HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday June 6, 1991*

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

With gratitude to You, O God, we enter a new day, full of the hopes and dreams that this day brings. We remember in prayer those near and dear to us and recall their names in the privacy of our own hearts. May Your spirit, O God, give strength to those who are weak, comfort those who experience sadness or sorrow, and encourage those who seek to do Your will. May Your blessing, gracious God, touch the lives of all Your people and give them that peace that passes all human understanding. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 173. An act to permit the Bell Telephone Companies to conduct research on, design, and manufacture telecommunications equipment, and for other purposes, and

S. 1193. An act to make technical amendments to various Indian laws.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO FEDERAL COUNCIL ON AGING

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 204 of Public Law 98-459, the Chair appoints from the private sector Dr. Eugene S. Callender of New York, NY, to the Federal Council on the Aging on the part of the House to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

THE DESERT STORM MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMY ELIGIBILITY EXTENSION ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Desert Storm Military Service Academy Extension Act of 1991 to extend the application deadline for admission to our military academies for service men and women who served tours of duty in the Persian Gulf during Operation Desert Storm. This legislation will do the same thing for service men and women who served tours of duty in other combat zones in the unfortunate event that the United States becomes involved in another armed conflict sometime in the future.

Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents who is still serving in the Persian Gulf, decided he wanted to attend the Naval Academy after he participated in Operation Desert Storm. The experience of serving with his fellow sailors in the Navy during wartime has inspired him to make the military his career. But by the time he returns home, he will be too old to apply to the Naval Academy and there is no mechanism for waiving the application deadline.

It is outrageous that he should be prevented from becoming a career Navy man, because he missed the application deadline while answering his country's call and risking his life in the Persian Gulf. In this era of a volunteer military, it is essential we do everything possible to widen the application process for potential academy candidates—especially ones who have already proven their mettle in a combat zone.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral responsibility to give something back to the troops who gave so much to us during their service in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and help service men and women who have served a tour of duty in wartime to come home and make the Armed Forces their career.

FLORIDIANS SUPPORT FAST PROPOSAL

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, there is a piece of legislation that is about to expire, and if you ask the people from high-growth States like mine, it could not expire soon enough. Year after year, these States are shortchanged by the Federal Highway and Transit Program.

For instance, in 1990 Floridians received 53 cents for each dollar they paid into the program—the lowest rate of any State. Since 1956, Florida has received only 82 cents on the dollar. Through that period, Florida has exported nearly $1.8 billion to pay for highway projects in other States.

Meanwhile, Florida ranks fourth in total population, second in population growth, fourth in the number of vehicles, and third in the number of vehicle miles traveled—yet, our State is dead last in the rate of tax returns.

I join my colleague from Florida, Mr. BENNETT, in introducing legislation to reverse this trend. It will raise the rate of return to 90 percent, boosting Florida's share from $551 million to a fairer $704 million, allowing Florida's residents and visitors to have a safer and saner driving experience.

BEST WISHES TO NICK CALIO, RETIRING LOBBYIST

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to alert my colleagues that one of our best friends in the White House is leaving. I am talking about Nick Calio, who is one of the classiest and most effective lobbyists I have run into during my years of service here.

Before he joined the White House staff, we worked together to enact the Tax Reform Act of 1986. After he became one of the President's men, we worked together on a series of projects including, most recently, extension of the President's fast track trade negotiating authority.

Nick knows how to frame an issue. He knows how to listen. And he knows how to count. He plays to win—and properly so—but he also plays with an awareness that there will be another game with new alliances tomorrow. He doesn't burn his bridges. Instead, he builds relationships with everyone, including those who may disagree with him on the issue of the day.

Anyone who has served here for more than a few years knows that lobbying is tough work and appreciates the talents of someone who does it well. Nick is a world-class lobbyist. I wish him

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

well during the next phase of his career.

A SILENT SCANDAL

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, we have spent the last month, and more specifically the last couple days, talking about fairness and equity. I would like to talk about an aspect of fairness that this body needs to address.

This city loves a scandal. It takes no more than a hint of wrongdoing or imperfection, and the wolf pack attacks. Names like Oliver North, John Tower, Gary Hart, Robert Bork, and Neil Bush come to mind.

That is why it is so interesting to note the silence which has greeted the saga of Clark Clifford and the alleged First American Bank mischief.

This story has all the elements of a good Washington feeding frenzy. There are ties to legendary political families, shadowy foreign investors, laundering of drug money for Manuel Noriega, massive profits from insider deals, and the list goes on; but as a Wall Street Journal column noted last week, the Washington wolf pack has been unusually silent on this issue.

Instead, the political wagons have been circled around Clark Clifford in an effort to protect the beleaguered patriarch of the Democratic Party. The congressional committees with oversight power are dragging their heels in investigation. Fortunately, the ranking Republican has asked for a subpoena.

We need to take a look at this and take a look at fairness.

AMERICA PARADES WHILE JAPAN BUYS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Desert Storm and our troops deserve a tribute, but Congress must stay focused. While America will be parading our military might, Japan has just leased the AT&T building and is taking prices on the Empire State Building.

In addition, a German company has just been awarded the first contract to build a bullet train in America.

Remember World War II? I want you to think back about Red Square; tanks, missiles, posters of Lenin. They have a May Day parade every year in the Soviet Union.

Congress, they are asking us for $150 billion so they can feed their people.

We must pay tribute to Desert Storm, but parading our tanks may not be the greatest need of this country. We had better take a look at our problems.

KEEP THE DREAM ALIVE—SUPPORT THE SPACE STATION

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

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when John F. Kennedy declared America would go to the Moon, he did not justify it in terms of cost effectiveness. He put it in terms of strengthening American leadership and expanding human horizons.

Ironically, one of the prime benefits of this mission was to propel American leadership in space to a level which has kept us ahead to this day. Our high technology lead has provided millions of jobs and tens of billions of dollars. A 4-A plus for our economy.

Unfortunately, some would ignore this lesson. Instead, they would allow this Nation to rest on its laurels. Forgetting the rest of the world will not stop if we pause. They will redouble their efforts to surpass us.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, did not look at the Moon rocks from the Apollo mission and wonder if some rocks were worth the expense. I, like the rest of America, saw the greater meaning behind the achievement.

The space station is the next step in that achievement. Support the space station—keep the dream alive.

TREE SPIKING: IT'S HAZARDOUS TO OUR HEALTH

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is danger in America's forests. Unbelievably, the perpetuators of this danger consider themselves environmentalists. More accurately they are eco-terrorists, engaging in an activity called tree spiking.

Opposed to legal timber harvesting, these eco-terrorists have taken to the practice of driving metal spikes into trees, hoping to discourage lumber companies from logging. The practice has life-threatening consequences.

Tree spiking came to light recently when a mill worker operating a bandsaw struck a spike. The impact of the saw hitting the spike sent metal flying, a piece of which slashed across the throat of the mill worker, almost killing him.

In Maine last year some 100 spikes were found in trees—this time on private land. And just last week, I received a letter from a small lumber company. Trees which the company had purchased were degraded by insertion of spikes. While serious injury to mill workers was avoided, the company lost thousands of dollars as the value of the trees was severely diminished.

I have introduced legislation to increase penalties for tree spiking. I would encourage my colleagues to cosponsor my bill.

No self-respecting environmentalist can support tree spiking. Congress must help ensure that tree spiking is brought to a halt.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR CHINA

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

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan says to give China the most-favored-nation status is just and it is moral. That is like the President saying that John Dillinger should be president of the Bank of America. It would be immoral, it would be immoral to recognize the oppression of human rights by any government. To recognize a nation that kills its people only because they want to speak out freely is crazy.

When that happened in Nicaragua, the Reagan and Bush team cut them off, no special trade status.

If you support the President on this, you are going to have to answer to the American people and to the American veterans who went out and fought and sacrificed to preserve precious freedoms and now to see their jobs lost to a suppressive government.

This Congress better send a strong message to the President of the United States that we expect him to stand up for America.

THE STRENGTH OF OUR ECONOMY DEPENDS ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

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

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, economic vitality is directly related to the national investment in research and development for science and technology. This lesson is understood by all industrialized nations.

The United States cannot be economically competitive without high productivity, and we cannot be more productive without technological innovation.

In high technology, markets are driven by product innovation. The company with the best product is the one that will succeed. Without the new knowledge that comes from research and development, we cannot create significant new innovations to drive our high technology industries forward.

High technology R&D can also increase our economic strength in low-technology manufacturing industries.

Our loss of competitiveness in manufacturing industries such as steel and construction reflects the fact that the United States did not incorporate high technology innovations as rapidly as did other nations.

Many countries that did not have significant R&D systems in the past—especially the newly industrialized nations of the Pacific rim—are rapidly developing an R&D capability. They understand that they must do so if they expect to be able to compete. They learned this lesson from the United States.

In both high- and low-technology products, success in the global market means creating and applying new knowledge—and new technology born of new knowledge—faster than one's competitors. The way to create new knowledge more rapidly is to increase our investment in R&D.

Insufficient support for science and engineering is related to our economic problems in general, and our lack of global economic competitiveness in particular.

An example of the need that I described is the space station, and I urge my colleagues to support restoration of funding for that project.

ABORTION RIGHTS UNDER ATTACK

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

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in less than a month, the Supreme Court of the United States has restricted a woman's right to comprehensive family planning advice. The Supreme Court has said twice that abortion counseling is not to be included.

First, the Court targeted American women who rely on federally funded family planning. In the Rust versus Sullivan decision, the freedom to choose for many women was virtually obliterated. Then, this past Monday, the Court let stand a Reagan administration policy cutting off family planning aid to foreign health care organizations that use funds from any source to provide abortion counseling.

It is clear. We cannot count on this Supreme Court to protect the right to choose. Now is the time for Congress to stand up where the Court has not. We must pass legislation to reverse these bans on free speech and infringements on the right to choose. Women's health is in jeopardy if these Supreme Court decisions are not reversed. We must restore the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship and protect access to a full range of family planning services for women whatever their economic condition.

IN SUPPORT OF SPACE STATION FREEDOM

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, the ancient Greeks learned long ago that the key to any well-intentioned government is balance. Balance between the needs of the present and the requirements of the future. Unfortunately, that balance is being threatened by recommendations to cancel the space station Freedom.

In these times of tight budgets, we must be very careful how we spend our limited resources. We must take care of our homeless, our veterans, and our environment. But we must also take care of our future. We must make the investments in research and development that will provide for future growth so that our children will not have to bear the full burden of our debt. We must continue to set high goals and challenges to inspire our children to study math and engineering and to stir their creative powers. Space station Freedom is just that kind of investment.

While it is important to strike a balance between today and tomorrow, it is also important to strike a balance within the space program itself. Space station Freedom does just that by keeping alive a manned space program. In canceling the space station, we would be pulling the plug on future human exploration of the solar system.

The space station Freedom is the next logical step in our hopes, dreams, and accomplishments in space. Just as the ancient Greeks looked to the heavens for guidance about the future, we too, should look to the stars as we contemplate our fate. In doing so, we should envision the international space station, called Freedom, and we should cast our votes to make it a reality.

Mr. Speaker, my district will not receive any money from this appropriation. But I want my children reaching for the stars.

TRIBUTE TO HON. GERALD B. SOLOMON ON HIS COMMITMENT TO OUR DESERT STORM VETERANS

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

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to extend my hearty congratulations to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable GERALD B. SOLOMON, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, who has just received this very important award. It is an award that underscores his commitment to insuring that the homecoming for the courageous Americans whose sacrifices during Operation Desert Storm will be recognized.

This Saturday we are going to see a parade like this town and like the United States of America has never seen before. It could not have taken place had it not been for the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. Speaker, I simply want all of us to extend our hearty congratulations to the gentleman from New York for receiving this great award.

