. We appreciate that, and thank him for his commitment to trying to do the right thing by all of the important programs and agencies under our jurisdiction. It has been a pleasure working with him and his hard-working staff, including Frank Cushing, Tim Peterson, Valerie Baldwin, Dena Baron, and Jennifer Whitson, from the professional staff; and from the chairman's personal staff, John Simmons and Ron Anderson.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank the talented staff on this side of the aisle, David Reich and Mike Stephens from the minority appropriations office, and Lee Alman and Gavin Clingham from my personal staff.

I want to thank, Mr. Speaker, especially the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member on the full committee, for all of his outstanding assistance and support throughout this process. He is a tireless leader of the Committee on Appropriations on our side of the aisle, and he has been extremely active in marking up this bill and throughout the process.

Finally, in closing, Mr. Speaker, we have four very capable, hard-working Democratic Members on this subcommittee: the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER).

Each of these Members have spent many hours working on this bill. It bears their input in so many places, and I am extremely appreciative for the contribution that each has made, and for their support throughout the process.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent conference report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development with whom, in this venture, we are partners. (Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and the conference agreement on H.R. 4635, and as my colleagues, both the chairman and the ranking member, have mentioned, this conference agreement will also enact the provisions of H.R. 5483, which I introduced yesterday, and is a modified version of the fiscal year 2001 energy and water development appropriations act that was vetoed by the President on October 7.

Members will recall that the President vetoed the bill over a provision regarding the management of the Missouri River that he had signed into law on four previous occasions. On October 11, the House voted to override the President's veto, and I want to thank my colleagues who supported on a bipartisan basis that override vote.

Unfortunately, the Senate did not believe it could override the votes. Either they did not have the vote or they elected not to take it up. Therefore, in order to move the process forward and to get this conference report passed, we have removed the provision that the President objected to regarding the Missouri River.

In cooperation with the Senate, we made a few other modest and minor changes in the bill, but I wish to assure my colleagues that we did not reduce or delete funding for any programs or

projects that were included in the conference agreement that was previously agreed to and passed on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this table, which outlines the various provisions of the energy and water development bill.

The table referred to is as follows:

**ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</b>						
<b>Corps of Engineers - Civil</b>						
General investigations .....	161,994	137,700	153,327	139,219	160,038	-1,956
Construction, general .....	1,385,032	1,346,000	1,378,430	1,361,449	1,717,199	+ 332,167
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee .....	309,416	309,000	323,350	334,450	347,731	+38,315
Operation and maintenance, general .....	1,853,618	1,854,000	1,854,000	1,862,471	1,901,959	+48,341
Regulatory program .....	117,000	125,000	125,000	120,000	125,000	+8,000
FUSRAP .....	150,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	-10,000
General expenses .....	149,500	152,000	149,500	152,000	152,000	+2,500
<b>Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil .....</b>	<b>4,126,560</b>	<b>4,063,700</b>	<b>4,123,607</b>	<b>4,109,589</b>	<b>4,543,927</b>	<b>+417,367</b>
<b>TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>						
<b>Central Utah Project Completion Account</b>						
Central Utah project construction .....	22,436	19,566	19,566	19,566	19,566	-2,870
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation .....	10,476	14,158	14,158	14,158	14,158	+3,682
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account .....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....
<b>Subtotal .....</b>	<b>37,912</b>	<b>38,724</b>	<b>38,724</b>	<b>38,724</b>	<b>38,724</b>	<b>+812</b>
Program oversight and administration .....	1,321	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,216	-105
<b>Total, Central Utah project completion account .....</b>	<b>39,233</b>	<b>39,940</b>	<b>39,940</b>	<b>39,940</b>	<b>39,940</b>	<b>+707</b>
<b>Bureau of Reclamation</b>						
Water and related resources .....	605,992	643,058	635,777	655,192	678,450	+72,458
Loan program .....	11,577	9,369	9,369	9,369	9,369	-2,208
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(43,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(-16,000)
Central Valley project restoration fund .....	42,000	38,382	38,382	38,382	38,382	-3,618
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration .....	60,000	60,000	.....	.....	.....	-60,000
Policy and administration .....	47,000	50,224	47,000	50,224	50,224	+3,224
<b>Total, Bureau of Reclamation .....</b>	<b>766,569</b>	<b>801,033</b>	<b>730,528</b>	<b>753,167</b>	<b>776,425</b>	<b>+9,856</b>
<b>Total, title II, Department of the Interior .....</b>	<b>805,802</b>	<b>840,973</b>	<b>770,468</b>	<b>793,107</b>	<b>816,365</b>	<b>+10,563</b>
<b>TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b>						
Energy supply .....	637,962	730,692	616,482	691,520	660,574	+22,612
(By transfer) .....	(5,821)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-5,821)
Non-defense environmental management .....	332,350	282,812	281,001	309,141	277,812	-54,538
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund .....	249,247	294,588	.....	297,778	.....	-249,247
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation .....	.....	.....	301,400	.....	393,367	+393,367
Science .....	2,787,627	3,162,639	2,830,915	2,870,112	3,186,352	+398,725
Nuclear Waste Disposal .....	239,601	318,574	213,000	59,175	191,074	-48,527
Departmental administration .....	205,581	214,421	153,527	210,128	226,107	+20,526
Miscellaneous revenues .....	-106,887	-128,762	-111,000	-128,762	-151,000	-44,113
<b>Net appropriation .....</b>	<b>98,694</b>	<b>85,659</b>	<b>42,527</b>	<b>81,366</b>	<b>75,107</b>	<b>-23,587</b>
Office of the Inspector General .....	29,500	33,000	31,500	28,988	31,500	+2,000
<b>Environmental restoration and waste management:</b>						
Defense function .....	(5,716,037)	(6,159,655)	(5,964,004)	(6,148,824)	(6,122,190)	(+406,153)
Non-defense function .....	(581,597)	(577,400)	(582,401)	(589,039)	(671,179)	(+89,582)
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>(6,297,634)</b>	<b>(6,737,055)</b>	<b>(6,446,405)</b>	<b>(6,737,863)</b>	<b>(6,793,369)</b>	<b>(+495,735)</b>
<b>Atomic Energy Defense Activities</b>						
<b>National Nuclear Security Administration:</b>						
Weapons activities .....	4,427,052	4,639,225	4,579,684	4,883,289	5,015,188	+588,134
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	729,100	865,590	861,477	908,967	874,196	+145,096
Naval reactors .....	677,600	673,083	677,600	694,600	690,163	+12,563
Office of the Administrator .....	.....	.....	.....	10,000	10,000	+10,000
<b>Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration .....</b>	<b>5,833,752</b>	<b>6,177,898</b>	<b>6,118,761</b>	<b>6,496,856</b>	<b>6,589,545</b>	<b>+755,793</b>
Defense environmental restoration and waste management .....	4,467,308	4,562,057	4,522,707	4,635,763	4,974,476	+507,168
Defense facilities closure projects .....	1,060,447	1,082,714	1,082,297	1,082,297	1,082,714	+22,267
Defense environmental management privatization .....	188,282	514,884	259,000	324,000	65,000	-123,282
<b>Subtotal, Defense environmental management .....</b>	<b>5,716,037</b>	<b>6,159,655</b>	<b>5,864,004</b>	<b>6,042,060</b>	<b>6,122,190</b>	<b>+406,153</b>
Other defense activities .....	309,199	575,617	592,235	579,463	585,755	+276,556
Defense nuclear waste disposal .....	111,574	112,000	200,000	292,000	200,000	+88,426
Energy employees compensation initiative (proposal) .....	.....	17,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities .....</b>	<b>11,970,562</b>	<b>13,042,170</b>	<b>12,775,000</b>	<b>13,410,379</b>	<b>13,497,490</b>	<b>+1,526,928</b>

**ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 — continued**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Power Marketing Administrations</b>						
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration .....	39,579	3,900	3,900	3,900	3,900	-35,679
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration .....	27,891	28,100	28,100	28,100	28,100	+209
(By transfer) .....	(773)					(-773)
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration .....	192,602	164,916	160,930	164,916	165,830	-26,772
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund .....	1,309	2,670	2,670	2,670	2,670	+1,361
<b>Total, Power Marketing Administrations .....</b>	<b>261,381</b>	<b>199,586</b>	<b>195,600</b>	<b>199,586</b>	<b>200,500</b>	<b>-60,881</b>
<b>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	174,950	175,200	175,200	175,200	175,200	+250
Revenues applied .....	-174,950	-175,200	-175,200	-175,200	-175,200	-250
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission) .....		-85,000	-85,000	-85,000	-75,000	-75,000
Defense environmental privatization (rescission) .....					-97,000	-97,000
<b>Total, title III, Department of Energy .....</b>	<b>16,606,924</b>	<b>18,064,720</b>	<b>17,202,425</b>	<b>17,863,045</b>	<b>18,341,776</b>	<b>+1,734,852</b>
<b>TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
Appalachian Regional Commission .....	66,149	71,400	63,000	66,400	66,400	+251
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	16,935	18,500	17,000	18,500	18,500	+1,565
Delta Regional Authority .....		30,000		20,000	20,000	+20,000
Denali Commission .....	19,924	20,000		30,000	30,000	+10,076
<b>Nuclear Regulatory Commission:</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	464,913	481,900	481,900	481,900	481,900	+16,987
Revenues .....	-442,000	-447,958	-457,100	-457,100	-447,958	-5,958
<b>Subtotal .....</b>	<b>22,913</b>	<b>33,942</b>	<b>24,800</b>	<b>24,800</b>	<b>33,942</b>	<b>+11,029</b>
Office of Inspector General .....	5,000	6,200	5,500	5,500	5,500	+500
Revenues .....	-5,000	-6,076	-5,500	-5,500	-5,390	-390
<b>Subtotal .....</b>		<b>124</b>			<b>110</b>	<b>+110</b>
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>22,913</b>	<b>34,066</b>	<b>24,800</b>	<b>24,800</b>	<b>34,052</b>	<b>+11,139</b>
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board .....	2,589	3,200	2,700	3,000	2,900	+311
<b>Total, title IV, Independent agencies .....</b>	<b>128,510</b>	<b>177,166</b>	<b>107,500</b>	<b>162,700</b>	<b>171,852</b>	<b>+43,342</b>
<b>TITLE V EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b>						
<b>Atomic Energy Defense Activities</b>						
Cerro Grande fire activities (contingent emergency appropriations) .....				203,460	203,460	+203,460
Appalachian Regional Commission (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					11,000	+11,000
<b>Total, title V, Emergency Supplemental .....</b>				<b>203,460</b>	<b>214,460</b>	<b>+214,460</b>
<b>TITLE VI RESCISSIONS</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</b>						
<b>Corps of Engineers - Civil</b>						
General investigations (rescission) .....	-930					+930
Construction, general (rescission) .....	-12,819					+12,819
<b>Total, Corps of Engineers - Civil .....</b>	<b>-13,749</b>					<b>+13,749</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b>						
Nuclear Waste Disposal (rescission) .....	-4,000					+4,000
<b>Power Marketing Administrations</b>						
Southeastern Power Administration: Purchase power and Wheeling (rescission) .....	-3,000					+3,000
<b>Total, title VI, Rescissions .....</b>	<b>-20,749</b>					<b>+20,749</b>
<b>Grand total:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority .....	21,647,047	23,146,559	22,204,000	23,131,901	24,088,380	+2,441,333
Appropriations .....	(21,667,796)	(23,231,559)	(22,289,000)	(23,013,441)	(24,045,920)	(+2,378,124)
Contingent emergency appropriations .....				(203,460)	(214,460)	(+214,460)
Rescissions .....	(-20,749)	(-85,000)	(-85,000)	(-85,000)	(-172,000)	(-151,251)
(By transfer) .....	(6,594)					(-6,594)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), for his help in putting these changes together.