WE SHOULD RECOGNIZE THE COMMITMENT OF OUR VETERANS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we have spent much of the last week talking about issues of equal treatment and fairness. We will spend approximately $8 million this weekend on a parade to honor veterans of a 43-day-old war that had the support of the vast majority of the American people and that met with unparalleled success.

But within our country are 8 million veterans of another war, the war which caused 45,000 casualties and that did not have the support of the vast majority of the American people and that in fact required far more patriotic commitment on the part of the brave men who fought that war. It was unsuccessful, but not due to the fault of the veterans who fought that war.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Desert Storm Homecoming Foundation voted to keep Vietnam veterans out of the march this weekend and out of the picnic that follows that march. Mr. Speaker, that is just one more wrong in a litany of wrongs against the veterans, the very brave and patriotic veterans of the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfair, and it ought to be changed.

□ 1020

NASA'S SPACE STATION, NOT A LUXURY, BUT A NECESSITY

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to stop playing with the future and start building it.

NASA's space station is today under attack from within this Chamber by those who mistakenly see it as a luxury.

Mr. Speaker, an American space station is not a luxury but a necessity as our world transforms itself from mili-

tary confrontation and toward economic competition.

Throughout the last 30 years we have seen time and time again how space exploration has helped educate our children, stimulate high-technology industries, and generate countless medical breakthroughs.

Our space program is not about hardware. It is about where this Nation will go and what we will do in the international laboratory of outer space.

How can we even consider short-changing future generations of Americans by putting the future on hold and eliminate space station Freedom as a national priority?

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we can, and it is my hope that the House will vote to restore funding for space station Freedom.

EXPANDING FEDERAL STUDENT AID FOR WORKING AMERICANS

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

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "If you want to see the faces of a young family turn pale in a hurry, just ask how they plan to pay for their children's college education."

Although expensive now, Mr. Speaker, a college education is considered a fairly routine requirement for young people who want to get ahead in life. But when we start estimating the cost of college and the hundreds of thousands of dollars, it becomes anything but routine. Over the past 10 years, while family income raised 35 percent, the cost of a college education rose from 60 to 90 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY], to expand Federal student aid for working Americans.

Expansion of the Pell grant and Perkins loan programs were two of the most repeated requests I heard recently when I conducted a series of financial aid meetings in my district recently.

My colleagues, a college education is an investment in our people. Middle-income students and their families are caught in a terrible squeeze and forced to make very difficult choices about their futures. I am pleased to stand with my colleagues to say to middle-income Americans, "We believe in you, too. We want you to succeed."

VOTE TO FUND THE HOPE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, in my short time in Congress, I have heard those on the other side of the aisle cry out for us to do something about the poor. Today, we have the opportunity to start doing something substantive about the poverty problem. Today, we can vote to fund the HOPE Program which will dramatically reform public housing in this country.

The only alternative to HOPE is to continue the failed housing policies of the past. One only needs to read the book, "There are no Children Here" by Alex Kotlowitz, to realize the scope of the failure of public housing. From the crime that rampantly runs through the projects to the rundown, rat-infested, closet-sized apartments that the tenants are forced to live in, there is no doubt that we have the duty to try something different.

Mr. Speaker, HOPE will begin the process of bringing the poor out of the grip of poverty by encouraging them to own property. We all know that when an individual has the power of ownership, their entire way of thinking changes, resulting in renewed confidence, a heightened sense of pride and previously unthinkable achievement. Mr. Speaker, it is time the liberals start trusting the poor by giving them the responsibility of home ownership.

OUR CHILDREN DESERVE THE BENEFITS TO BE DERIVED FROM SPACE STATION FREEDOM

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of space station Freedom. We must continue on the path of manned exploration of space. A permanent manned presence in space with the space station is necessary for this effort.

Space station Freedom will provide a space based laboratory for conducting life sciences and microgravity research that will be unparalleled. We will realize unprecedented technological and scientific advancement from our development of the station. Our children deserve the benefits to be derived from space station Freedom.

We certainly face tough choices in this time of fiscal restraint and rightfully so. But lets not take a short-sighted approach and ignore an investment in the future. Funding the space station will insure that the United States will continue as the world's leader in space exploration and continue to be competitive as a technology based society.

I urge all my colleagues to enthusiastically support the Chapman/Lowery amendment which provides funding for space station Freedom.

FUTURE OF SPACE STATION AND STRONG SPACE PROGRAM THREATENED FOR YEARS TO COME

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, today I do urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Chapman-Lowery amendment to restore the funding for the Space Station Program.

The expedient action of the Appropriation Subcommittee not only kills this program today, but will destroy any chance for a strong, relevant space program for many years to come. We have not had the opportunity to fully debate and weigh the impacts of this action practically as to their long term implications. Expediency must not push us blindly along a path when we have given little thought to where it is leading.

We are now able to put in place technology that now permits us to understand our planet and to measure the changes that man is bringing about. We can now see the depletion of the Earth's ozone layer; we can for the first time measure and monitor CO_2 and CFC's in our atmosphere; we see deforrestation taking place and the encroachment of deserts. These capabilities provide us the basis to be better stewards of planet Earth. The U.S. space program has made much of this advance possible.

We must carefully consider that the consequences of this action will further erode our reputation as a reliable partner for international cooperative efforts. I am not convinced that these issues have been thoroughly reviewed in the haste to agree with a bottom line.

MORTGAGE SCAM

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention a scandal that has rocked the city of Boston and elsewhere in Massachusetts. Hundreds, maybe thousands, of poor and elderly citizens are on the verge of losing their homes. Here is what is happening: A fly-by-night contractor bangs on your door, tells you that you need your roof fixed or your bathroom repaired or have your house painted or windows replaced. And that it won't cost you anything because he represents a bank that will put up the money. The homeowner, who is often illiterate, never sees a dime, and signs

a paper agreeing to pay off a loan at interest rates as high as 24 percent, and often demanding a balloon payment at the end of 2 or 3 years. When the homeowner cannot pay, his home is seized, and he and his family are thrown out onto the street.

It is not just these con-artist contractors and rip-off mortgage companies that are involved in this scam. The major banks of this Nation are providing financing for these fraud firms. And it is happening in Georgia, Alabama, and other cities and States throughout this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to check up on home repair practices in their districts, to ensure that unsuspecting homeowners are not being ripped off by hustlers working in cahoots with banks that are unwilling to open offices in low- and moderate-income areas, but are happy to play patsy with those who would prey upon society's most vulnerable citizens.

PERMISSION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY TO BE ON TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1991, INSTEAD OF MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1991

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that District of Columbia Day be obseverd under clause 8, rule XXIV, on Tuesday, June 11 of this year instead of Monday, June 10, 1991.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Under my reservation I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, to explain the reasons for his request and for the legislation to be considered.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] for yielding, and, as I am sure the Members of the House are aware, the rules of the House permit that the second and fourth Mondays are designated as District Days on which our committee can bring local legislation to the floor of the House. However we are making this request for District Day to be on Tuesday, June 11, 1991, in deference to a number of my colleagues, including the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, who has expressed a personal interest in one of both of the two bills that will be considered.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will continue to yield, I would like to explain briefly the two pieces of legislation that we would consider, pending the unanimous-consent request on Tuesday. First, we would consider H.R. 2123, which would establish a predictable and equitable method for determining the amount of Federal payment for the District of Columbia. In addition, the bill would authorize the Federal payment to the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1992.

□ 1030

In addition to H.R. 2123, Mr. Speaker, we will call up H.R. 1720. That bill would amend Public Law 98-621, the St. Elizabeth's Hospital Transfer Act of 1984, to allow for certain capital improvements of the campus of St. Elizabeth's Hospital, and for other purposes. H.R. 1720 authorizes no new moneys for St. Elizabeth's Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined, as I understand it, in this request by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], who, as I indicated in my previous earlier remarks, is the ranking member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for his explanation. I note that at least one other member of our committee on this side will not be here on Monday. So, since this request to move District Day is in part at our request, I thank the gentleman for his indulgence and would note that I am in strong support of both items of the legislation to be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I repeat my unanimous consent request.

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

There was no objection.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 166 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 166

Resolved, That all points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXI are hereby waived. During consideration of the bill, all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI are waived: beginning on page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 25; beginning on page 10, line 5 through page 11, line 24; beginning on page 13, lines 3 through page 13; beginning on page 16, line 8 through page 23, line 10; beginning on page 24, lines 9 through page 17; beginning on page 25, line 7 through page 26, line 2; beginning on page 27, lines 9 through 16; beginning on page 29, line 1 through page 30, line 4; beginning on page 31, line 8 through page 34, line 2; beginning on page 34, line 23 through page 37, line 26; beginning on page 38, line 8 through page 42, line 24; beginning on page 45, line 21 through page 46, line 17; beginning on page 47, line 1 through page 50, line 14; beginning on page 50, line 22 through page 54, line 2; beginning on page 55, line 15 through page 56, line 4; beginning on page 56, lines 9 through page 23; beginning on page 57, line 8 through page 58, line 14; beginning on page 59, line 21 through page 64, line 9; beginning on page 79, line 15 through page 80, line 6. It shall be in order to consider en bloc the amendments numbered one printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, said amendments en bloc shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment. It shall be in order to consider en bloc the amendments numbered two printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, said amendments en bloc shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, and all points of order against said amendments en bloc are hereby waived. It shall be in order to consider en bloc the amendments numbered three printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, said amendments en bloc shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and may amend portions of the bill yet read for amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] 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 166 is the rule waiving points of order against provisions of H.R. 2519, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year 1992.

House Resolution 166 provides the necessary waivers of the rules to allow immediate consideration of H.R. 2519 and waives rules against specific provisions of the bill.

The rule specifically makes it in order to consider the following amendments: First, the amendments en bloc to be offered by Representative TRAXLER, second, the amendments en bloc to be offered by Representatives CHAPMAN and LOWERY, and third, the amendments en bloc to be offered by Representative KOLBE.

The rule waives clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI, requiring a 3-day layover, and clause 7 of rule XXI, requiring relevant printed hearings and report to be available for 3 days prior to consideration of a general appropriation bill, against consideration of the bill.

House Resolution 166 also waives clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in general appropriations bills, and restricting the offering of limitation amendments to such bills, against specific provisions of the bill.

Furthermore, the rule waives clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations in a general appropriation bill, against specific provisions of the bill.

The precise provisions of H.R. 2519 for which these waivers are provided are detailed in the rule by reference to page and line in the Veterans Affairs/Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for fiscal year 1992.

Finally, the rule specifically makes it in order to consider the following amendments: First, the amendments en bloc to be offered by Representative TRAXLER, second, the amendments en bloc to be offered by Representatives CHAPMAN and LOWERY, and third, the amendments en bloc to be offered by Representative KOLBE.

The three en bloc amendments are printed in the report accompanying the resolution, are not subject to a demand for a division of the question, and may amend portions of the bill not yet ready for amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the Chapman-Lowery amendments en bloc.

Mr. Speaker, the HUD/VA appropriations bill funds many vitally important programs. I urge adoption of the rule so the House can proceed to consideration of this important measure.

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

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I would like to begin by extending my appreciation to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] and a number of his colleagues on the majority side for helping us fashion this rule. I should say, however, that I am concerned due to the fact that not all Republican Members who want to offer amendments to H.R. 2519 will be able to do so. I am referring to the Roukema en bloc amendments to transfer additional funds to the HOME and HOPE Programs.

However, the rule does make in order the Kolbe-Espy-Mrazek en bloc amendments to provide $151 million to help public housing residents buy their units. Despite the fact that this program, known as HOPE I, was authorized by the Banking Committee last year, the Appropriations Committee chose not to provide funding to help public housing residents attain the dream of home ownership.

Instead, the Appropriations Committee chose to increase, by $151 million, Federal handouts to owners of multifamily housing projects, many of whom can truly be called slumlords.

By funding HOPE II and HOPE III, while denying funds for HOPE I, the Appropriations Committee has effectively relegated public housing tenants to second-class citizenship. The Kolbe-Espy-Mrazek amendment will restore some semblance of sanity to the funding priorities of this appropriations bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank many of the Members on the majority side for helping us incorporate this amendment.

The rule also makes in order the Chapman-Lowery amendment to restore funding for the Space Station Program, which is essential to maintaining our national security as well as our leadership in space exploration. The United States has already spent $5.6 billion to develop the station and foreign partners in the project have spent about $1 billion.

Cancellation of the space station will jeopardize future scientific cooperation between the United States and our partners in Europe and Japan. The director of the European Space Agency said:

> It cannot be doubted that U.S. withdrawal from the international space station would have a serious adverse impact on the prospects for any future trans-Atlantic cooperation in the space field. It would certainly have an effect in other scientific and technological fields.

In short, Mr. Speaker, as Admiral Truley said: "America's credibility is on the line."

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the administration's views on H.R. 2519. I will support this rule, and urge my colleagues to move forward with passage of the Chapman-Lowery amendment and the Kolbe-Espy-Mrazek amendment.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 5, 1991.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(H.R. 2519—VA/HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriation Bill, FY 1992—Sponsors: Whitten, Mississippi; Traxler, Michigan)

This Statement of Administration Policy expresses the Administration's views on the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, as reported by the Committee. The Administration objects in the strongest terms to the termination of the Space Station and the funding of excessive public housing subsidies instead of HOPE. If these objections are not addressed in the bill presented to the President, his senior advisers would recommend that the bill be vetoed.

SPACE STATION

The Administration urges the Rules Committee to approve a rule that would make in order an amendment, expected to be offered by Congressmen Chapman and Lowery, to fund Space Station Freedom, with appropriate offsets.

The Administration strongly objects to the Committee's proposed termination of Space Station Freedom. It is particularly disturbing that such an action should be proposed immediately following the completion by NASA of a comprehensive restructuring of the program, performed at the specific request of the Subcommittee. The restructuring met all of the criteria imposed by the Subcommittee, including limits on annual budgetary growth.

Space Station Freedom is a critical element in planned future space science and technology programs; it is a major contributor to long-term U.S. economic growth; and it is an important element in international cooperation in science and technology. It is a visible manifestation of the nation's commitment to investment in the future.

The United States has already invested over $4 billion in the Space Station program. Our international partners have already invested over $1 billion. If the program that has been supported by a bipartisan national consensus for the last seven years were now canceled, it would call into question our ability to execute any large, complex science and technology program. Other nations would rightly question our reliability as a partner in such ventures, which would have serious implications for cooperation on important projects in a number of other fields.

The Committee's action is tantamount to an abandonment of America's manned space program. The House is urged in the strongest terms to restore funding for Space Station Freedom.

HOPE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS

The Administration strongly opposes the Committee's severe reduction in the President's requested funding for new housing programs, authorized in the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act—especially HOPE homeownership grants. Instead of supporting these new and innovative housing programs that give tenants a stake in their future, the Committee added $1.4 billion above the President's request for the costly and ineffective housing construction programs that have been tried in the past. The 76 percent reduction in the President's request for HOPE grant funding, from $865 million to $210 million, would deny thousands of low-income families the opportunity to become homeowners. The Administration urges the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment that would reallocate housing funds for HOPE homeownership grants for public housing tenants.

The Administration objects to the Committee's funding level or $2.4 billion for public housing operating subsidies, a $250 million increase over the President's request. The President's $2.2 billion request will more than adequately cover the operating subsidy needs in FY 1992 for two reasons. First, utility costs are now projected to be substantially less than those assumed in the FY 1992 Budget. Second, HUD estimates that a significant portion of the FY 1991 supplemental appropriation will be available for obligation in FY 1992.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICERS ACT

The Administration strongly opposes section 519, which would bar the use of funds appropriated in the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill for the implementation of Public Law 101-576, the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990. This law addresses long-standing Congressional and Administration concerns about financial man-

agement deficiencies in the Federal Government. These are deficiencies that must be corrected.

In passing the Chief Financial Officers Act (CFOs Act), the Congress found that "[b]illons of dollars * * * lost each year through fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement * * * could be significantly decreased by improved management." As a remedy, the CFOs Act (passed by voice vote without dissent) (1) strengthens Management capabilities; (2) provides for improved accounting systems, financial management, and internal controls to assure reliable information and deterrence of fraud, waste, and abuse; and (3) provides for reliable financial information—useful to Congress and the Executive Branch—in financing, managing, and evaluating Federal programs. Implementation of the CFOs Act is essential to good government.

The House is respectfully urged to support Space Station Freedom and provide additional funding for HOPE homeownership grants. The Administration's other concerns with the Committee-reported bill are outlined in the attachment.

H.R. 2519—VA/HUD AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992

MAJOR PROVISIONS OPPOSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION

A. Funding Levels

Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

HOPE: The House Committee provides $1.1 billion for HOPE, $1 billion less than the President's request of $2.1 billion. The largest share of the decrease is in the HOPE Homeownership Grants program, where only $210 million of the $865 million requested was provided. Moreover, the Committee mark provides no funds at all for the Secretary's highest HOPE priority—public housing tenant ownership. The 76 percent reduction in HOPE grants funding will deny thousands of low-income families the opportunity to become homeowners. This opportunity, endorsed by the Congress last year in the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, should be given a chance to become reality with adequate funding.

HOME: The House Committee provides $500 million for HOME grants, $500 million less than the President's request or $1 billion. HOME grants provide States and localities greater flexibility in meeting the housing needs of their low-income residents. Funding HOME at $1 billion in FY 1992 would serve up to 70,000 families, and most of the assistance would be available within two years. These same funds in public housing new construction would create only about one-fifth as many new units some five years after the commitment of funds.

Subsidized Housing—Public Housing Modernization: The House Committee provides $2.5 billion for public housing modernization, $233 million more than the President's request. The President's request of $2.3 billion represents a 28 percent increase over the average modernization funding level for the years 1988 through 1990. The 1991 level of $2.5 billion has increased the substantial backlog of available but unspent modernization funds to around $5 billion. Funding this program at $2.5 billion in FY 1992 will only exacerbate an already excessive backlog.

Subsidized Housing—Public and Indian Housing New Construction: The Administration objects to providing $732.3 million for Public and Indian housing development. Public housing new construction costs twice as much as rental assistance (rental certificates, housing vouchers) with less choice. The President's Budget funds Indian housing units through a set-aside of $125 million in the new HOME grant program. The HOME set-aside will provide more flexibility to Indian tribes to develop housing programs that they believe are most effective. Tenant-based housing vouchers, which utilize existing private housing, can provide housing at less cost and with more choice to tenants.

Subsidized Housing—Elderly and Handicapped New Construction: The Committee provides nearly $797 million, $542 million more than requested by the Administration. The Committee level does not assume any funding for these units through the less expensive and more flexible options of leasing of existing housing. The Administration proposed to fund approximately 3,000 units through leasing, for a total of 5,000 units.

Subsidized Housing: The earmarkings for various programs under the account, Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing, exceed the amount appropriated. The Committee covers the excess earmarking by assuming the reservation of $216 million in previously appropriated funds, which would be carried over into FY 1992. Such carryovers have never been assumed in the past and are inappropriate. To the extent that the carryovers do not occur, the Administration would be required to make appropriate reductions below the specific funding earmarks included in bill language. Accordingly, the number of additional subsidized units and the size of the subsidized programs may turn out to be lower than the Committee forecasts in the bill.

Community Development Block Grants: The House Committee provides $345 million above the President's 1992 Budget request for this program. The President's request should be more than sufficient, given the start up of the new HOME program.

Salaries and Expenses: The Committee has abandoned the traditional practice of funding all of HUD's staff costs, excluding the Inspector General, in a single large appropriation, totaling $879 million. In lieu thereof, the Committee has straitjacketed HUD with separate appropriations for seven headquarters staff offices for personnel services and travel only, and a separate large appropriation of $750 million for HUD's remaining expenses. These seven appropriations for headquarters staff offices (five of the seven are less than $15 million) will severely limit the Secretary's ability to efficiently manage staff and to quickly reallocate staff to respond to unexpected demands. For example, the recent HUD scandals demanded quick action including reallocation of staff. Under the Committee appropriation structure the Secretary could not have responded in a timely manner to the unfolding events. The Administration asks the House to return to the traditional single appropriation for HUD staff that has worked effectively and efficiently in the past.

Office of the Inspector General: The House Committee cuts by $1 million the President's request for the HUD Inspector General. This reduction will impede audits and investigations to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies.

Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)

Medical Care: The bill includes an unnecessary $265 million increase above the President's request for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) medical care. Most of this increase is attributable to medical equipment, personnel costs, such as physician pay, and unrequested program enhancements, such as increased nursing staff. Any increases in personnel costs in VA medical care could be accommodated within the 7.5 percent increase over the FY 1991 level that was requested by the Administration for FY 1992.

Construction: The Administration strongly objects to the addition of $72 million for three unrequested VA construction projects: $16.8 million for design of a $187.8 million clinical addition in Ann Arbor, Michigan; $48.8 million of an ambulatory care facility in El Paso, Texas; and $6.4 million for renovations in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Funding these low-priority projects circumvents VA's orderly construction planning process. The Ann Arbor project, the second costly replacement project in southern Michigan in two years, would be constructed within 40 miles of the $247 million replacement hospital in Detroit.

Parking Garages: The Administration objects to the addition of $10.7 million for parking garages in Nashville, Tennessee, and Miami, Florida. The Committee's rejection of the budget proposal to reallocate FY 1990 funds from a 1,500-space garage in Detroit, Michigan to partially fund the Nashville parking garage disregards VA's current planning projections, which support a 1,250-space garage in Detroit. The 1,500-space garage in Detroit, MI, is not supported by VA's current planning projections. Moreover, funding unrequested, low-priority projects such as the Miami parking garage further circumvents VA's orderly construction planning process.

Inspector General: The Committee provides $1.9 million less for VA's Inspector General than proposed in the President's FY 1992 budget. The Inspector General is required by statute to maintain an employment level of at least 417 FTE. In addition, the Inspector General's office has been given the responsibility of overseeing the audit of VA's financial statements as required by the recently enacted Chief Financial Officers Act. The funding decrease jeopardizes the Inspector General's ability to carry out these and other responsibilities.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Superfund: The Administration objects to the Committee's reduction of $100 million in the Superfund program and to the reallocation of an additional $36 million from critical-site cleanup work to fund low-priority activities. These actions would undermine the Administration's efforts to accelerate cleanup of the nation's worst hazardous waste sites and would unnecessarily extend the risks posed by these sites to public health and the environment.

Construction Grants/Wastewater Treatment Grants: The Administration opposes the $295 million increase for wastewater treatment grants because it exceeds the authorized level of funding. The President's request of $1.8 billion to construct facilities to treat domestic sewage is consistent with the overall level authorized by the Water Quality Act of 1987, and would target $300 million to cities with the largest remaining need. These targeted amounts are vital to the achievement of the Nation's water quality goals.

The Administration objects to the removal of $51 million from the President's request to construct a plant to treat sewage discharge from Tijuana. The Administration is committed to addressing serious pollution problems along the U.S.-Mexican border. Tijuana's sewage is causing adverse public health affects in southern California that must be addressed on a priority basis.