I express my appreciation to the leadership of the House, and particularly of the Committee on Appropriations that has crafted this joint effort to join these two conference reports together, so we can move the process forward. I will ask all of my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise for two purposes. The first is to add my voice to that of the gentleman from California (Chairman PACKARD) and to acknowledge to my colleagues that there is an agreement as far as the changes that were made on energy and water. It obviously is now included in part of the underlying legislation. I would ask for their support.

The second point I would make is that I believe that the bill relative to the Veterans Administration, Housing, Urban Development, and Related Agencies also deserves our support, and will congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), as well as the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for their work.

Again, I do urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy on a provision in the conference agreement relating to the definition of "urban county" under Federal housing law.

As the chairman knows, the community development block grant, CDBG, program's statutory provisions relating to the urban county classification do not contemplate the form of consolidated city-county government found in Duval County, Florida, which encompasses my city of Jacksonville, where there is no unincorporated area.

A recent decision by the Bureau of the Census and subsequently by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has questioned the status of Jacksonville/Duval County as an entitlement area.

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

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I am aware of this problem facing the city of Jacksonville.

Mrs. FOWLER. My purpose for entering into this colloquy is to seek clarification from the chairman about the effect of the provision adopted by the Conference Committee to amend the definition of "urban county" to address this problem facing Jacksonville.

Is it the chairman's understanding that section 217 of the conference report addresses the concerns of the town of Baldwin, Jacksonville, and the Beaches communities, by amending current law to classify Jacksonville as an urban county, and that the language would preserve the area's longstanding status as an entitlement area for CDBG grants, while also allowing the town of Baldwin to elect to have its population excluded from the entitlement area?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. I believe the language clarifies that Jacksonville/Duval County meets the definition of an urban county under the statute, as amended. HUD also agrees with this interpretation.

Mrs. FOWLER. I thank the chairman for his comments.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), a hard-working member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity for me to express my feelings about our subcommittee, our chairman, and our ranking member and the staff, as well as the full committee.

This has been an exercise in good bipartisanism of working together to reach a goal that will benefit the people of this country and improve the quality of their lives, so this is an experience.

The conference report should be voted on positively by every Member of this body. A great deal of work has gone into it, quite a bit of negotiating, and that is what it should be in this body. I am happy to see that the community development block grant program is funded at \$5.1 million, \$157 million above the President's request, and \$257 million more than last year.

This is a signal that this committee has looked at low-income and moderate-income people to certainly help them to improve the quality of their lives.

EPA also had an increase, \$529 million for NSF, and \$683 million for NASA. I will not go into all of these details, Mr. Speaker, but the Congress needs to realize I think that this is one of the few times that the committee funded everything. All of the agencies and all of the programs that merited their funding they did fund. We will not find programs in this particular conference report for people who need it and did not get it.

We could have more money in the conference report for Section 8 housing, but they did a good job of that under the circumstances.

One thing about the chairman and the ranking member, they are very fair people, very fair. Once they promise us something in terms of one's districts, in terms of the people, they come through with it. So I am happy to see they put 79,000 new Section 8 vouchers. They did the best they could, and I thank them for that.

I am particularly proud, Mr. Speaker, of what the committee did for housing and seniors. That program represents a very dire need for better housing. This conference report took this into consideration and provided considerable new support for housing.

The conference agreement appropriated \$996 million to develop housing for the elderly and the disabled, \$85 million more than last year. That is a considerable rise or increase in this program. Capital grants for construction, for rehab and acquisition for the elderly under the section 202 program, the measure provides \$779 million more than last year.

I guess what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, this conference report reflects a unanimous effort to aid people in this country, and I think we should thank the committee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for the tremendous work that he and the members of the subcommittee have done this year in preparing the conference report for the House consideration.

As many of our colleagues may know, the subcommittee's initial allocation made the gentleman's task especially difficult this year, but the conference report we are considering today is truly an affirmation of the gentleman's commitment and this House's commitment to our Nation's veterans, and I thank the gentleman for his work.

□ 1330

As my colleagues know, the 11th District of North Carolina, which I have the privilege to represent, has one of the largest numbers of senior veterans in the country. My constituents have served the United States in every war, and especially World War II to the Persian Gulf. Many of them now are needing assistance from our veterans hospital. They get their good assistance from the VA Medical Center at Oteen, but we are experiencing a growing health problem among the veterans of the Western North Carolina region. Alzheimer's disease is certainly impacting our area.

The Asheville Center has proposed the creation of a unit devoted to the diagnosis and treatment of dementia-related illness as part of the fiscal year 2001 budget. This project has been included as a priority by the network in its most recent planning submission to the Department of Veterans Affairs. I will be working with the Department to secure funds for the staffing needs for the dementia unit in the upcoming year.

I want to bring the project to the attention of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and ask for the support of the subcommittee and the House in making the much-needed project a reality for the senior veterans of western North Carolina.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) for bringing the project to the subcommittee's attention. I know that improving and expanding the Asheville VA Medical Center has been the highest priority for him and the veterans of his district for many, many years.

I am also aware that Alzheimer's disease and other dementia-related illnesses are a growing problem for veterans in western North Carolina and throughout the Nation. I would be happy to work with the gentleman from North Carolina in bringing the important project to the Department's attention and in helping the Asheville VA Medical Center as it moves forward with it.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) for his assistance.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 4635, the Fiscal Year 2001 Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill.

In particular, I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for the work they did on fully funding the NASA budget as it relates to the International Space Station and the Space Shuttle program, and particularly with reference to the fact that the conference report includes \$3 million for the planning and design of the Bioastronautics Project.

The bill will provide the initial funding for the construction of a research facility located at the Johnson Space Center to examine the health effects of microgravity on long-term space flight. It will be undertaken with the Human Space Flight Program along with the National Space and Biomedical Research Institute located at Baylor College of Medicine in my district.

I appreciate the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and the gen-

tleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), ranking member, for putting this in, as well as the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), vice-chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the VA-HUD appropriations conference report. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) for his leadership, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for his leadership, and the great work of the staff in meeting the many priorities that we all want included in the bill.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, the bill increases funding for veterans' medical care, as has been said earlier, by \$1.35 billion over last year's level for a total 2-year increase of \$3 billion. This is absolutely critical funding that will be used to provide our veterans with nursing home care, treatment for serious mental illnesses, prescription drugs, routine medical care, and other badly needed services.

One way the money can be used next year will be to provide each of the 22 Veterans Integrated Service Networks, or VISNs, with a higher rate of reimbursement for treating veterans with the hepatitis C virus. This may not be on everybody's radar screen, but the disabling disease of the liver affects a large number of veterans, especially those of the Vietnam era. The treatment for the disease is costing an average of \$15,000 a year for medications alone. Yet the VA only reimburses VISNs at the low, basic-care rate of \$3,200.

As a result of language contained in the conference report, this will now change. At the Chair's insistence and my assistance and the committee members, we are now directing the VA to reimburse the VISNs for hepatitis C at the higher, complex-care rate of \$42,000 per patient being treated for the disease.

I particularly would like, Mr. Speaker, to thank the Vietnam Veterans of America for their strong advocacy on the matter.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that the conference report provides additional funding for affordable housing for all Americans, especially older Americans and disabled individuals under section 202 and section 811.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking minority member.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the conference report. I think that, after being lost in wonderland territory for over 8 months, that the committee has finally been allowed

to be realistic in terms of what our housing needs are, what our scientific research needs are, and what some other basic needs are that are funded by the bill.

I also want to congratulate the members on the other subcommittee in the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for the work that they have done. I must confess some disquiet in supporting that portion of the conference report, not because I object to the work done by the subcommittee, but because we are proceeding in a very strange way. Because of that fact, we are in a situation where we are going to be voting almost \$900 million more than the President requested for that bill without having any knowledge of how much we are going to be allowed to provide for what I consider to be even more critical programs such as education and health care.

We have been stymied here for months, frankly, over the resistance of the majority party leadership to provide the same kind of financial largesse for education that we are providing in the Energy and Water bill for the Army Corps of Engineers or in some of the other bills that have gone through the place.

I would simply say I congratulate everyone for the work they have done on these bills. It is not their fault that the bills are being considered in the context. I want to make that clear. But I do object to having to vote for the kind of package without knowing what the plans are in the end to meet what ought to be the number one priority in the country, education.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

As the gentleman is aware, our New York State Department of Health recently released its findings from its Cancer Surveillance Improvement Initiative. That report disclosed that Rockland County in my area of New York State and the East Side of Manhattan are among the highest breast cancer incidence in the States.

Specifically, the report shows that a majority of these two areas are characterized by elevated incidence and are 15 to 50 percent higher than the State average for breast cancer incidence.

In response to this alarming finding, I have been working with the gentleman from Manhattan, New York (Mrs. MALONEY), to secure funding

from the EPA for the NYU School of Medicine to conduct an assessment to determine if the observed excess incidence of breast cancer in Rockland County and on the East Side of Manhattan are associated with air pollution and electromagnetic radiation generated from local power plants.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for the work that he has done on this important issue and bringing it to the subcommittee's attention. I share his concern for the findings in the New York State Department of Health's report, which show the high incidence of breast cancer in Rockland County and also on the East Side of Manhattan Island.

I want to assure the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that I will work with him and with the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) to find the best source of funding for the important research project in next year's appropriations bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) for his support.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for his efforts in working with me to secure the funding for the project. I also want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), ranking member, for their commitment to work with us to secure funding for this important project next year.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a hard-working member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the conference report. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and certainly the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking member, Frank Cushing, the staff, all of the staff for their great work in bringing about an outstanding conference report. None of this would have happened without extraordinary work, a lot of hours. I know there have been many long hours, so I salute all of them for that great amount of effort and great contribution.

This conference report responsibly provides a \$1.3 billion increase for Vet-

erans' Medical Health Care, a critical \$30 million increase for Veterans' Medical and Prosthetics Research and responsible increases in the research-intensive agencies NASA and NSF. I am pleased that these and other funding priorities are in this bill and will be signed into law when this conference report lands on the President's desk.

The 2001 VA-HUD bill is a fair bill produced under most difficult circumstances. In fact, this 2001 Energy and Water spending bill, under the stewardship of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), has been attached to this conference report. I am pleased that it, too, will be signed into law. This package holds the line on spending in a prudent manner and allows us to pay down the debt.

The gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) is to be saluted for crafting this piece of legislation under those very difficult circumstances, and I think he and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) have worked with our colleagues and certainly the colleagues in the other body to forge a fiscally responsible bill in a bipartisan spirit.

This has been an unusual process this year because the other body did not consider the VA-HUD bill on the floor. Yet, it was negotiated in a bipartisan way with the White House fully engaged, and I am aware of no objections to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is the fruit of all their labors, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his thorough and responsible work, and let him know that I appreciate his assistance over the past months to address an important and divisive issue in my congressional district; that is, our national policy on contaminated sediments and specifically EPA's policies on contaminated sediments in the Hudson River.

At this point, EPA is poised to propose a massive environmental dredging project that would drastically affect both the ecology of the Upper Hudson River and the economies of those communities along its banks. This is a decision that has many of those communities rightly concerned about the long-term impacts of any such project and the scientific basis for it.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, there are strong feelings on both sides of this issue and that the common interest is to see that remediation of the environmental damage to this river is accomplished. What we need at this point is to mitigate the contention and let

sound science direct the decision making, and I believe the statement of the managers at this time will do that because it expressly directs the EPA to take no action to initiate or order the use of dredging until the National Academy of Science report has been completed and its findings have been properly considered by the agency. These instructions and the statement of managers are clear, and I expect the EPA to abide by the language.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's earlier statements to clarify the intent of the language in the Statement of Managers, which is similar to language included in this year's spending bill, and also for the past 2 years. As in past years, exceptions have been made for voluntary agreements and urgent cases.

The NAS will soon deliver a comprehensive report on the risks associated with various methods of addressing contaminated sediments, including: dredging, capping, source control, natural recovery, and disposal of contaminated sediments. I want to point out that this information by the NAS will be really the first time that other alternatives to dredging have been seriously considered.

On behalf of the constituents of the 22nd Congressional District, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for persevering and staying with us on this, because we need to ensure public confidence, and I want to thank him again for his earlier comments which do clarify.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to engage in a brief colloquy with the fine chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

I note in the conference report there are two line items through EPA which will help improve the environmental quality of the Kalamazoo River Watershed in southwestern Michigan. One such provision is directed to Western Michigan University's Environmental Research Institute; the other is directed to Calhoun County, Michigan.

I would like to clarify that the line item with respect to Calhoun County would be solely administered through Western Michigan University's Environmental Research Institute, provided that such funds are used to provide environmental quality for that portion of the Kalamazoo Watershed which is in Calhoun County, Michigan. By doing this, we will help ensure that there is no unnecessary duplication of effort in this regard.

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

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would simply advise the gentleman that I agree with him.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his agreement.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, can you advise us as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the VA-HUD appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this has been a challenging task to assemble this comprehensive legislation; and it is a testament to the tireless efforts of the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), as well as the staff of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

I am pleased that there is a provision in this bill that was authored by our colleague from Georgia and myself which will help and assist our communities across this country by delaying the designation of nonattainment by EPA until such time as the Supreme Court rules or until June 15 of 2001, whichever comes first.

In the interim, though, Mr. Speaker, the EPA and State environmental divisions will also continue to monitor our air, the air quality for communities, so that they can be assured that they know what is in their air. But this legislation, too, will ensure that reason and common sense is adhered to as we all work towards the common goal of improving our Nation's air quality.

I appreciate the fact that the White House did give us a consensus on this and worked with us too, and I look forward to further working with these gentlemen in subcommittee in their efforts.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this VA-HUD conference report, and I want to commend our colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their diligence. Their leadership has produced a conference report that is not only fiscally sound but one that provides for our Nation's veterans, for housing, and for environmental programs with the funding and tools needed to meet our important needs.

Specifically, this conference report provides over \$107 billion in new budget authority for our veterans' benefits, for housing programs, and for those agencies dealing with science, space and the environment. While the bill is higher than the House-approved bill, it is nevertheless \$2.3 billion less than the President's request. More importantly, though, this report includes \$5.2 billion for debt reduction.

In addition, this conference report includes the provisions of H.R. 1594, the Filipino Veterans Benefits Improvement Act, which will permit the payment of full service-connected disability compensation to our Filipino veterans residing in the United States who are citizens, or who have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence; provides comprehensive health care services at VA health centers; and permits the VA outpatient clinic in the Philippines to provide Filipino veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces with comprehensive health care.

It is gratifying that the fiscal year 2001 energy and water conference report, which the House previously approved, has been included in this measure and which includes several important flood control projects in my district, including the Ramapo/Mahwah and the Saw Mill River projects at Elmsford.

Accordingly, I urge all our colleagues to fully support this important conference report.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the leadership for giving us the opportunity to present this bill before the House today. I think, as we have said, it is a good bill and it is a bipartisan bill. I think we have worked well together all the way along. I think the House really did a great job.

That is not to denigrate the Senate, but I think we clearly knew what our challenge was and we set out to do it. We worked together, and I think we can all be proud of this product.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4635, particularly title V dealing with Filipino veterans benefits improvements. I commend Mr. FILNER and Mr. GILMAN for their tireless efforts on this issue and their leadership in this long struggle for Filipino veterans equity.

H.R. 4635 will correct some of the injustices inflicted on the Filipino soldiers who fought courageously under U.S. command during World War II. It will provide full compensation for service related disabilities for Filipino veterans who are living permanently and legally in the United States. These veterans would receive the full dollar amount in benefits, rather than the "peso-rate standard" of 50 cents to the dollar. Filipino veterans deserve full compensation like all other U.S. veterans. Today, there are about 17,000 Filipino veterans who are U.S. citizens, and about 1,250 of these

currently receive Veterans Affairs compensation for service-connected disabilities. Full compensation would be a long awaited victory for them.

In addition, H.R. 4635 will expand health services to those already receiving compensation for service connected disabilities in the U.S. so that they can be seen for all medical care. To the fullest extent possible, veterans residing in the Philippines who enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces would be able benefit from this expansion of health services as well.

The remedy of full compensation is long overdue. Filipino veterans have been waiting over 50 years to receive such benefits, after the Rescission Act of 1946 denied them promised benefits. Now they are in their late 70s and 80s and continue to fight for the equity that they rightfully deserve.

In 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt called and ordered all organized military forces of the Philippine government into the service of the U.S. Armed Forces under the United States Army Forces in the Far East. Under U.S. command, the Philippine Commonwealth Army and the Special Philippine Scouts fought valiantly alongside American soldiers. They participated in some of the toughest battles of World War II and helped to achieve peace in the Pacific.

Unfortunately, after the war's end, these efforts were not justly recognized. The Rescission Act of 1946 deemed Filipino military service as non-active, thereby denying them the rights, privileges and benefits which every U.S. military serviceman is entitled to. H.R. 4635, by providing full compensation for service related disabilities in the full dollar amount, will bring these veterans one step closer to equity.

Filipino veterans have been fighting many years for equity. In 1990, they were allowed eligibility for citizenship in the U.S., and in 1999, Public Law 106-69 enabled Filipino American veterans of WWII to return to the Philippines and maintain 75 percent of their benefits, including Supplemental Security Income. President Clinton issued a memorandum this past July that directed the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to complete a study by October 31, 2000, of Filipino veterans and to identify options available for addressing those needs.

Therefore, I urge your support for the advancement of Filipino veterans equity. Filipino veterans fought fearlessly to achieve peace more than 50 years ago amidst the turmoil of World War II. Filipino soldiers also fought valiantly alongside American soldiers, under the command of the United States of America. They were crucial to our nation's war efforts in the Pacific. For this they deserve benefits equal to every other veteran who fought under the United States flag. I urge my colleagues to continue this fight for equity and support H.R. 4635 so that Filipino veterans will receive some of the benefits that are long overdue.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the VA/HUD/Energy and Water Appropriations Act. During the 106th Congress, the Administration and Congress have significantly increased appropriations for veterans' health care. For fiscal year 2000, the administration requested a \$1 billion increase in appropriations for veterans' health care and Congress eventually approved a

\$1.7 billion increase. This increase recognized the adverse consequences of four consecutive years of flat-line budgets for the Department of Veterans Affairs medical care system. The only increase in funding had come from a stream of non-appropriated revenues including veterans' health insurance and copayments, sharing agreements and other funds—the increase in appropriations also signaled the failure to provide adequate funding for veterans' health care from non-appropriated sources. For a number of reasons—some beyond its control—VA has not been successful obtaining the full amount of these projected revenues. For fiscal year 2001, the administration requested a \$1.35 billion increase in appropriations for veterans' health care—a record administration increase in VA health care appropriations. While we have made some real progress in funding our veterans' health care, we must continue this progress in the future as VA health care is not immune to rising costs of providing health care, particularly pharmaceutical costs.