Operating Program: The President's request included a $191 million (8 percent) increase over FY 1991 for EPA's Operating programs (Salaries and expenses, Abatement, control and compliance, Research and development, and Buildings and facilities) to fund Clean Air Act implementation and initiatives such as Great Lakes cleanup. The additional $162 million above the request is not necessary to carry out EPA's statutory mandates and would fund activities that are primarily state and local responsibilities (e.g., implementation of the nonpoint source program, and asbestos loans and grants). Particularly objectionable are the increases that would fund numerous low-priority and special-interest projects, such as expensive unwanted laboratories, at a time when the Committee is reducing funds for Superfund cleanups. The Administration opposes the funding of special interests at the expense of the health and safety of Americans.

Dock Facilities in Bay City Michigan: The Administration strongly objects to the inclusion of $20 million for dock facilities and other items in Bay City, Michigan. This hardly seems consistent with the mission of a regulatory agency charged with protecting human health and the environment.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)

Earth Observation System: The Administration objects to earmarking $25 million from Research and Development and $3.4 million from Construction of Facilities for the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network for work on the Earth Observing System (EOS) date and information system (EOSDIS). The amount earmarked from Research and development is 30 percent of the total funding available for the EOS data and information system—the most crititical element of the EOS program. Earmarking funding for this Consortium, based in Michigan, will have serious adverse affects on the current EOSDIS schedule and thereby delay achievement of the objectives of the broader U.S. Global Change Research Program.

Landsat: The Committee provides $5 million for Landsat long lead parts. This would initiate a new, unrequested program in NASA at a time when other on-going programs, including Space Station, have few resources. No funds are required in FY 1992 for additional satellites, consistent with the expected lifetime of Landsat 5. The Administration is committed to maintaining the continuity of Landsat-type data, and is considering options for continuing Landsat-type data after Landsat 6, including how Landsat should be funded. Traditionally, Landsat has been funded by NOAA.

National Science Foundation (NSF)

Academic Research Instrumentation Program: The Administration objects to the deletion of funding proposed for the National Science Foundation's new Academic Research Instrumentation program. The Administration requested $50 million for high cost scientific instruments. There is an enormous need for this high cost equipment in order to make continued progress in research in fields such as surface chemistry, materials synthesis and processing, and molecular biology. Breakthroughs in basic research in all of these fields have the potential to make long-lasting contributions to U.S. economic growth. The need of researchers for access to state-of-the art instrumentation far outstrips the additional funding provided by the Committee for facilities renovation funds or for graduate traineeships.

Research Facilities Modernization: The Administration objects to the $20 million provided by the Committee for a program to modernize academic research facilities. The Federal government is providing over $1 billion per year to universities for facilities through use charges and operations and maintenance expenses included in indirect cost recovery payments. This is the proper way to fund academic research facilities. The Administration understands that universities have not always invested these payments for renovation and modernization of buildings and equipment, and has proposed changes in the rules governing indirect costs to address this situation.

Traineeship: The Administration opposes $25 million included for a new program of graduate traineeship. The traineeship programs apparently are justified by concerns over possible "shortages"; however, serious questions have recently been raised about the validity of these alleged "shortages". The House is urged to delete funding this low-priority program.

Salaries and Expenses: The Administration objects to the deletion of funds for NSF's relocation. NSF requested relocation from the General Services Administration (GSA) because its current location is inadequate both in terms of total spaced and support for NSF's activities (e.g., computer and electrical capability). GSA conducted a full and open competition and has executed a lease on a new facility for occupancy in 1993. Abrogating this lease will be extremely costly to the taxpayer.

The Points of Light Foundation: The Committee provides no funding for the Points of Light Foundation. The Foundation, a Presidential initiative, makes direct and consequential voluntary service aimed at serious social problems central to the life and work of every American. The House is urged to fund this program at the requested level of $7.5 million.

National Institute of Building Sciences: The Administration opposes funding for this Institute. Consistent with the Institute's original authorizing legislation, it should continue to be self-supporting as it was in FY 1991.

B. Language Provisions

Environmental Protection Agency

User Fees: The Administration objects to the Committee's delegation of language included in the President's Budget that would allow user fees deposited in the Environmental Services Fund to be used to finance the programs for which the fees are collected. This language is consistent with—and needed to fully implement—the EPA fee provisions in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990. Further, it would provide an incentive for quick establishment of the fees and ensure that they are used to support the programs for which the fees are charged.

Personnel Earmarking: The Administration opposes inclusion of specific staff levels for various EPA headquarters offices. Congressional micromanagement of this nature eliminates the necessary flexibility to allocate staff resources to the most presiding needs. The House should delete this provision.

Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (LUST): The Administration objects to report language earmarking $1 million for a demonstration project in Iowa. The existing allocation system for LUST resources has worked well and the House should avoid the temptation to make this a pork barrel program.

Environmental Education Awards: The Administration requests the deletion of report language which would transfer from the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) to EPA the responsibility for the President's Awards for Excellence in Environmental Education. This transfer contradicts the National Environmental Education Act of 1990, which specifically designates CEQ as the administrator of the program.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Administrative Provisions: The Administration objects to a number of provisions that forgive repayments and a loan to HUD. These provisions allow the cities of Malden and Newburyport, Massachusetts, Jefferson City, Missouri, Valleyjo, California, and New London, Connecticut to retain land disposition proceeds, and allows Calhoun Falls, South Carolina to not repay its public facilities loan. These provisions set an undesirable precedent as other communities could seek similar exceptions to HUD program requirements.

Senior Executive Service Limits: Currently, HUD is authorized 28 noncareer positions in the Senior Executive Service. If the Department is limited to 15 noncareer positions in the Senior Executive Service, the Secretary's ability to respond to serious issues relating to HUD's mission will be severely impeded and will seriously impact HUD's management. This micromanagement of an Executive branch agency is inefficient, ineffective and inappropriate.

Department of Veterans Affairs

Medical Care: Language earmarking $8.75 billion for personnel services within VA Medical Care infringes upon VA's executive management of the veterans' health care system and precludes the Department from utilizing medical funds in the most effective and efficient manner. This provision should be deleted.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA): National Insurance Development Fund. The bill would forgive Treasury borrowing incurred by the National Insurance Development Fund (Crime Insurance). This budget adjustment would not result in any savings. The House should delete this forgiveness of debt.

Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC): Private industry currently receives CPSC advice, expertise and safety "certification" free-of-charge. The President's FY 1992 Budget proposes to begin to recover the costs of these services through user fees. The budget proposal follows the directive in the recent CPSC reauthorization (P.L. 101-608) that the CPSC should conduct a one-year study on the feasibility of user fees. In failing to adopt proposed user fee language, the Committee has missed an opportunity to improve the operation and equity of Federal services.

C. Scoring

Scorekeeping Adjustments: Based on preliminary analysis, OMB's scoring of the bill shows that total budget authority would be $310 million above the 602(b) allocation. This results from three scorekeeping adjustments:

$273 million of this increase is in discretionary receipts for GNMA's mortgage-backed securities program. The Committee assumes that this program makes a profit for the Government; the President's Budget assumes that the fees charged to the users of the program cover its cost;

$14 million is for VA incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm that

the committees declared an emergency. These monies would continue to fund additional staff through FY 1992 for claims processing and transition assistance that was provided in the FY 1991 emergency supplemental. The President's Budget assumes there would be an increase in the number of new veterans as a result of the planned reduction of active military strength. Therefore, additional funding is not needed and would not be designated as an emergency; and,

$17 million for medical cost recovery that would result in an increase in spending. The Committee added a limitation that would allow VA to use collections above the level projected in the President's Budget.

VA, HUD, INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 1992 DEFENSE AND DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

[In millions of dollars]

Major programs	1991 enacted[1]		1992 President's request[2]		House committee		House Difference from			
							Enacted		Request	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
DISCRETIONARY SPENDING										
Domestic spending:										
Housing and Urban Development:										
Subsidized housing programs	16,910	14,225	16,016	15,801	16,838	15,821	−72	1,595	822	19
HOPE grants	.....	.....	865	.....	210	.....	210	.....	−655	.....
General and special risk program account	268	62	244	225	244	225	−24	163	.....	.....
Shelter plus care	.....	.....	91	4	87	4	87	4	−3	.....
Flexible subsidy fund	.....	26	203	102	203	102	203	76	.....	.....
Payments to the operation of low-income housing	2,175	2,047	2,156	2,190	2,406	2,305	231	258	250	115
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	150	0	165	76	165	76	15	75	.....	.....
Community development grants	3,205	3,073	2,920	3,099	3,265	3,113	60	40	345	14
Emergency shelter grants	73	67	71	73	71	73	−2	6	.....	.....
HOME block grant	.....	.....	1,000	20	500	10	500	10	−500	−10
Management and administration	459	429	479	474	478	474	20	45	−1	−0
Other HUD	160	1,339	319	1,331	277	1,328	117	−10	−43	−3
Subtotal, HUD	23,400	21,269	24,530	23,394	24,745	23,530	1,345	2,261	215	135
Veterans Affairs:										
Medical care	12,335	12,123	13,260	13,014	13,552	13,231	1,217	1,109	292	217
Other VA	2,011	1,772	1,893	1,738	2,048	1,807	37	35	155	70
Subtotal, VA	14,346	13,994	15,154	14,752	15,600	15,039	1,254	1,144	446	287
NASA:										
Research and program management	2,212	2,223	2,452	2,417	2,427	2,396	215	173	−25	−22
Space flight control and data communication	5,124	5,184	5,576	5,454	5,618	5,483	493	299	42	29
Construction of facilities	498	363	480	445	399	440	−99	77	−82	−5
Research and development	6,024	5,718	7,199	6,389	5,195	5,371	−829	−348	−2,004	−1,019
Other NASA	11	10	15	14	13	13	2	3	−2	−1
Subtotal, NASA	13,868	13,497	15,721	14,719	13,651	13,702	−217	205	−2,070	−1,018
FEMA:										
Disaster relief	.....	822	184	356	184	356	184	−466	.....	.....
Other FEMA	255	330	229	292	271	334	16	4	42	42
Subtotal, FEMA	255	1,152	414	648	458	690	201	−462	42	42
EPA:										
Construction grants	2,100	2,353	1,900	2,194	2,195	2,199	95	−154	295	5
Hazardous substance response trust fund (superfund)	1,616	1,361	1,750	1,514	1,650	1,493	34	132	−100	−21
Salaries and expenses	975	922	1,090	1,062	1,090	1,062	115	140	.....	.....
Research and development	255	253	313	276	334	284	79	31	21	8
Abatement, control and compliance	979	865	1,020	893	1,134	939	155	73	114	46
Other EPA	157	131	139	148	164	153	8	23	25	5
Subtotal, EPA	6,081	5,884	6,212	6,087	6,567	6,129	486	245	355	42
National Science Foundation	2,316	2,098	2,722	2,416	2,722	2,398	406	298	−0	−20
Resolution Trust Corporation	11	11	30	30	30	30	20	19	.....	.....
Other Independent Agencies	172	−43	132	111	121	102	−51	145	−11	−9
Total domestic spending	60,449	57,762	64,915	62,157	63,891	61,617	3,442	3,855	−1,023	−541
DEFENSE SPENDING										
FEMA	308	310	310	312	310	312	2	2	.....	.....
All other	27	6	27	27	27	27	1	1	.....	.....
Total defense spending	335	336	337	339	337	339	3	2	.....	.....
Total discretionary spending	60,784	58,098	65,252	62,496	64,229	81,968	3,445	3,857	−1,023	−541

[1] FY 1991 enacted includes credit reform adjustments for comparability with FY 1992.
[2] FY 1992 President's request includes legislative proposals.
602(b) Allocations:
Defense discretionary—Budget authority $338; Outlays $339.
Domestic discretionary—Budget authority $63,590; Outlays $61,390.

Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

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

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's support for this rule. We believe it to be a fair rule. The rights of all Members are maintained to offer germane amendments to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 14, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

YEAS—404

Abercrombie	Archer	Barrett
Ackerman	Armey	Barton
Alexander	Aspin	Bateman
Anderson	Atkins	Beilenson
Andrews (ME)	AuCoin	Bennett
Andrews (NJ)	Bacchus	Bentley
Andrews (TX)	Baker	Bereuter
Annunzio	Ballenger	Berman
Applegate	Barnard	Bevill

Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Gray
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—14

Allard
Burton
Coble
Cox (CA)
Crane
Dannemeyer
Hancock
Hefley
Herger
Petri
Roukema
Stump
Upton
Vucanovich

NOT VOTING—13

Anthony
Bilbray
Collins (IL)
Hunter
Levine (CA)
Mavroules
Mfume
Neal (NC)
Olin
Savage
Sisisky
Thomas (GA)
Wise

□ 1101

Mr. McCANDLESS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2519, the bill about to be considered, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1104

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2519, with Mr. BEILENSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] will be recognized for 45 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] will be recognized for 45 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we bring to you a bill that I think deserves your unanimous support, and I am confident that it will receive much of that.

Before I begin, I want to express my personal appreciation and gratitude to the distinguished ranking minority Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN]. He is an outstanding Member of this body who is appreciated and whose thoughtfulness and intellect and careful positions are appreciated by not only myself but every Member. This product represents that portion of the intellect of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] that we all admire, and it could not be here but for him.

Mr. Chairman, also, I would like to especially express my gratitude to the members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS], the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], of course, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY]. Then, Mr. Chairman, there are some unseens and unrecognized staff people

who make this process work and without whose valuable assistance no bill could ever come to this floor, and so it is with deep appreciation I recognize what I consider to be some of the finest staff people on this Hill. We all know that without the help of the staff, the business of the Congress could never go forward; and all staff adequately and wonderfully serve the people of the United States of America: Dick Malow, who is the committee clerk who has been there for 19 years; Paul Thomson, many years on the subcommittee; Michelle Burkett, starting with us officially last year as a member of the subcommittee staff; Marissa Smith, an intern detailed to the subcommittee, and I could not go on without mentioning a person on my personal staff, Bill Gilmartin, and on Mr. GREEN'S staff, Jeff Lawrence, both of whom have made significant contributions over the years to this effort.

Mr. Chairman, well now, what are the facts that the subcommittee faced when we put this bill together, and why did we do what we did do? Let me tell you.

Here is the situation: the outlays for the 10 domestic discretionary appropriation bills increased by 7½ percent for 1992 above 1991. This bill, as requested by the President, required roughly a 7-percent increase in outlays.

The allocation, the pie, that the subcommittee received represented a 5½-percent increase. Well, what does that really mean? Let me translate.

That means that we had to cut the President's budget by $1,207,000,000 in budget authority, and $840,000,000 in outlays.

Those are only numbers. They are only numbers, and perhaps because of the size, we do not understand them or do not appreciate them. I have a problem with it. That is a lot of money in my world back outside the Beltway, as it is for all of you.

What it really means is that we had to make tough, hard choices. The subcommittee had to prioritize between funding major new initiatives such as the space station versus funding for other ongoing program requirements both within NASA and the other agencies in the bill. Not fun, not easy.

But we are not here looking for sympathy. We are here to explain to you why we present this bill in the form that it is in and why and how we made those choices.

□ 1110

Now, the choice was made to cancel the space station. Let me say that this was not an easy choice. We have worked closely, with the authorizing committee, and I am very proud of the personal relationship that I have with the authorizing Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Unfortunately, he and I will have separate views on this, and he will explain those to you later.

I might also add that later there will be an amendment to be offered by two distinguished members of the subcommittee.

I regret that we have these different views and positions. It in no way affects the esteem and warmth with which I hold them, and certainly the decision to cancel the station by the subcommittee and the full committee does not in any way impinge on the friendship and the esteem with which we have held the NASA management.

Admiral Truly, J.R. Thompson, and Bill Lenore in my judgment are three very capable, talented managers, of which this Nation can be proud. I have enjoyed with them a friendship and I expect that will continue even though we hold different positions in relation to the station.

This subcommittee has been and will be a strong supporter of the NASA programs.

Now, why do we make this change? Why do we cancel the station?

Well, if we had funded the station, the subcommittee would have had to make drastic cuts in the funding in these areas:

VA medical care, environmental programs within EPA, the National Science Foundation and all the wonderful work it does in basic science, science teacher education and the scholarships that it offers. The importance that it is to the technological base and the productivity of America is critical to us, and we fully funded science education and then some.

I must also say, we did not want to reduce the programs within NASA, the science programs which we think are extremely beneficial and important. We made those difficult choices.

It really came down to these kinds of issues. We could fund the space station and provide for virtually no other increases, and indeed probably be forced into a reduction mode, or we could cancel the station, and fund other important science and people programs that are in this bill. Not an easy choice, not one that any member of this subcommittee is overjoyed with.

Let me say a word or two about veterans medical care, and I will expand upon this later when I offer the amendment to increase the veterans medical care.

We have added $265 million for VA medical care, and that does not include a $33 million amendment we will offer in a little while from now. None of this would have been possible without the able assistance and the friendship of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He was able to find for our subcommittee some $90 million that is going to be dedicated to VA medical equipment, and for that I am especially grateful. His commitment to America's veterans is exceeded nowhere in this Congress or in this Government, and I am very appreciative of that dedication. He makes my task, my job in the subcommittee, so much easier.

But the truth of the matter is that while we have added this $265 million for VA medical care, and there will be as I said another $33 million added to that, we should be adding probably $400 to $500 million if we really want to begin to address the problems within the VA health care system, and I want you to understand that. In spite of the best efforts that the subcommittee has been able to make, with the full cooperation of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and the Veterans' Affairs Committee, in my judgment we are still short.

Today, many of the VA hospitals are operating at the margin. They are not delivering, in my judgment, the kind of first-class medical care that our veterans are entitled to. I regret that and so does every member of the subcommittee and of this body, I am sure. They do not have the nurses to staff the wards. They do not have the anesthesiologists to keep the operating rooms going. They do not have enough radiologists to read the x rays, or laboratory technicians to conduct the tests, to measure the blood samplings. The list goes on and on.

We made a choice to take some money and put it in the National Science Foundation science programs, very critical science programs to this country. We put it in the EPA in their research and enforcement budgets. We put it into VA medical care and VA medical research; but above all other increases, we put it into the NASA science programs, such as the Earth Observation System, EOS, CRAF/Cassini, and so on. These programs are strongly supported by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. They have been the genesis for many of them, and for that I am grateful.

Now, let me say a word or two about the space station. You know, as I said earlier, our argument is not against NASA. We are not even arguing, as a matter of fact. We are making a hard choice. They redesigned and rescoped the space station according to the subcommittee's request. We did not design it. We are not engineers, and we do not intend to be, but we were concerned about certain cost-factors. NASA brought within some parameters that we were concerned about and they did so, I think, with the full cooperation of the subcommittee and a lot of conversation, and for that I am appreciative.

The rescoped station, in my judgment, is an excellent design and it meets most of the subcommittee's concerns.

The sad part is that we would have a station in orbit today if the agency and others in this town had taken the advice back in 1984 when another chairman stood in this well and swore that there was not going to be enough money to fund the then-concept of the station, the big enchilada.

We said let us proceed with this on a "buy the yard basis". That advice was not taken at that time, and now we find ourselves in this situation. The new design is, by the way, a "buy the yard" station.

There are fire walls in the station, and if the amendment prevails to reinstate the station—I hope it will not, but if it does prevail—I will tell you, if the cost of the station continues to escalate, we will be back down here in another year on another day and we will be drawing this line and this fight will be held all over again if those costs escalate.

Now, we cannot afford the station, unfortunately, even if it is redesigned, in my judgment. Big science is really knocking out little science here. You cannot escape that.

If you look carefully at the proposed amendment, it goes after the science in NASA and, of course, it does some other things to low-income housing which we will discuss later. But the point that is really our focus is also the point that the academics have been talking about, that we have all read about, heard about in our luncheon conversations and in the seminars we have attended—little science versus big science.

The amendment will slash little science within NASA and promote one single objective, and that is the space station. Big science, yes, in their amendment; little science, yes, in our amendment. I think that we properly framed that.

I want to tell you that if the station comes in, in my judgment it is going to eat our lunch this year, but it is going to eat your dinner next year.

Keep in mind the 1993 space station costs are about $2.5 billion, followed with an increase to $2.5 billion the following year. These increases, coupled with the increase in EOS and other NASA programs, cannot fit into the shrinking discretionary budget. It simply cannot be.

Why? As we stand here, we know in this subcommittee and in the full committee, and the Budget chairman will tell you that the allocation in 1993 will probably not allow us to fund inflationary increases in this subcommittee.

Now, ask yourselves how we can expect to provide for 10 to 15 percent increases in NASA, 8 to 9 percent increases in the VA medical care, an 18 percent increase in the National Science Foundation, and 8 to 10 percent increases in environmental programs, and do all that when the allocation will go up within a range of 3 to 4½ percent.

□ 1120

It "don't" work. That dog "don't" hunt, the turkey "don't" fly.

I cannot manufacture money, and neither can the subcommittee. We are living under the budget agreement of last fall. Like it or not, that set the tone and the blueprint for what the appropriators can do. If you make those numbers fly and do those things, you are a superior mathematician than I am, and you may be engaging in some Chinese arithmetic.

On the other hand, you can do what the amendment proposes—restore the station, and you can offer up for space station, on its altar, virtually every other NASA program. Let me emphasize that: If you do station in this amendment, you are throwing out the window the NASA science space programs. The thing that the Augustine Commission said was the most vital and important thing we could do in space is space science and the last thing they said we ought to do priority-wise is space station. The leaders of the American space community issued that report. We got copies of it; you got copies of it, read it, believe it, follow it.

This is not just something that the subcommittee dreamt up as a priority. This report is the speaking of the American space community leadership in the Augustine Commission report. I commend it to you.

My judgment is that this amendment will wipe out space science and you ought not decimate it, you ought not cripple the shuttle program, you ought not cut to the bone NASA personnel and the facilities budget, and you ought not wipe out and hurt—not wipe out, you will decimate the aeronautics programs.

If you do that, I am personally convinced it is the wrong choice for NASA, and more importantly it is the wrong choice for the Nation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the bill and a "no" vote on the station amendment.