I do want to address one concern about a modification made to the House bill in the conference agreement. In this regard, I want to thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. WALSH, and the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN for addressing concerns which the chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, BOB STUMP, and I noted in our views and estimates submitted to the Budget Committee and which I later shared with them in testimony to the subcommittee. In particular, we expressed concern about a legislative proposal to return to the U.S. Treasury revenues anticipated from new resources collected using authorities in the Veterans Millennium Health and Benefits Act. I appreciate the subcommittee's rejection of that legislative proposal. When this Congress passed the millennium bill, it was clearly understood that its promise lay in allowing new funding streams, primarily from veterans' increased cost sharing, to augment VA's long-term care program. This proposal would, thus, compromise VA's funding for new long-term care programs.

The House initially rejected a proposal by the administration to return to the U.S. Treasury revenues anticipated from these new resource collection authorities. As veterans age, finding acceptable long-term care alternatives grows increasingly important to ensuring their health. Without expanding these options, VA will be forced to reduce others services it offers veterans. In conference, however, these funds were made subject to appropriation—I am hopeful that this will not mean that any additional revenues collected will be used to offset any program growth these funds might have allowed. This would constitute a real breach in the compact Congress has made with our veterans to use additional funds from their increased copayments for VA programs.

On the floor, the House added \$30 million to VA's Grants for Construction of State Extended Care Facilities, bringing the total House request to \$90 million. I am pleased the Senate has also seen fit to add funds to the Grants for Construction of State Extended Care account. Additional funds will ensure a smooth transition from VA's current funding methodology to an improved formula that will allow more renovation projects to be consid-

ered and ensure that veterans' needs are addressed. It will allow all of the "grandfathered" projects to be addressed and, thus, allow VA to determine its new priorities with a clean slate.

VA Research was also in need of additional resources. While other federal research programs have recognized significant gains in recent years, VA research has been frozen in the last four budgets. The ranking member of the VA Committee's Health Subcommittee, Mr. Gutierrez, recommended an additional \$30 million for VA Research for FY 2001 in an amendment that was accepted on the House floor. These funds would allow the program to accommodate inflation and fund additional areas of interest. I understand the Senate's bill also supports this level of funding for medical research and I'm pleased that this level of funding was approved by the Conferees.

I am extremely pleased to note both House's strong support for new centers of excellence in the treatment and research of motor-neuron diseases, such as Parkinson's Disease. In fact, VA has recently shared with me an excellent proposal for six new Parkinson's centers. I had an opportunity to visit the VA Centers' prototype in San Francisco. VA is accomplishing great things there and I am pleased that this experience may soon be duplicated to the benefit of veterans in five additional sites around the country. I also believe VA would be well served by developing centers of excellence in Multiple Sclerosis as referenced in both of the VA—HUD Appropriations Subcommittee reports.

I am pleased that the resources, as outlined by the Conference Agreement, will allow funds for the successful operation of all VA programs. VA must continue to allow for responsible growth in each year's budget. Just like other health care providers, VA has inflationary costs beyond this control. In recent years, as VA has shifted to outpatient care that increasingly relies upon pharmaceuticals to manage health care conditions, VA's prescription drug costs have increased at rates from 15–25% annually. Likewise, the cost of medical supplies and capital equipment continue to increase at rates above general inflation. Employee payraises must be accommodated. VA nurses, some of whom have gone without any payraise for several years, were long overdue for increases in pay. Fortunately, Congress has just approved a bill that will correct this problem, but we must also give VA the ability to use the new pay rates we have authorized by providing needed resources to recruit and retain highly qualified health care providers in an era of fierce competition for their skills.

Just like other health care providers, VA also has significantly transformed the way it does business in the past few years. It has closed many beds, even while adding significantly to its patient workload. I am convinced the organization is committed to reforms that will bring about greater efficiencies. Even with these changes, however, it is impossible for VA to meet all of its challenges without a healthy annual increase in its budget.

The VA health care system must also contend with the significant challenge of Hepatitis C that is disproportionately affecting its users. The San Francisco VA Medical Center esti-

ated that, including the costs of screening for veterans with negative tests and candidates who are not well-suited to treatment, it costs up to \$100,000 for each "cure" (or each case in which viral counts are reduced to untraceable amounts). Last fall, the Inspector General indicated that in each of the eight facilities it visited, employees believed addressing Hepatitis C would require between two and seven dedicated employees. This constitutes an enormous new challenge for VA. In addition to this new epidemic, VA must continue to effectively manage the many other chronic conditions, such as hypertension, diabetes, AIDS, and pulmonary disorders that its veteran patients have in higher proportions than the general population. VA health care must also restore some of the capacity it has reduced under financial duress for seriously mentally ill veterans.

Congress and veterans have grown increasingly concerned with waiting times—the time that it takes VA to offer veterans its next-available appointment. Long waiting times have been a clear indication to many Members of Congress that there has been significant stress on the system. In addition to requesting additional funding for VA health care for this fiscal year, the Administration now has many initiatives underway to address the problems. I have requested that the General Accounting Office study the issue and report to me about the problems with data that hamper VA's ability to understand waiting times and initiatives, including "best practices", underway to address waiting times.

We also know that certain services and regions have been drastically affected by VA's Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation model. A few of the 22 Veterans Integrated Service Networks have had to request budget supplements—even with the significant increase we provided last year—and even with optimistic future funding scenarios, expect significant funding shortfalls in the future. The network that serves many veterans in my district in Western Illinois, is one example. I know the belt-tightening that has occurred throughout Nebraska, Iowa, and the rest of the areas that comprise that network. They have actually closed some inpatient facilities and now contract for care from local community facilities. This is a practice that as few as 10 years ago would have been considered untenable. Even if it closes most of the remaining medical centers in the network, the network will continue to have fiscal obligations that outstrip its projected budgets. I recently requested the General Accounting Office to look at allocations to determine if some regions are more adversely impacted than others under the new methodology.

I have also been concerned that the new funding methodology has adversely impacted mental health and other programs that address chronic disease or disability. In moving toward a community and outpatient-focused approach, VA has closed literally thousands of psychiatric inpatient beds—about 40% of the beds it operated five years ago. I remain concerned that VA has not replaced the beds with meaningful programs in the community designed to help the veterans that have been displaced from inpatient programs.

I understand that, as a result of its commitment to moving forward on VA's Capital Assets Restructuring for Enhanced Services (CARES) initiative, there is a de facto moratorium on major construction for VA's health care system. It is important to realize, however, that even as VA considers changing the mission of its facilities or even closing some of its buildings, there is still an aging health care infrastructure to maintain. On top of the needs for modification to ensure the safety of the patients and staff who use its buildings, a moratorium could impede VA's ability to perform its missions. Many of the buildings from which VA operates are aging and need significant renovations. There are also needs for significant modifications in order to address new missions and to accommodate new technology. I am concerned that any moratorium will compromise VA's ability to make adjustments to its infrastructure to accomplish its goals in an evolving health care environment. VA cannot stand still and also have the modern facilities that are critical to higher quality, more timely patient care and more efficient use of limited resources.

These continuing concerns set the stage for the debates we will soon have about the fiscal year 2002 budget. Still, it is clear from the fiscal year 2001 budget submission that communication between Congress and the Administration has greatly improved and that this has translated into a strong budget request for this year—the strongest an Administration has ever made. I am also appreciative that Congress has seen fit to address shortfalls that could have undermined VA's ability to be the type of health care provider we want for our veterans.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I rise today to discuss the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2001. As the distinguished Chairman knows, I authored report language to accompany H.R. 4733 that recommended the Department of Energy process Uranium-233 stored in Building 3019 at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, in Tennessee, in a manner that would retain and make available alpha-emitting isotopes for the development of a promising and innovative cancer therapy known as Alpha Particle Immunotherapy.

Researchers at the Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center in New York view this therapy as a potential breakthrough treatment for numerous types of cancer, including acute myelogenous leukemia, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, breast, prostate, ovarian and lung cancer. This innovative approach to treat cancer is highly valuable because of its ability to target cancer cells and its unique potency in killing them. In addition, API treats the cancer without causing some of the negative side effects associated with treatment, such as nausea, hair loss and general malaise.

I am concerned by reports that the Oak Ridge National Laboratory is unable to produce the medical isotopes needed to support the development of this extremely promising cancer therapy. We simply must execute this project for its potential to save lives and save money for the U.S. taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to take a moment to emphasize my intent in offering this language. Briefly, the intent of this language is to permit the Department of Energy to use the

\$15 million it has projected are needed for Building 3019 surveillance and maintenance costs to stabilize, dispose and deactivate all of the excess Uranium-233 in Building 3019 to enable the beneficial use of Uranium-233 for this breakthrough cancer treatment. In doing so, it is my intent that the Department of Energy would spend the \$15 million to conduct routine surveillance and maintenance to control the stored material safely while at the same time blending-down the Uranium-233 to a radioactivity that eliminates safety and safeguards concerns, and extracting the radioactive isotope for cancer treatments. This approach would enable the Department of Energy to not only eliminate the nuclear criticality and vulnerability concerns at the Oak Ridge site, but would also provide the Department with the opportunity to take a leadership role in the worldwide effort to cure cancer. Again, I would like to point out that all of this could be accomplished within the existing DOE Building 3019 budget projections and potentially could provide life-cycle cost savings to the DOE and the American taxpayers of over \$200 million.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Highly Enriched Uranium Vulnerability Assessment Report identified Building 3019 as one of the ten most hazardous facilities within the DOE complex. This risk increases as long as no action is taken to place the Uranium-233 in stabilized form.

The language that I drafted attempts to correct this situation by enabling the Department of Energy through private sector stabilization, disposition and deactivation to expeditiously eliminate the concerns at the Oak Ridge site, while enhancing the accessibility of the Lab.

This entire opportunity holds the potential to turn "swords in plowshares" by reindustrializing this nuclear liability into a humanitarian use. In addition, it offers significant national benefits, not only the primary ones to cancer patients and their families, but also benefits to the DOE and the Oak Ridge area as it would: Accelerate the disposition of this special nuclear material, reducing the long-term costs associated with its surveillance and maintenance; Begin addressing the State of Tennessee's concerns regarding the current U-233 storage facility, which has been classified as one of the ten most hazardous facilities within the DOE complex; and Broaden the scope of reindustrialization initiatives in Oak Ridge, potentially creating manufacturing and research jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the people of America and the world, particularly those suffering from cancer, to do whatever we can do to enable this breakthrough cancer treatment to move forward as quickly as possible. This concludes my remarks. I thank you again for allowing me to clarify the intent of this very important provision.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, while I support the hard work of House conferees in crafting this conference report I want to express concern that an amendment I had offered to H.R. 4465 was dropped in conference.

The amendment expressed concern about the state of NASA's research and analysis programs (R&A). Through peer reviewed grants to individual scientists, R&A provides

the basic research which is the seed corn for space exploration missions. While these activities often are not glamorous, and do not make for pretty images on CNN, they are essential for increasing the return to taxpayers from more visible and expensive flight programs. Unfortunately, NASA been underfunding this activity. Despite projected overall increases in the NASA budget in the outyears, R&A is expected to be flat funded at best, and may in fact suffer further funding reductions.

In 1998, the National Research Council Report "Supporting Research and Data Analysis in NASA's Science Programs" offered significant new findings and important recommendations for strengthening this activity as well as Data Analysis (DA) programs. Six explicit recommendations were offered, but despite their clear potential for improving the effectiveness of flight programs, NASA has implemented few if any changes. My amendment simply required a review of the status in implementing the recommendations in the report, barriers to implementation and specific guidance on optimal funding levels. The provision was considered non-controversial by the full Appropriations Committee and was adopted by voice vote.

While Members of Congress regarded this as a common sense, good government amendment, NASA objected most strenuously to being held to the basic recommendations of the Space Studies Board. In an effort to preempt my language, NASA requested an interim assessment of Research and Data Analysis in the Office of Space Science. This September 22, 2000 letter report from the Space Studies Board (SSB), which I am including for the record, hardly notes enthusiastic support for the 1998 recommendations. It suggests that while NASA has been effective in talking about change in this area, little action has been seen to date.

As the letter report notes: "While the board supports the steps noted above, there are still two concerns to be addressed. First, many of the OSS responses to the 1998 report's recommendations are planned rather than ongoing activities, and so any assessment of their effectiveness must await their implementation. Second, there are areas where the plans appear to be incomplete or where the attention being given may be inadequate." The board concludes by noting that "it cannot, however, be confident that these recommendations will be met until an explicit implementation plan is available."

I note that this was an "interim" report for only one of NASA's three science offices, and that more comprehensive analysis is required. I expect that NASA will continue to work with interested Members of Congress and the SSB to ensure that these sound recommendations are actually implemented. The fact that this amendment was dropped from the final conference report should in no way be seen as a diminution of Congressional interest in this issue. I can assure the agency that unless concrete steps to towards implementation are undertaken, further Congressional action is likely. Research and analysis activities are critically important and the SSB has made sound recommendations for improvement which should be heeded.

I would also like to use this opportunity to bring to Members' attention, and that of VA

policy, program and budget officials, the legislative history and background surrounding the inclusion of \$5,000,000 for the Joslin Vision Network (JVN), developed by the Joslin Diabetes Center. The Conference Agreement of \$5,000,000 for this effort is based on the following components.

Dr. Sven Bursell of Joslin Diabetes Center presented Outside Witness testimony to the VA/HUD Subcommittee describing a \$5 million plan for the JVN to be deployed within the VA beyond the FY 2000 level, and for the refinement of the JVN system toward a Windows NT platform and a seamless interface with VA Medical Care software. Dr. Bursell outlined the two major elements of the \$5,000,000 plan as follows: \$3 million would be used by the VA and Joslin to expand to additional sites with the most need for portable advanced detection and begin to train personnel and equip additional VA facilities to utilize the JVN technology; and \$2 million would be provided to the Joslin Diabetes Center to complete the refinement of the original, prototype system (equipment and software) to the point that the VA can purchase and utilize advanced detection equipment and reading center technology.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman SAM GEJDENSON and I testified together before the VA/HUD Subcommittee on April 11, 2000, in support of the Joslin Diabetes Center plan. Our bipartisan request for approval and funding of the \$5,000,000 Joslin Diabetes Center request was approved in the Conference Agreement on H.R. 4635. Congressional intent underlying this item is clear. The VA should endeavor to implement this plan as expeditiously as possible in order to bring improved care to VA patients suffering from diabetes.

#### INTERIM ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH AND DATA ANALYSIS IN NASA'S OFFICE OF SPACE SCIENCE

On September 22, 2000, Space Studies Board Chair John H. McElroy sent the following letter to Dr. Edward J. Weiler, associate administrator for NASA's Office of Space Science.

As you requested in your letter of June 16, 2000 (Appendix A), the Space Studies Board (the Board, Appendix B) has conducted a brief review of actions taken by the Office of Space Science (OSS) that are relevant to recommendations in the board's 1998 report Supporting Research and Data Analysis in NASA's Science Programs: Engines for Innovation and Synthesis. The statement of task for this review is provided in Appendix C.

The Board conducted this assessment on an ambitious schedule in accordance with your request for feedback by September 2000. The Board was provided with relatively little written documentation of NASA's plans for improving the OSS R&DA program.

The review was based, in part, on inputs received from relevant standing committees of the Board—the Committee on Solar and Space Physics, the Committee on Planetary and Lunar Exploration, and the Committee on Astronomy and Astrophysics. A major source of information for the review was a pair of short papers provided to the Board on July 25, 2000, by Dr. Guenter Riegler, director of the OSS Research Program Management Division (Appendixes D and E). Dr. Riegler then briefed the board's executive committee and standing committee chairs at a meeting on August 16 at the National Academies' study center in Woods Hole, Massachusetts. At that meeting, members of the

Board reviewed and discussed the information from NASA and the Board's discipline committees' responses and assembled this consensus assessment. The board concluded that the proposals that Dr. Riegler described for responding to the 1998 report are appropriate; however, a final assessment awaits action guided by a concrete implementation plan.

#### GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The 1998 Space Studies board report analyzed the roles and contributions of R&DA grants in the research programs of NASA's three science offices, and it presented a set of strategic and programmatic recommendations to enhance the R&DA programs. The Board reaffirms the conclusions of the 1998 report: research and data analysis activities are critical elements of a viable space science program. The Board is aware of a number of actions within OSS that are under way or planned that will strengthen the R&DA programs and that will be entirely consistent with the recommendations of the 1998 report. For example, Dr. Riegler described plans to reallocate current budgets and to seek funds for new projects that will provide selected increases in data analysis funding at an overall rate of 8% per year. He also reported on the OSS intent to provide explicitly for data analysis funding in all new projects when they are initially proposed. Further, Dr. Riegler described a regular process of "senior reviews" of the research grants program that would complement the senior reviews of operating spacecraft mission programs and provide a mechanism to accomplish a number of actions recommended by the Board in the 1998 report.

While the Board supports the steps noted above, there are still two concerns to be addressed. First, many of the OSS responses to the 1998 report's recommendations are planned rather than ongoing activities, and so any assessment of their effectiveness must await their implementation. Second, there are areas where the plans appear to be incomplete or where the attention being given may be inadequate. In the remainder of this report, the Board provides additional comments on those areas by addressing each of the six major recommendations in the 1998 report in order.

#### ASSESSMENT OF THE OSS RESPONSE TO THE 1998 SSB RECOMMENDATIONS

##### 1. Principles for Strategic Planning

The first recommendation of the 1998 report addressed a number of aspects of managing R&DA programs strategically. To be able to do so requires, of course, a strategic plan for the program as a whole and an approach that integrates attention to R&DA into that plan. In its May 2000 review of the OSS draft 2000 strategic plan, the Board indicated that while many aspects of the draft were solidly grounded, the document still lacked several important aspects of a strategic plan, as follows:

Although the draft document is called "The Space Science Enterprise Strategic Plan," it lacks, in fact, some key characteristics of a strategic plan. For example, the document does not explicitly discuss how choices were or are made in setting priorities, and it does not identify priorities for missions or other program elements that are presented in the plan. . . .

Regarding the integration of R&DA into that strategic plan, the Board's May 2000 report said:

The OSS draft plan should reflect a clearer sense of the priorities for R&DA, the link-

ages between R&DA and other parts of the OSS program, and the overall importance of R&DA in the space science enterprise. Finally, also needed is a more explicit discussion of the OSS strategy for achieving balance between flight mission development, supporting ground and suborbital research, theory and modeling, and data analysis. . . .

The Board is aware of OSS's plans to institute a new senior review process for evaluating the research grants program (Appendix D), probably on a triennial basis, to complement the senior reviews for operating satellites. Together these two reviews will go a long way toward responding to regular evaluations of balance as recommended in the 1998 report. What is apparently missing, however, is a process to integrate these decisions and to look across the whole program strategically. This integrating function is particularly important for handling cases in which senior reviews of operating missions and of the grants program might arrive at different conclusions. The NASA Space Science Advisory Committee may be a possible venue for integrating the senior reviews and evaluating balance across OSS.

##### 2. Innovation and Infrastructure

The second recommendation addressed the need to examine strategically the requirements, priorities, and health of research infrastructures at universities and NASA field centers. This issue was also addressed in the Board's review of the OSS draft strategic plan:

The OSS draft document says little about what responsibility OSS assumes for universities. It notes the intention to "maintain essential technical capabilities at the NASA centers," and although it recognizes the role of scientists at universities in research and planning, and in developing the next generation of space research professionals, it is silent about intentions of OSS to maintain essential capabilities at universities. . . . Furthermore, a long-standing question within NASA has concerned the extent to which universities should be considered to be vendors, sources of members of the technical workforce, integral partners, or some mix of those roles. The OSS plan could be strengthened by more clearly recognizing that the universities are elements of the fabric of space science and that their capabilities also need to be nurtured.