I will include a table comparing the amounts recommended in the bill with the 1991 appropriations and the revised 1992 budget requests at this point:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1992

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1991 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1992 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1991 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1992 (6)
TITLE I					
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Benefits Administration					
Compensation and pensions	16,397,135,000	15,841,620,000	15,841,620,000	-555,515,000	.....
Readjustment benefits	752,500,000	635,400,000	635,400,000	-117,100,000	.....
Veterans insurance and indemnities	15,410,000	25,740,000	25,740,000	+10,330,000	.....
Loan guaranty revolving fund	670,200,000	.....	.....	-670,200,000	.....
Guaranty and indemnity fund	80,800,000	.....	.....	-80,800,000	.....
Guaranty and indemnity program account (indefinite)	.....	367,709,000	367,709,000	+367,709,000	.....
Administrative expenses	.....	39,689,000	39,689,000	+39,689,000	.....
Loan guaranty program account (indefinite)	.....	128,920,000	128,920,000	+128,920,000	.....
Administrative expenses	.....	85,870,000	85,870,000	+85,870,000	.....
Direct loan program account (indefinite)	.....	9,000	9,000	+9,000	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	.....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	.....	1,368,000	1,368,000	+1,368,000	.....
Education loan fund program account	.....	8,000	8,000	+8,000	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	.....	(21,000)	(21,000)	(+21,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	.....	307,000	307,000	+307,000	.....
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account	.....	105,000	105,000	+105,000	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	.....	(1,688,000)	(1,688,000)	(+1,688,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	.....	936,000	936,000	+936,000	.....
Direct loan revolving fund (limitation on direct loans)	(1,000,000)	.....	.....	(-1,000,000)	.....
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration	17,916,045,000	17,127,681,000	17,127,681,000	-788,364,000	.....
Veterans Health Administration					
Medical care	12,335,490,000	13,287,096,000	13,462,096,000	+1,126,606,000	+175,000,000
Medical equipment	.....	.....	90,000,000	+90,000,000	+90,000,000
Copayment savings	.....	.....	-90,000,000	-90,000,000	-90,000,000
Medical and prosthetic research	216,795,000	216,795,000	226,795,000	+10,000,000	+10,000,000
Health professional scholarship program	10,113,000	10,113,000	10,113,000	.....	.....
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	41,434,000	40,479,000	40,479,000	-955,000	.....
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	484,000	500,000	500,000	+16,000	.....
Total, Veterans Health Administration	12,604,316,000	13,554,983,000	13,739,983,000	+1,135,667,000	+185,000,000
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses	914,514,000	847,204,000	854,204,000	-60,310,000	+7,000,000
Desert Shield/Desert Storm incremental costs	.....	.....	(14,100,000)	(+14,100,000)	(+14,100,000)
Office of Inspector General	24,859,000	29,959,000	28,000,000	+3,141,000	-1,959,000
Construction, major projects	580,000,000	450,000,000	522,000,000	-58,000,000	+72,000,000
Construction, minor projects	130,640,000	195,701,000	189,701,000	+59,061,000	-6,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(44,420,000)	(46,176,000)	(45,176,000)	(+756,000)	(-1,000,000)
Parking garage revolving fund	28,900,000	8,536,000	19,200,000	-9,700,000	+10,664,000
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities	70,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	+15,000,000	.....
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemetaries	3,946,000	5,104,000	5,104,000	+1,158,000	.....
Total, Departmental Administration	1,752,859,000	1,621,504,000	1,703,209,000	-49,650,000	+81,705,000
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs:					
New budget (obligational) authority	32,273,220,000	32,304,168,000	32,570,873,000	+297,653,000	+266,705,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,000,000)	(2,709,000)	(2,709,000)	(+1,709,000)	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(44,420,000)	(46,176,000)	(45,176,000)	(+756,000)	(-1,000,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1992—Continued

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1991 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1992 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1991 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1992 (6)
TITLE II					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Housing Programs					
Homeownership and opportunity for people everywhere grants (HOPE grants)	.....	865,400,000	210,000,000	+210,000,000	-655,400,000
HOME investment partnerships program	.....	1,000,000,000	500,000,000	+500,000,000	-500,000,000
Annual contributions for assisted housing	9,525,000,000	9,065,790,000	9,985,790,000	+460,790,000	+920,000,000
Rescission of assisted housing deobligations (budget authority, indefinite)	-535,190,000	-227,000,000	-227,000,000	+308,190,000	.....
Total, annual contributions for assisted housing (net)	8,989,810,000	8,838,790,000	9,758,790,000	+768,980,000	+920,000,000
Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts	7,890,800,400	7,024,589,000	7,024,589,000	-866,211,400	.....
Rental rehabilitation grants	70,000,000	.....	.....	-70,000,000	.....
Rental housing assistance:					
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite	-46,000,000	-52,641,000	-52,641,000	-6,641,000	.....
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,393,000)	(-2,393,000)	(-393,000)	.....
Rent supplement program:					
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite	.....	-53,856,000	-53,856,000	-53,856,000	.....
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	.....	(-2,448,000)	(-2,448,000)	(-2,448,000)	.....
Housing assistance for the elderly and persons with disabilities	.....	152,810,000	.....	.....	-152,810,000
Congregate services	9,500,000	.....	9,500,000	.....	+9,500,000
Payments for operation of low-income housing projects	2,175,000,000	2,155,844,000	2,405,844,000	+230,844,000	+250,000,000
Housing counseling assistance	8,000,000	3,700,000	8,350,000	+350,000	+4,650,000
Flexible subsidy fund	.....	203,413,000	203,413,000	+203,413,000	.....
Federal Housing Administration Fund	317,366,000	.....	.....	-317,366,000	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(75,000,000,000)	.....	.....	(-75,000,000,000)	.....
Temporary mortgage assistance payments (limitation on direct loans)	(151,125,000)	.....	.....	(-151,125,000)	.....
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	.....	(53,592,815,000)	(60,000,000,000)	+60,000,000,000	(+6,407,185,000)
Administrative expenses	.....	255,645,000	255,645,000	+255,645,000	.....
Offsetting receipts	.....	-255,645,000	-255,645,000	-255,645,000	.....
FHA - General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	.....	(8,651,901,000)	(8,651,901,000)	(+8,651,901,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	.....	189,000,000	189,000,000	+189,000,000	.....
Program costs	.....	54,911,000	54,911,000	+54,911,000	.....
Total, Federal Housing Administration Fund	317,366,000	243,911,000	243,911,000	-73,455,000	.....
Nonprofit sponsor assistance (limitation on direct loans)	(1,100,000)	.....	.....	(-1,100,000)	.....
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	150,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	+15,000,000	.....
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(80,000,000,000)	(74,769,293,000)	(74,769,293,000)	(-5,230,707,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	.....	6,595,000	6,595,000	+6,595,000	.....
Offsetting receipts	.....	-279,700,000	-279,700,000	-279,700,000	.....
Total, Housing Programs (net)	19,564,476,400	18,408,455,000	19,439,795,000	-124,681,400	+1,031,340,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1992—Continued

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1991 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1992 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1991 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1992 (6)
Homeless Assistance					
Emergency shelter grants program	73,164,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	-2,164,000	
Transitional and supportive housing demonstration program	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000		
Supplemental assistance for facilities to assist the homeless	11,263,000	57,000,000	57,000,000	+45,737,000	
Section 8 moderate rehabilitation, single room occupancy	105,000,000		55,000,000	-50,000,000	+55,000,000
Shelter plus care:					
Section 8 moderate rehabilitation, single room occupancy		53,333,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000	-3,333,000
Section 202 rental assistance		37,200,000	37,200,000	+37,200,000	
Homeless rental housing assistance program		167,200,000	116,000,000	+116,000,000	-51,200,000
Total, Homeless Assistance	339,427,000	535,733,000	536,200,000	+196,773,000	+467,000)
Community Planning and Development					
Community development grants	3,200,000,000	2,920,000,000	3,265,000,000	+65,000,000	+345,000,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(140,000,000)		(140,000,000)		(+140,000,000)
Urban homesteading	13,000,000			-13,000,000	
Total, Community Planning and Development	3,213,000,000	2,920,000,000	3,265,000,000	+52,000,000	+345,000,000
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology	28,500,000	35,000,000	29,500,000	+1,000,000	-5,500,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities	12,410,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	+590,000	
Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses (multiple accounts)	429,500,000	444,453,000	444,453,000	+14,953,000	
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(396,000,000)	(435,000,000)	(435,000,000)	(+39,000,000)	
Office of Inspector General	29,283,000	35,020,000	34,000,000	+4,717,000	-1,020,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(10,000,000)	(9,645,000)	(9,645,000)	(-355,000)	
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	23,616,596,400	24,257,061,000	24,471,948,000	+855,351,600	+214,887,000
Appropriations	(24,197,786,400)	(24,590,558,000)	(24,805,445,000)	(+607,658,600)	(+214,887,000)
Rescissions	(-581,190,000)	(-333,497,000)	(-333,497,000)	(+247,693,000)	
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indef)	(-2,000,000)	(-4,841,000)	(-4,841,000)	(-2,841,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(152,225,000)			(-152,225,000)	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(155,140,000,000)	(137,014,009,000)	(143,561,194,000)	(-11,578,806,000)	(+6,547,185,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended)	(406,000,000)	(444,645,000)	(444,645,000)	(+38,645,000)	
TITLE III					
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
American Battle Monuments Commission					
Salaries and expenses	15,900,000	18,440,000	18,440,000	+2,540,000	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1992—Continued

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1991 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1992 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1991 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1992 (6)
Commission on National and Community Service					
Salaries and expenses	2,000,000	.....	.....	-2,000,000	.....
Program activities	55,000,000	.....	.....	-55,000,000	.....
Total, Commission on National & Community Service	57,000,000	.....	.....	-57,000,000	.....
Consumer Product Safety Commission					
Salaries and expenses	37,109,000	39,200,000	40,200,000	+3,091,000	+1,000,000
Court of Veterans Appeals					
Salaries and expenses	7,481,000	9,133,000	9,133,000	+1,652,000	.....
Department of Defense - Civil					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses	12,236,000	12,587,000	12,587,000	+351,000	.....
Environmental Protection Agency					
Salaries and expenses	974,700,000	1,090,000,000	1,090,000,000	+115,300,000	.....
Office of Inspector General	37,000,000	41,200,000	39,661,000	+2,661,000	-1,539,000
Research and development	254,900,000	313,000,000	333,875,000	+78,975,000	+20,875,000
Abatement, control, and compliance	1,006,525,000	1,019,500,000	1,133,625,000	+127,100,000	+114,125,000
Buildings and facilities	40,000,000	13,000,000	39,700,000	-300,000	+26,700,000
Subtotal, operating programs	2,313,125,000	2,476,700,000	2,636,861,000	+323,736,000	+160,161,000
Hazardous substance superfund	1,616,228,000	1,750,000,000	1,650,000,000	+33,772,000	-100,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(233,000,000)	.....	(260,000,000)	(+27,000,000)	(+260,000,000)
Leaking underground storage tank trust fund	65,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	+20,000,000	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(6,000,000)	.....	(6,400,000)	(+400,000)	(+6,400,000)
Construction grants	2,100,000,000	1,900,000,000	2,195,000,000	+95,000,000	+295,000,000
Total, Environmental Protection Agency	6,094,353,000	6,211,700,000	6,566,861,000	+472,508,000	+355,161,000
Executive Office of the President					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	1,873,000	2,560,000	2,560,000	+687,000	.....
National Space Council	1,363,000	1,491,000	1,491,000	+128,000	.....
Office of Science and Technology Policy	3,560,000	3,880,000	3,880,000	+320,000	.....
The Points of Light Foundation	5,000,000	7,500,000	.....	-5,000,000	-7,500,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	11,796,000	15,431,000	7,931,000	-3,865,000	-7,500,000
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Disaster relief	.....	184,459,000	184,459,000	+184,459,000	.....
Disaster assistance direct loan program account	.....	541,000	541,000	+541,000	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	.....	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(+6,000,000)	.....
Salaries and expenses	143,000,000	165,113,000	165,113,000	+22,113,000	.....
Office of Inspector General	3,351,000	5,144,000	3,600,000	+249,000	-1,544,000
Emergency management planning and assistance	282,624,000	277,827,000	277,827,000	-4,797,000	.....
Emergency food and shelter program	134,000,000	100,000,000	134,000,000	.....	+34,000,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	562,975,000	733,084,000	765,540,000	+202,565,000	+32,456,000
General Services Administration					
Consumer Information Center	1,540,000	1,944,000	1,944,000	+404,000	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(2,172,000)	(2,285,000)	(2,285,000)	(+113,000)	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1992—Continued