Dr. Riegler called the Board's attention to plans within the executive branch to strengthen government-university partnerships, based on the "Principles of the Federal Partnership with Universities in Research" laid out in the National Science and Technology Council's report *Renewing the Federal Government-University Research Partnership for the 21st Century*. He cited several proposed NASA initiatives to increase university involvement in developing space hardware and infrastructure. These plans, if implemented, will enhance the research infrastructure in some areas. However, based on the information provided by OSS, the Board concluded that a more systematic assessment of research infrastructure along the lines recommended in the 1998 report is still needed.

##### 3. Management of the Research and Data Analysis Programs

The third recommendation focused on the need to assess the distribution of grant sizes in each of NASA's science program areas. NASA presented data regarding grant sizes in different areas of the OSS research program as well as a description of the logic and history of the differences in sizes among

those research areas. However, there does not appear to have been any systematic assessment across the program. In addition, the Board recognizes that a response to Recommendation 6 of the 1998 report is required in order to conduct such an assessment. Finally, the planned senior review of the research grants program described by NASA could be an appropriate vehicle for carrying out this systematic review.

#### 4. Participation in the Research and Data Analysis Programs

The fourth recommendation emphasized the value in preserving a mix of university and non-university participation in technology, instrument, and facility development. OSS did not provide the Board with any information indicating that OSS has conducted or plans to conduct a systematic evaluation of the mix of university principal investigator awards and non-university funding for technology, instrument, and facility development. The Board notes that in assessing the mix of institutions involved in technology development, NASA should also promote university-industry-field center partnerships.

#### 5. Creation of Intellectual Capital

The fifth recommendation addressed the use of training grants as a way to ensure breadth in graduate education. NASA indicated an intent to increase the number of (or introduce a new element into) training grants in the university program; however, no actions had been undertaken at the time of this review. The Board is interested in seeing an implementation plan for this initiative.

#### 6. Accounting as a Management Tool in the Research and Data Analysis Programs

The sixth recommendation addressed the need to establish a uniform procedure for collecting data on R&DA funding and funding trends for use as a management tool. This issue was also raised in the Board's reports on technology development in OSS and in the report Federal Funding of Astronomical Research. NASA presented plans for acquiring the types of data recommended in the 1998 report, and the Board views this plan as a positive response. These plans would involve using a single contractor to administer the proposal review process as a means for collecting the data. If appropriate data are collected (e.g., on trends with respect to discipline, class of activity, and type of performing institution), they will provide a useful management tool for assessing the balance among elements and participants in the R&DA program. However, these data on R&DA funding will be incomplete until NASA implements full-cost accounting at the NASA field centers. In addition, these data will be required before OSS can respond appropriately to Recommendation 3 of the 1998 report.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Board believes that OSS's proposals for responding to the recommendations of the 1998 report are moving in the right direction. It cannot, however, be confident that these recommendations will be met until an explicit implementation plan is available. The Board is prepared to assist OSS in any way it can.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of funding provided for the Joslin Vision Network in H.R. 4635, the Fiscal Year 2001 VA/HUD Appropriations Act.

I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman WALSH, Ranking Member Mr. MOL-

LOHAN, and the House Conferees for the inclusion of several items in the VA Medical Care account that will provide improved detection and care for those in the VA patient population that suffer from diabetes and the complications of diabetes.

Specifically, I would like to highlight the legislative history and background surrounding the inclusion of \$5,000,000 for the Joslin Vision Network (JVN), developed by the Joslin Diabetes Center. The Conference Agreement of \$5,000,000 for this effort is based on the following components.

Dr. Sven Bursell of Joslin Diabetes Center presented Outside Witness testimony to the VA/HUD Subcommittee describing a \$5 million plan for the JVN to be deployed within the VA beyond the FY 2000 level, and for the refinement of the JVN system toward a Windows NT platform and a seamless interface with VA Medical Care software. Dr. Bursell outlined the two major elements of the \$5,000,000 plan as follows:

\$3 million would be used by the VA and Joslin to expand to additional sites with the most need for portable advanced detection and begin to train personnel and equip additional VA facilities to utilize the JVN technology; and

\$2 million would be provided to the Joslin Diabetes Center to complete the refinement of the original, prototype system (equipment and software) to the point that the VA can purchase and utilize advanced detection equipment and reading center technology.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman GEORGE NETHERCUTT and I testified before the VA/HUD Subcommittee on April 11, 2000 in support of the Joslin Diabetes Center plan. The VA should endeavor to implement this plan as expeditiously as possible in order to bring improved care to VA patients suffering from diabetes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to express his support for the conference report for H.R. 4635, the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001. First, this Member would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies from New York (Mr. WALSH), the distinguished Ranking Member from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and all members of the Subcommittee for their work in bringing this measure to the House Floor.

This Member would like to focus his remarks on the following five areas: veterans, the Community Development Fund—Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the HOME program, the American Indian Loan Guarantee Program, and the issue of arsenic in drinking water.

#### 1. VETERANS

First, this Member rises in strong support of the \$47 billion in the conference report that will be made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) for improvements in health care, housing, education and compensatory benefits to veterans and their dependents. The 106th Congress has continued to make dramatic improvements in the amount of funding available for veterans' services. Recent events in the Middle East remind us of the sacrifices that are made by those who

have served our country and that we should remain true to our promise of providing equal and accessible health care as well as other services to all of our veterans throughout the United States no matter where they live.

#### 2. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND (CDF)

Second, this Member commends the \$5.1 billion appropriations in the conference report for grants to state and local governments to fund selected community development programs, such as the highly successful CDBG program. This appropriation is \$257.6 million more than the President's request. The CDBG program not only is valuable to the larger entitlement cities, but it also gives assistance to those communities under 50,000 through state administering agencies. It is a government program with minimal overhead and bureaucracy.

In addition to this, this Member applauds the following set-asides within the CDF account: the Whitcomb Conservatory at Doane College in Crete, Nebraska; the downtown redevelopment of South Sioux City, Nebraska; and the Cedar Youth Services in Lincoln, Nebraska.

#### A. Whitcomb Conservatory at Doane College

First, \$430,000 is appropriated in the conference report for Doane College in Crete, Nebraska, for the rehabilitation of the historic Whitcomb Conservatory for joint use by the college and the community as a performing arts center. This unique, five-sided structure built on the "Prairie" or "Frank L. Wright" architectural style was completed in 1907 and is a component of the Doane College Historic District National Register listing. It has many unusual architectural and construction features which make the building very important to preserve. The funding is needed for major structural repair of its roof, installation of a new mechanical system (including a new heating and cooling plant), new wiring, and a complete cosmetic refurbishing.

The Conservatory has been vacant for more than 30 years. However, the Crete community—as well as the student population of Doane is growing—and necessitates refurbishing the building. Doane College and the Crete community have a close and long-standing working relationship and would have a formal joint-use agreement for the future use of Whitcomb Conservatory. The restoration of the Conservatory would create a community resource and provide a setting for musicals, summer community theater, special concerts and lectures.

#### B. South Sioux City, Nebraska

Second, \$430,000 is appropriated in the conference report for the South Sioux City, Nebraska, Downtown Redevelopment Area—for the redevelopment and rehabilitation of a civic building site. South Sioux City, Nebraska, as part of the South City Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), which also includes Sioux City, Iowa, and North Sioux City, South Dakota, has the lowest per capita income of any SMSA in the surrounding states. Moreover, South Sioux City, which borders the Missouri River, has experienced a decline in employment and tax base and was declared blighted in 1998 by local elected officials in accordance with state law. This funding will be used for the much-needed downtown redevelopment of South Sioux City.

*C. Cedar Youth Services in Lincoln, Nebraska*

Third, \$1.25 million is appropriated in the conference report for Cedar Youth Services' in Lincoln, Nebraska. Cedars Youth Services, a leading social service provider in the City of Lincoln, would use this funding to complete construction of a community center on the corner of 27th and Holdrege Streets to serve as the focal point for a variety of services and support to strengthen and revitalize the surrounding neighborhood. Social services, such as Head Start preschool classes, as well as neighborhood-strengthening activities, such as preventative health care and recreational opportunities, would be provided at the North 27th Street Community Center. This appropriation builds on the \$550,000 which was appropriated in FY2000 for this project.

## 3. HOME PROGRAM

Third, this Member supports the \$1.8 billion appropriation for the HOME Investment Partnerships program in the conference report, which is \$215 million more than the President's request. This program provides funds to states, units of local government, Indian tribes and others for acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction to expand the supply and quality of affordable housing.

## 4. AMERICAN INDIAN LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Fourth, this Member commends the inclusion of \$6 million in loan subsidy in the conference report for the HUD Section 184 Housing loan guarantee program, which this Member created in consultation with a range of Indian Housing specialists. A very conservative estimate would suggest that this \$6 million appropriation should facilitate over \$72 million in guaranteed loans for privately financed homes for Indian families who are otherwise unable to secure conventional financing due to the trust status of Indian reservation land.

## 5. ARSENIC IN DRINKING WATER

Lastly, this Member is pleased that the conference report includes language providing up to an additional six months for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to issue a final regulation for arsenic in drinking water. This Member shares the conferees concerns and has in fact written a letter to EPA Administrator Browner asking hard and specific questions about the necessity for this regulation. Over the past month, this Member has received many letters from utilities superintendents, city administrators, village boards, mayors and other local officials who are understandably concerned about the effects this proposed rule would have on their communities. The EPA has a responsibility to really listen to these individuals' comments and to address their concerns. The additional time provided in the H.R. 4635 conference report certainly will help.

Local officials in the 1st Congressional District of Nebraska have not been convinced of the need to lower the maximum contaminant level for arsenic from the current 50 parts per billion (ppb) to possibly as low as 5 ppb. Such a change could cost every water system customer hundreds of dollars per year, if not more. The costs would fall disproportionately on the smallest systems. It is also important to keep in mind that forcing communities to treat water often results in a series of other problems which must be addressed. Everyone cer-

tainly recognizes the importance of providing safe drinking water and this Member obviously does not support taking any action that would cause drinking water to become unsafe. However the EPA has a clear responsibility to demonstrate the need for such a drastic change which would have far-reaching consequences. If there is inadequate science to support this rule, communities should not be forced to divert scarce resources to come into compliance.