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1991 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1992 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1991 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1992 (6)
Department of Health and Human Services					
Office of Consumer Affairs	1,964,000	2,103,000	2,103,000	+139,000	.....
Interagency Council on the Homeless					
Salaries and expenses	1,083,000	1,300,000	1,083,000	.....	-217,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Research and development	6,023,600,000	7,198,500,000	5,194,600,000	-829,000,000	-2,003,900,000
Space flight, control and data communications	6,334,132,000	5,608,300,000	5,650,300,000	-683,832,000	+42,000,000
Portion applied to debt reduction	-1,209,732,000	-32,675,000	-32,675,000	+1,177,057,000	.....
Construction of facilities	497,900,000	480,300,000	398,700,000	-99,200,000	-81,600,000
Research and program management	2,211,900,000	2,452,300,000	2,427,300,000	+215,400,000	-25,000,000
Office of Inspector General	10,500,000	14,600,000	12,952,000	+2,452,000	-1,648,000
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	13,868,300,000	15,721,325,000	13,651,177,000	-217,123,000	-2,070,148,000
National Credit Union Administration					
Central liquidity facility:					
(Limitation on direct loans)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on admin. expenses, corporate funds)	(893,000)	(964,000)	(964,000)	(+71,000)	.....
National Institute of Building Sciences					
Payment to the National Institute of Building Sciences	.....	.....	250,000	+250,000	+250,000
National Science Foundation					
Research and related activities	1,694,200,000	1,963,500,000	1,960,500,000	+266,300,000	-3,000,000
Academic research facilities	20,478,000	.....	20,000,000	-478,000	+20,000,000
Academic research instrumentation	.....	50,000,000	.....	.....	-50,000,000
United States Antarctic research activities	100,000,000	118,000,000	118,000,000	+18,000,000	.....
United States Antarctic logistical support activities	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	.....	.....
Education and human resources activities	322,350,000	390,000,000	435,000,000	+112,650,000	+45,000,000
Salaries and expenses	101,000,000	122,000,000	110,000,000	+9,000,000	-12,000,000
Office of Inspector General	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,300,000	+300,000	-200,000
Total, National Science Foundation	2,316,028,000	2,722,000,000	2,721,800,000	+405,772,000	-200,000
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation					
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	25,554,000	26,900,000	26,900,000	+1,346,000	.....
Selective Service System					
Salaries and expenses	26,635,000	27,480,000	27,480,000	+845,000	.....
Total, title III, Independent Agencies:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	23,039,954,000	25,542,627,000	23,853,429,000	+813,475,000	-1,689,198,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(241,172,000)	(2,285,000)	(268,685,000)	(+27,513,000)	(+266,400,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(600,000,000)	(606,000,000)	(606,000,000)	(+6,000,000)	.....
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended)	(893,000)	(964,000)	(964,000)	(+71,000)	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1992—Continued

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1991 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1992 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1991 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1992 (6)
TITLE IV					
CORPORATIONS					
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:					
FSLIC Resolution Fund	22,000,000,000	3,419,000,000	15,899,000,000	-6,101,000,000	+12,480,000,000
Portion applied to liquidation of authority to borrow	-22,000,000,000	-3,419,000,000	-15,899,000,000	+6,101,000,000	-12,480,000,000
Resolution Trust Corporation: Office of Inspector General	10,785,000	30,328,000	30,328,000	+19,543,000	
Total, title IV, Corporations	10,785,000	30,328,000	30,328,000	+19,543,000	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	78,940,555,400	82,134,184,000	80,926,578,000	+1,986,022,600	-1,207,606,000
Appropriations	(80,731,477,400)	(82,500,356,000)	(81,292,750,000)	(+561,272,600)	(-1,207,606,000)
Rescissions	(-581,190,000)	(-333,497,000)	(-333,497,000)	(+247,693,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(285,592,000)	(48,461,000)	(313,861,000)	(+28,269,000)	(+265,400,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-4,841,000)	(-4,841,000)	(-2,841,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(753,225,000)	(608,709,000)	(608,709,000)	(-144,516,000)	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(155,140,000,000)	(137,014,009,000)	(143,561,194,000)	(-11,578,806,000)	(+6,547,185,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended)	(406,893,000)	(445,609,000)	(445,609,000)	(+38,716,000)	

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies has pointed out, this is a bill which brings home the fact that this House must make choices. I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] because he has had the courage to make choices instead of just trying to keep everything rolling along on inefficient levels which are only ultimately going to make the choices even harder in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, he has had the courage to lead the committee through the process of saying what our options are, not just this year but next year, and to see that we come to a rational conclusion as to what the country can afford and what the country cannot afford.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest to my colleagues that when a chairman of a subcommittee on appropriations shows the kind of courage that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has shown in making the hard decisions, this House ought to back him up, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

I should like to discuss just two of the choices that we have made. My remarks cover issues which will be debated at great length in the day ahead, so I shall be brief. Let me address first the housing issue and then the space station issue.

In the case of the housing programs, the subcommittee faced the problem that last year's new housing bill provided for $4 billion more in authorizations than the then-current level of appropriations. Plainly our subcommittee could not fund all of the things that were authorized in last year's housing bill. So we did have to make some choices.

Those choices include a significant start on the major new programs in the housing bill, the HOME Program, and HOPE II and HOPE III, which are the single-family and multifamily HOPE Programs.

The one home ownership program which we did not provide additional separate funding for was the so-called HOPE I Program, the sale of public housing to its tenants.

But I think the House should be aware, as it faces that decision, that there is outstanding a demonstration program involving the sale of 2,000 units of public housing by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. They have been engaged in that program with the approval of our subcommittee for 6 years now. In the course of those 6 years they have sold just under 350 units of public housing to its tenants. We asked them why is this program going so slowly, because this is obviously the precursor to HOPE I. We were told by the department in the course of our hearings that the reason it is going so slowly is that in the report where we gave the department the go-ahead for this demonstration program, we told them to replace every unit sold with a new unit of public housing. I think they were right, that was a very serious constraint.

So, to meet that objection, we included in the bill before you language removing that constraint, and that means that the agency will not be subject to that very restrictive feature in disposing of the remaining 1,650 units which are available under this demonstration program.

The agency also tells us that it is costing about $30,000 per unit to fix up these units and put them in condition for sale to tenants. I think with a little arithmetic you can see that that number gives us a $49.5 million program for sale of public housing to its tenants simply by moving forward the demonstration, one hopes, more rapidly with the constraints removed from it.

So I think that we have been fair to all of the various interests that participated in the compromise that produced last year's housing bill, and I think that the department is being given a fair shot to get the new programs going.

Let me now turn to what is certainly an even more contentious issue, and that is the space station. I should like to explain why, at least for this member of the subcommittee, the space station in the end turned out to be a very low priority.

I will go into this in greater detail later on. But I think I can sum it up by quoting from the Space Studies Board of the National Research Council, and I am sure the Members are aware that the National Research Council is a subsidiary of the National Academy of Sciences and National Academy of Engineering, designed to look at public policy issues from a scientific point of view and give advice to the executive and legislative branches as to where to go.

As they reviewed the latest configuration of the space station, here is what they said:

> In the judgment of the Board, the proposed redesign of space station Freedom does not meet the stated national goal of enabling the life sciences research necessary to support extended human space exploration nor does it meet the stated needs of the microgravity research community, the two major science areas that are claimed for the space station.

So, given the fact that, after all this time and all this money, the station cannot really perform much in the way of useful purposes, from my point of view it really has to be at the end of the parade as far as this bill is concerned.

Unfortunately, the money ran out before we could get to the space station. It is as simple as that.

Now we are going to face an amendment today which will take $250 million from public housing operating subsidies and the balance from other NASA programs to provide $1.9 billion for the space station. I just want everyone to understand what that choice means if you want to go that way.

First you are going to cut by 10 percent the operating subsidy for the homes of some of the poorest people in this country. We will be told, "Well, you are $250 million over the administration's request." We sure are, because according to HUD's own formula we had to up the administration's request for this program for the current fiscal year, not by $250 million, but by $350 million before we were finished with the supplemental appropriation bill because the administration consistently underrequests for that operating subsidy.

So that is one of the things you will be doing.

The other thing you will be doing is simply devastating everything else at NASA: Mission to planet Earth, you are putting off a decade and we will not get the vital information that we need to make the very expensive decisions we are going to have to make about global warming, global climate change.

You will be decimating the astronomy programs, you will be decimating even the real life science that NASA does.

Now, they crafted the amendment in this way despite the devastation it wreaks on NASA, I think, for two reasons. First, I think they hoped, as we all hoped, that somehow the Senate would save us.

□ 1130

Well, the Senate has not saved us. The fact of the matter is that yesterday the Senate got its 602(b) allocations—that is the son of 302(b)—and this subcommittee on the Senate side got only $50 million more than our subcommittee did in the House. Fifty million dollars is not going to bridge that $1.9 billion gap for the space station. So, there is no salvation over there.

And remember also that we have to think, not just about fiscal year 1992, but fiscal year 1993. Oh, the sponsors of the Chapman-Lowery amendment say it does not affect the veterans, it does not affect poor people and housing, it does not affect the environment, but my colleagues must understand that, if they vote for that amendment, they are voting not just for $1.9 billion this year. They are voting for $2.3 billion next year and another quarter of a billion dollars over that the year after that, and out to the end of the century.

I say to my colleagues, If you don't think that's going to reduce the amount of funding that our sub-

committee has available for veterans, if you don't think that's going to reduce the amount of funding that our subcommittee has available for poor people, and housing and the homeless, if you don't think that's going to affect the amount of money that our subcommittee has available for the environment, then I really don't think you can add or subtract very accurately. It's got to kill those programs in future years, and you ought to understand that if you're going to think of voting for that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of choice that our subcommittee has made under the distinguished leadership of our chairman. We made the tough choices. I ask the House to show the same courage that our chairman did and that our subcommittee did, to back up our distinguished chairman. Vote "yes" on the bill and vote "no" on the amendments.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], just let me correct myself for a moment here. The Augustine Report, quoting from it, to put their priorities in perspective, I misquoted it when I was in the well, and I would not want anyone to misunderstand what the Augustine Report said.

> It is our belief that the space science program warrants the highest priority for funding. It in our judgment, it ranks above station, aerospace planes, manned mission to the planets and many other major pursuits which often receive greater visibility.

End of quote from the Augustine Report.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking majority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2519, the VA/HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the ranking minority member the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. Even though confronted with a very inadequate allocation for programs under the committee's jurisdiction, they have steered a measure through the committee that responds to the pressing issues facing our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, to say that this bill provides funding that is essential to our society is an understatement. This contains many people programs that are of crucial importance to millions to our citizens.

There are housing programs, not just for the poor, elderly, and homeless, but those that provide mortgage and loan guarantees to all persons. This bill incorporates programs to develop our neighborhoods and cities, which are decaying and in dire need of our support. Programs that compensate veterans and their families, provide them housing loans, and furnish their medical care and treatment are also included in this measure. The bill provides funds to support our efforts to cleanup the environment, including asbestos removal from schools; lead based paint abatement; pollution prevention and control; and ozone and global warming studies come out of this allocation. Our Nation's disaster relief projects are also funded through this measure.

In addition, the essential strategies and activities to improve our math and science capabilities, and thus our economic competitiveness, are addressed in this one bill. This includes NASA and the National Science Foundation.

I know how important each of these programs are just to my district alone. Over 200,000 veterans are treated in the VA hospital in Cleveland. There are thousands of children with lead-based paint poisoning, as well as polluted waters on Ohio's lakeshore.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the prospect for supporting these programs that provide basic services to Americans is especially grim. As you know, the level of funding provided for the VA/HUD appropriations was well below what we anticipated for our target this year. Given this situation, and the fact that we owe it to the American public to provide and maintain these services, we are left with few choices than that which is before us today.