Mr. Speaker, for these aforementioned reasons and others, this Member would encourage his colleagues to support the conference report of H.R. 4635, the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the Ranking Member on the Science Committee, I rise in strong support of the VA-HUD Conference Report, which is a much more satisfying bill than the one which passed the House in June. I am especially pleased to see that the Conferees were able to find funds for important programs at NASA and NSF that this body didn't seem to have access to four months ago.

In June, the President's request for NASA was slashed by \$377 million. One of the most troubling cuts in that bill was the elimination of funding for the Space Launch Initiative, a program that directed at developing advanced, reusable launch vehicles that will dramatically reduce the cost of launching government and commercial payloads. The high cost of access to space is the single largest impediment to our ability to reach our full potential in space. Fortunately, the bill we are considering today fully funds the Space Launch Initiative.

In funding NASA at \$14.285 billion, this Conference Report provides the resources needed to ensure the successful development and assembly of the International Space Station and the continued safe operation of the Space Shuttle. H.R. 4635 also provides a healthy level of funding for NASA's important Science, Aeronautics, and Technology activities. Finally, I am pleased that H.R. 4635 requires NASA to provide for annual life and micro-gravity sciences research missions on the Space Shuttle.

I have long supported a vigorous program of life and micro-gravity sciences flight research, and believe that such flights ultimately will deliver significant scientific returns. At the same time, we will need to ensure that such flights do not adversely disrupt the assembly of the Space Station, which will be the ultimate venue for path-breaking biomedical research in orbit.

As for the National Science Foundation appropriations, again, this conference report is a great improvement over the House-passed bill, which cut the Administration's request by \$500 million. I know that in June the Committee did the best that it could with the hand it was dealt. But, had the cuts prevailed, NSF—an agency with a critically important role in sustaining the nation's research and education capabilities in all fields of science and engineering—would have been severely damaged.

These cuts would have been short-sighted because basic research discoveries launch new industries that bring returns to the economy far exceeding the public investment. The Internet, which emerged from research

projects funded by the DOD and NSF, strikingly illustrates the true investment nature of such research expenditures. In fact, over the past 50 years, half of U.S. economic productivity can be attributed to technological innovation and the science that has supported it.

I am pleased that the conference report recognizes NSF's important role by providing an historic increase of \$539 million, or nearly 14 percent, above the previous year's budget level. This increase will enable the Foundation to expand its investments in exciting, cutting-edge research initiatives, including information technology, nanoscale science and engineering, and environmental research.

Moreover, this new funding will enable NSF to increase average grant size and duration, as well as increase the number of new awards. Last year alone, NSF could not fund 3800 proposals that received very good or excellent ratings by peer reviewers.

Finally, the increases provided by the conference report will begin to address a growing imbalance in federal support for fundamental research in the physical sciences and engineering relative to the biomedical fields. This is a serious matter because for any field of science progress is dependent on advances made in other fields.

This point was recently made by the past director of the National Institutes of Health, Nobel Laureate Harold Varmus: "Most of the revolutionary changes that have occurred in biology and medicine are rooted in new methods. Those, in turn, are usually rooted in fundamental discoveries in many different fields."

For the past half-decade, we have been very free in our support of biomedical research. I consider that to be a very good thing for all of our people. However, investing too narrowly in medical fields without investing in all the other sciences—sciences that contribute to the base of knowledge necessary for medical breakthroughs—will lead to a slow-down in medical progress in the long-run.

I want to congratulate the Conferees on their work in this bill and to particularly thank them for finding the resources necessary to keep our Nation at the forefront of progress in space and science.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Chairman and our Subcommittee for crafting such a fine bill which meets the needs of our veterans, addresses our critical housing needs, protects our environment and at the same time pays down our national debt.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee and the VA-HUD Subcommittee, I support the common-sense approach the Committee has already taken to address the problem of contaminated sediments in our rivers.

Three years ago, Congress directed the EPA not to issue dredging or capping regulations until the National Academy of Sciences completes a study on the risks of such actions. Qualified scientists are working to finish this report to determine the best way to clean up rivers with nominal impact to the surrounding environment. This has been an open process, allowing input from the public, environmental organizations, and from the EPA itself.

I want to reiterate that in the final decision making process, the EPA must ensure that

remedies will protect human health and environment, and be cost effective. The National Academy of Science study will be extremely useful in guiding the EPA to develop the most appropriate methods of mediation. My colleagues on the Committee and I will be closely watching to ensure that EPA considers the recommendations of the study and fully integrates them into the final rule.

Additionally, the report language which accompanies this bill also allows for the immediate sediment clean up in specific, urgent cases where the contaminated sediment poses a significant threat to public health. However, I would like to clarify that this exception is only for new and immediate risks.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that this is an environmentally sensitive issue, and it is important that most qualified, independent scientists weight in on this regulation. This is why I support the existing language, which directs the EPA not to act prematurely and to wait until the NAS study is complete.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WALSH for the excellent work he has done on crafting this find bill. It has been a pleasure to work with him this year.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, following the pattern of recent years, the conference report for VA-HUD Appropriations ignores the funding cuts for housing programs that the majority party paused through the House earlier this year. The result is a product with very modest funding boosts for affordable housing and economic development.

There are some positive provisions in the bill worth nothing. Following the lead of the Administration and Congressional Democrats, the conference report funds 79,000 incremental Section 8 vouchers, the third year in a row that we have expanded the supply of rental housing assistance.

Building on the efforts this year of many of us who successfully fought to restore funding for expired, unrenewed Shelter Plus Care homeless assistance grants, the conference report for the first time creates a separate account for renewals, entitled "Shelter Plus Care Renewals." This account provides \$100 million, enough to renew all Shelter Plus Care grants expiring during fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

Unlike last year's approach, in which renewals were subject to competing with all other projects under the broad McKinney-Vento Act continuum of care competition, this separate funding source makes renewals contingent only on meeting minimal, but reasonable requirements that the "project is determined to be needed under the applicable continuum of care" and that it "meets appropriate program requirements and financial standards, as determined by the Secretary."

I am also pleased to see that the conference report continues for another year the provision which allows non-insured Section 236 affordable housing projects to retain their "excess income." This is especially critical for non-profits which own affordable housing units that are aging and in need of capital repair, since non-profits typically lack access to capital or financing to make such needed repairs.

Another positive development is that the conference report, like the House-passed language, expands the range of eligible appli-

cants for the \$50 million in grants to convert elderly affordable housing units to assisted living. Last year's bill limited grant eligibility to only Section 202 elderly housing units. This year's bill refers specifically to Section 202b (Section 2 from H.R. 1624, my "Elderly Housing Quality Improvement Act" of last year). This section, enacted last year, authorizes conversion grants, and generally makes all federal elderly housing projects eligible.

Finally, I am pleased to see that the conference report extends the nationwide application of FHA down payment simplification for another twenty-seven months, through December 31, 2002. While there is overwhelming bi-partisan House support for making down simplification permanent, this provision at least guarantees that we will have all of the next Congress to further extend its application or make it permanent.

However, notwithstanding these few provisions and the modest funding increases, the real story of this bill is one of missed opportunities. For example, the House earlier this year passed, as part of H.R. 1776, a bill that I authorized to provide one percent down FHA mortgage loans for teachers, policemen, and firemen buying a home in the school district or local jurisdiction of employment. This same provision was included in the Senate version of this year's VA-HUD appropriations bill. Yet, in conference this provision was inexplicably stripped out. This is doubly unfortunate, because the provisions would have actually raised funds, which could have been reinvested in housing, veterans, or other worthy programs.

The conference report is also notable for its lack of any new affordable housing production initiative. This is in spite of the fact that the Senate bill had included a new capital grant housing production bill, and the House version had included incremental voucher linked to new affordable housing production.

Moreover, unlike last year's bill, the conference report does not include any additional provisions from H.R. 202, the elderly housing bill which passed the House last year. This raises the prospect that we will adjourn without acting on the Vento matching grant program for housing preservation, a number of related provisions to encourage mixed income elderly housing, greater flexibility in the use of elderly and disabled service coordinators, and a provision to make it easier for sponsors of Section 202 elderly housing projects to use savings from refinancing for the benefit of their projects or tenants.

So, with respect to housing, this is a modest bill which undoes the harm of the House-passed bill, but which is notably lacking in making any dramatic progress to address the growing affordable housing challenges facing our low- and moderate-income seniors, disabled, and families. Hopefully, we will redouble our efforts in this area next year.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Year 2001, VA/HUD appropriations bill. The Appropriations Committee has put together a bill that is truly bipartisan. I am proud to rise in strong support of this measure which funds such important priorities as veterans health care and benefits, section 8 family housing, housing for persons with AIDS, and key environmental

programs. This measure also provides much needed resources to assist state and local governments with infrastructure improvement and economic development needs.

The Central Naugatuck Valley, in my district, has been undergoing a major water infrastructure upgrade. I am pleased that under the State and Territorial Assistance Grant Program, \$1,000,000 has been appropriated for these much needed improvements.

The City of Waterbury, which operates the hub of the region's sewer system, has been burdened by the majority of the cost for these improvements. Therefore, \$750,000 (of the total \$1,000,000) will go to the City of Waterbury for wastewater infrastructure improvements including the cost of the new sewage treatment facility in the City.

The Town of Wolcott, Connecticut is partially served by the water system of the City of Waterbury. However, the Clinton Hill Road neighborhood of Wolcott relies on well water and septic systems for their water needs. Recently, this area of the town has been experiencing well failures and contamination. Under this legislation, the Town of Wolcott will receive \$250,000 (of the total \$1,000,000) toward the extension of the water distribution system to the Clinton Hill Road neighborhood.

Finally, I would like to also point out that \$100,000 has been appropriated for the Town of Beacon Falls toward the purchase of the currently nearly vacant Pinebridge Industrial Park. The purchase of this property will enable Beacon Falls to develop an economically vital and viable industrial park. To Beacon Falls, the failure to fill the existing park with tenants over the years represents many missed opportunities for economic development and an expanded tax base. This funding will allow the Town to at last address this issue in an effective way.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to support this measure not only because of what it means to my District, but also for what it means to America's veterans, our environment and those who receive the vital housing assistance they need in order to partake in the American Dream. Thank you.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4635.

H.R. 4635 includes provisions which address benefits for our World War II Filipino Veterans. These provisions add only a small incremental benefit to these veterans who fought side-by-side to our soldiers in World War II.

I have long argued that Congress must act to establish parity for these Filipino Veterans. Those of us familiar with this injustice recall President Roosevelt's promise of U.S. citizenship and veterans benefits to Filipinos who fought alongside our soldiers in World War II. Prior to the war the Philippines had been a United States possession for 42 years.

On June 26, 1941, when President Roosevelt issued his Executive Order nearly 200,000 Filipinos responded. They responded without hesitation to defend their homeland, and because they felt part of the United States Government.

During four years, Filipino soldiers fought alongside American Soldiers. They bravely fought in every major battle, and endured years of captivity.

In 1946 Congress broke its promise to these Filipino Veterans when it denied full benefits to them.

The issue today is not should we correct this injustice, but when will we fulfill our obligation?

H.R. 4635 increases the disability benefit compensation for Filipino Veterans who currently live in the United States. Currently, they receive only 50% of the disability compensation paid to other veterans with service-connected disabilities. H.R. 4635 also allows Filipino Veterans who currently receive medical care in VA facilities for service-connected disabilities to receive care for illnesses and injuries that are not service-connected.

H.R. 4635 also benefits Filipino Veterans living in the Philippines. Filipino Veterans currently receiving medical care at a VA facility for service-connected conditions will now receive full medical care at VA outpatient facilities in the Philippines.

The \$3 million appropriated by H.R. 4635 to fund these two provisions represent an improvement in the status of Filipino Veterans. I want to stress this is not a new benefit for Filipino Veterans. It supplements what they already receive.

Those Filipino Veterans who receive no benefit now, will not benefit from this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4635 because it recognizes our obligation to Filipino Veterans by increasing disability compensation and medical care for Filipino Veterans with service-connected disabilities.

However, Congress must fulfill its obligation and enact legislation that establishes parity between Filipino Veterans and their American counterparts. There is no excuse for this continuing injustice.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the VA—HUDS—IA Conference Report that would significantly increase funding above the earlier House and Senate passed levels for vital housing programs. I commend HUD Secretary Cuomo, President Clinton, and Representative ALAN MOLLOHAN, Ranking Member of the HUD—VA House Subcommittee, for their tremendous leadership on housing issues and their success in increasing America's investment in affordable housing for impoverished Americans.

In June, I joined with most Democrats in voting to oppose the Republican led House bill that was severely underfunded. Thanks to the success of our Democratic leadership, today, I intend to vote for this improved agreement. Although I am glad this agreement increases funding levels, we must recognize that it still does not meet America's housing needs. Despite America's continuing economic growth, an estimated 5.4 million Americans pay more than half their income for rent and millions more live at risk of homelessness. We must continue to do more to develop new quality affordable housing, preserve existing affordable units, and provide needed housing and services to homeless Americans and those with special needs to ensure they have an adequate foundation to participate in our growing economy.

This bill is so important because it assists low income Americans. HUD residents of Section 8 housing and public housing have an average annual income of \$7,800. This bill also

assists seniors on fixed incomes and people with disabilities and special needs. Without this housing assistance, working men and women would be forced to choose between housing, health care, food, and other basic needs.

This agreement provides funding increases to important programs; \$258 million for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS programs [HOPWA]; \$452 million for 79,000 new Section 8 housing vouchers for low-income Americans; \$100 million for a new Shelter Plus Care account to renew expiring homeless projects; \$3 billion to modernize and make capital improvements to public housing and \$3.242 billion to operate public housing for the 1.4 million American families who live there; and \$1.8 billion for the HOME program to produce affordable housing for poor Americans.

Of particular importance to San Francisco, this agreement provides \$258 million for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program [HOPWA] to assist low-income persons with AIDS and their families with short-term rental assistance and mortgage assistance, and provides assistance to acquire, construct, modernize, or operate facilities and deliver supportive services. HOPWA provides vital resources to ensure that people living with HIV and AIDS have access to the stable housing that is necessary for their medical care. More than 200,000 people with HIV/AIDS are currently in need of housing assistance, and 50% of those living with this disease will need housing assistance at some point during their illness. Increase in housing demand and the number of people living with HIV/AIDS mean that San Francisco's HOPWA needs are greater than ever. This increase will greatly benefit those living with HIV/AIDS.

I urge my colleagues to support this Conference Report and increase housing assistance to low-income Americans.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the statement accompanying this conference report contains language which directs the Environmental Protection agency (EPA) to take no action to initiate or order the use of dredging or invasive remedial technologies where a final plan has not been adopted prior to October 1, 2000, or where such activities are not now occurring until the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report, which Congress required, has been completed and its findings have been properly considered by the agency. The language further provides that remediation plans which include dredging or invasive technologies are not to be finalized until June 30, 2001, or until the agency has properly considered the NAS report, whichever comes first. It is important to note that the language provides for exceptions to this limitation on the initiation of dredging or invasive remedies, and these exceptions include instances in which a party may voluntarily agree to the remedy, or "urgent" cases where "contaminated sediment poses a significant threat to public health."

As in years past, this language speaks to the importance of obtaining information on the various technologies for addressing contaminated sediments. I hope that the NAS will complete this study as soon as practicable, and sooner than the date by which the conferees encourage its completion.

However, I wish to clarify, as my colleagues in the Senate have noted, that this language is not an amendment to the Superfund statute. This language is not a product of the regular order of legislative business that may result in an amendment to our laws, after full and fair consideration by the authorizing Committees. The statutory criteria by which the EPA selects remedies, the regulatory criteria promulgated under the statutory authority, and applicable guidance are not changed by this language. When the NAS study becomes available, the language directs EPA to "properly consider" the study. The language does not direct the agency to confer deference to the study, nor to adopt its recommendations in remedial decisions. I note that the Chairman of the Subcommittee in the Senate has concurred with this interpretation of this language.

My colleagues in the Senate also have clarified that the terms "urgent" and "significant threat to public health" as used in this language should be defined within the discretion of the EPA. I note that the EPA has specific authority governing its ability to issue orders under the Superfund statute, and I reiterate that this language is not an amendment to a statute. In keeping with the spirit and intent of the statute, the EPA should not interpret this language to limit the scope of its authorities to address threats posed to human health and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues Messrs. TOWNS, OBERSTAR, and BORSKI request that I state their concurrence with this statement.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 24, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—386

Abercrombie	Blumenauer	Clayton
Ackerman	Blunt	Clement
Aderholt	Boehert	Clyburn
Allen	Boehner	Coble
Armey	Bonilla	Collins
Baca	Bonior	Combest
Bachus	Bono	Condit
Baird	Borski	Cook
Baker	Boswell	Cooksey
Baldacci	Boucher	Costello
Baldwin	Boyd	Coyne
Ballenger	Brady (PA)	Cramer
Barcia	Brady (TX)	Crane
Barr	Brown (FL)	Crowley
Barrett (NE)	Brown (OH)	Cubin
Barrett (WI)	Bryant	Cummings
Bartlett	Burr	Cunningham
Bass	Burton	Danner
Becerra	Buyer	Davis (FL)
Bentsen	Callahan	Davis (IL)
Bereuter	Calvert	Davis (VA)
Berkley	Camp	Deal
Berman	Canady	DeFazio
Berry	Cannon	DeGette
Biggert	Capps	Delahunt
Bilbray	Capuano	DeLauro
Billirakis	Cardin	DeLay
Bishop	Carson	Deutsch
Blagojevich	Chambliss	Diaz-Balart

Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill (IN)  
Hill (MT)  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Insee  
Isakson  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E.B.  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy

Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kleczyka  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
Kuykendall  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larson  
Latham  
LaTourrette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeke (NY)  
Menendez  
Metcalfe  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Owens  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pickett

Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schakowsky  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shaw  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stearns  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Towns  
Traficant  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Ose  
Upton  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Whitfield

Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu

Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

#### NAYS—24

Andrews  
Archer  
Barton  
Bliley  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coburn  
Cox

DeMint  
Gibbons  
Hostettler  
Johnson, Sam  
Kasich  
Paul  
Pitts  
Ryun (KS)

Salmon  
Sanford  
Schaffer  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Stenholm  
Tancredo  
Toomey

#### NOT VOTING—22

Campbell  
Chenoweth-Hage  
Clay  
Conyers  
Franks (NJ)  
Goodling  
Hansen  
Houghton

Jones (OH)  
Lazio  
Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
McCollum  
McIntosh  
Miller (FL)  
Oxley

Rodriguez  
Shays  
Talent  
Thompson (MS)  
Turner  
Wise

#### □ 1413

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 114.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 637 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 637

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

#### □ 1415

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 637 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.J. Res. 114, a resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001. H.J. Res. 637 provides for 1 hour of debate equally di-

vided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, the current continuing resolution expires at the end of the day and a further continuing resolution is necessary to keep the government operating while Congress completes consideration of the remaining appropriations bills.

H.J. Res. 114 is a clean continuing resolution that simply extends the provisions included in H.J. Res. 109 through October 25.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, it takes a lot of hard work and tough decision-making to fund the Federal Government. While I share the regret of many of my colleagues that the negotiations have stretched on this long, we are now very close to completing the appropriations process. We have successfully resolved many of the hurdles in our path with hours of hard work. As we enter the final stretch, we remain dedicated to passing sensible and fiscally responsible appropriations bills. I am confident that this fair, clean and continuing resolution will give us the time we need to fulfill our obligations to the American people and complete the appropriations process in an even-handed and conscientious manner.

This rule was unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules on yesterday. I urge my colleagues to support it so we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I thank my colleague and my dear friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. This is the fourth continuing resolution to come before the House this year. Apparently number three was not the lucky charm. This is the fourth time that we have had to extend the appropriations deadline and this time through October 25, because my Republican colleagues just have not finished their work; and I do not think it is going to be the last time.

Despite the promises to finish all 13 appropriation bills on time, my Republican colleagues are still very far behind.

Mr. Speaker, from where I sit, the end is not even in sight. Each time we pass another continuing resolution, we grant another reprieve. Congress goes back in a recess. We all go back to our districts and nothing gets done here in Washington. So I think enough is enough. I think we should do shorter