I am pleased that this bill incorporates provisions of specific interest to me that address our domestic concerns. This includes funds for a national lead-based paint abatement program, the No. 1 preventable health hazard facing our children. Linked to this is a requirement that the Environmental Protection Agency take the lead in developing a comprehensive Federal implementation plan for attacking this epidemic.

In addition, the measure includes several amendments to assist socially and economically disadvantaged businesses. One would require the Resolution Trust Corporation [RTC] to make 10 percent of contracts from the savings and loan crisis available to disadvantaged individuals and firms. Another provision establishes within the EPA a contractor mentor/protege program for disadvantaged businesses applicable to all prime contracts over $3 million.

I was also able to include in this bill $2 million for the National Science Career Access Program for summer science camps for underrepresented middle school youth.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern about continuing the space station. But I absolutely object to efforts to restore funding for this project on the backs of the least fortunate in our society. That is exactly what would happen under the proposed amendment to fund the space station by taking money from public housing operating subsidies. In the city of Cleveland, this would mean a $4 million deduction for public housing operating subsidies. And, ironically, the amendment to fund HOPE I takes away from a program serving low and moderate income persons. Thus, the very individuals who need our assistance to keep a roof over their heads are the same ones who would suffer under these proposals.

We must not forget that we have not totally abolished the work proposed to come from the space station. This bill provides funds to carry out a study of alternate methods of building the station. Moreover, it provides funds to conduct right here on Earth the most critical research to be carried on by the space station. But most importantly, because we recognize the vital services NASA as a whole provides to the Nation, we have left intact the other NASA programs. Moreover, we provided $210 million to HOPE II and III, which includes money for an elderly independence demonstration project.

Mr. Chairman, this bill presents some very hard choices. Nonetheless, the priorities of this bill are correct. They are prudent. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2519.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON].

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I am forced to object to the $14 million so-called emergency appropriation for claims processing included in this measure, and I want to speak briefly about it.

One can make a case that this additional spending is appropriate. Indeed, its proponents have gone to some trouble to do so. But regardless of the merits of the argument, no one can make a legitimate case that this constitutes an emergency.

This funding can be planned for; the fact that it's included in legislation for a fiscal year that doesn't start until 4 months from now makes the point. This kind of planning—distributing a limited amount of resources according to one's priorities, and making the tradeoffs required to do so—is what budgeting is about. The Appropriations Committee did show this kind of decision-making ability with regard to the space station: Regardless of the way one feels about the merits of that project, at least the appropriators made a choice—a choice that involved a high-visibility program and the allocation of $2 billion. But when it came to this $14 million item, the appropriators lost their will to make any more tradeoffs. So they slapped an emergency label on this provision. This is not necessary; we could expand veterans' services by $14 million without the emergency designation. But by calling

this an emergency—so that no limits apply—the appropriators have given themselves $14 million to spend somewhere else. I might add that it does no credit to us, or to our country's veterans, to keep pretending we can increase veterans spending as if no one has to pay for it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we are talking here about a $63.6 billion appropriations bill. The $14 million emergency represents about 2 1/100 of 1 percent of the whole bill. In that context, if we can't find $14 million of savings somewhere else in the $63.6 billion we are spending here, then the American taxpayers, many of whom are veterans, have every right to believe that Congress just doesn't know how to budget.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], the former ranking minority member of our subcommittee.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2519, a bill appropriating funds for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies like the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

This was perhaps the most difficult year the subcommittee has ever had in crafting our annual appropriations measure and our chairman, Mr. TRAXLER, and the ranking Republican member, Mr. GREEN, are to be commended for their open-mindedness and fairness in working through the difficult decisions we had to make.

Later today we will debate amendments dealing with two of the most contentious decisions our subcommittee made affecting space station and HOPE I initiative. I won't take time at this moment to discuss these issues since they will be debated in detail shortly.

I do, however, want to comment on some of the specific appropriations recommendations we made. But before I do, I do want to caution the Members that we had extraordinarily severe funding constraints.

First, our budget allocation fell $1.2 billion in budget authority and $845 million in outlays below the President's budget request. This is regrettable and, as Republicans, we have objected to the process which gives us very little voice in these budget allocations and prevents approval of many of the President's laudable funding requests.

Second, as in past years, authorization levels far outstripped our funding allocation. In the case of housing programs, the authorization level was no less than $4 billion over the amount appropriated last year. There was no way our panel ever would have had the resources to fund all the innovative and positive housing programs authorized under the National Affordable Housing Act. The same is true of NASA where the authorizing committees have approved all sorts of programs leaving us to sort out the funding priorities.

Despite these problems, we did succeed in approving the administration's request for the National Science Foundation. Almost all programs, excluding the space station, receive full funding in NASA. Veterans compensation and benefits, and medical care assistance will receive a needed infusion of resources. Moreover, the Environmental Protection Agency will receive a $355 million increase over the administration's budget to embark on a variety of critical environmental protection initiatives affecting air and water quality, drinking water, hazardous waste, pesticide, toxic substances, and Superfund.

H.R. 2519 is a fiscally responsible and delicately balanced bill and I urge my colleagues support.

□ 1140

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my very good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], not only for his generosity but for bringing what I have already told him is an exceptionally good bill to the floor. We have only one difference, really, and that is over the funding of the space station, and I want it clear that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has from the beginning recognized that and has been very generous in offering to assist in the phrasing of an amendment which would put that question before us in a way which would allow us to make the decision on the floor. It is obviously too important a decision to be made in the context of any small group of the Congress, whether it is the authorizing committee or the Committee on Appropriations.

I think we could put the actions of the Appropriations Committee in very simple terms. Recognizing that he was faced with a deficit of over $1 billion in his allocation and having to decide how to handle that, what the subcommittee has done is to cut NASA $217 million below an absolute freeze level for 1991. In other words, NASA will get $217 million less than it got this year, but all of it will come out of the station. With those additional funds the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the committee have been able to increase all the other programs within their jurisdiction by fairly substantial amounts. That was the decision that the committee made. I happen to agree with the need to support the social programs more adequately. Unfortunately, I cannot agree with the rest.

Mr. Chairman, on Monday, many Members of the House of Representatives participated in the special order on the space station Freedom. During that lengthy colloquy, we had the opportunity to hear the diverse reasons to support the continuation of the space station program. I do not need to review that discussion.

In anticipation of today's debate on the VA/HUD Independent Agencies appropriations bill, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee held a hearing on Tuesday to examine the implications of canceling the space station.

I want to make it very clear that this was not a hearing for the Science Committee to examine the merits or the schedule or the various capabilities of the currently proposed space station. We as a committee had completed that examination in our authorization hearings. We found the station to have many merits and accordingly reported an authorization bill with full funding for the space station and that authorization was confirmed overwhelmingly by a vote of 361 to 36 by the full House of Representatives several weeks ago. The committee's vote and the House vote are part of the public record.

Our hearing was focused specifically and singularly on the impact of the possible space station cancellation.

For the benefit of my colleagues in the House who are not members of the Science Committee and thus did not have the opportunity to hear our witnesses speak to the consequences of cancellation, I would like to review briefly some of their warnings. In an effort to portray a comprehensive perspective of outcomes, we invited administration officials and representatives of our foreign partner nations.

Let me begin with Jean-Marie Luton, director general of the European Space Agency representing our nine partner nations in ESA. The Europeans have pledged between $8 and $10 billion to the space station program. With the cost of constructing the station estimated at $16.9 billion, this contribution represents roughly one-third of the total cost of the construction and about one-half of what America's contribution will be. This is not a symbolic or token partnership, this is full-fledged participation. To date, the Europeans have spent $1 billion of these committed funds.

Mr. Luton told us:

> After three years of joint development work and seven years after first inviting the other nations to participate in this "genuine partnership," the United States suddenly now feels able to stop the project in its tracks to solve an internal budget problem. We all face budget shortfalls and very hard choices. * * * Failure by the United States to live up to its commitments in the international Space Station partnership will fundamentally influence Europe's plans, but not

stop the pursuit of its own ambitions to implement manned/man-tended orbital facilities. * * * Moreover, it cannot be doubted that U.S. withdrawal from the international Space Station would have a serious adverse impact on the prospects for any future transatlantic cooperation in the space field. It would certainly have an effect in other scientific and technological fields. These effects would of course be felt most should the United States attempt to initiate a major new international technological program. * * * The future of this cooperation is clearly in your hands.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an idle statement, it is a serious portrayal of consequences that we will bring down upon ourselves. In an era of increasing international cooperation, the United States is playing a dangerous game of alienating its friends.

I do not in any way question, in fact I defend, America's right and responsibility to make independent decisions about its welfare. However, the debate and judgment to plan the space station as an international partnership program took place years ago. Withdrawal now does not reflect responsible action, but rather irresponsible action.

The testimony of Dr. John Boright, Deputy Assistant Secretary at the Department of State, reflected how the space station cancellation would represent a pervasive foreign policy discontinuity for the United States that would invade all aspects of our foreign relations. He said:

It is important to bear in mind that the Europeans, Japanese, and Canadians accepted our invitation only after lengthy internal consideration and debate. The Canadians and the Japanese had doubts about making such a large proportion of their space programs dependent upon a cooperative agreement with the U.S. One-half of Canada's expenditures on space go to the Space Station; the entire Japanese manned space program has been structured around the Japanese Experimental Module (JEM), their contribution to the Space Station. In Europe, there was intense debate between those who favored cooperation with the United States and those who preferred investing in autonomous programs competitive with our own.

Mr. Chairman, the decision on the part of the Europeans to join with us in space station Freedom was actually a leap of faith. They have strong and bitter memories of the American withdrawal from the International Solar-Polar Mission—now called Ulysses. At the hearing, Jean-Marie Luton responded to a question about European reaction to the space station termination with the chilling response that, "this will be a ghost in the European memory."

I do not need to remind my colleagues that there are several international science and technology projects on the world agenda. We are currently active partners in some of those such as the international thermonuclear experimental reactor project [ITER], a cooperative fusion energy initiative. We are planned partners in others such as the Earth Observing System [EOS] Program to monitor global change over a 15-year period. We are seeking active partners in others such as the superconducting super collider project. And there are still other projects that are in the formative discussion stage, from which the United States will be excluded, as the uninvited partner, because our allies and friends no longer trust our word. Dr. Boright put it quite succinctly when he said:

There is little distinction between leadership and honoring one's commitments.

It would be the ultimate irony to cancel the space station program only to have the Europeans, Canadians, and Japanese regroup to cooperate in a permanently manned project while America's manned space effort ossifies on the sidelines and we become the has-beens of space history. We should not delude ourselves that this possibility is far-fetched, rather we should recognize that we have already been forewarned.

Mr. Chairman, Richard Darman, Director of the Office of Management and Budget said in his testimony:

Breaking faith on space station Freedom should not be confused with deficit reduction. * * * From a fiscal perspective, the failure to appropriate $2 billion for space station Freedom would not "save" a dime. Under the budget agreement, total discretionary spending is set. What is at issue is the allocation, not the total.

Mr. Chairman, let me comment for a moment on the allocation to which Richard Darman referred. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration funding is included in the Appropriations Subcommittee with funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans' Administration, and other independent agencies. Although these are unlikely bedfellows, that is a fact unchangeable. As all of my colleagues well know, this arrangement often pits these diverse programs against each other.

A great nation should provide for its citizens in the most compassionate and substantial manner. In order to provide the continuing social benefits of health care, housing, child care, handicapped services, school lunch programs, and hundreds more, we have to have an economic base that can generate growth and that has the inherent potential for continued expansion.

Social programs generate economic wealth by helping citizens lead productive lives that enhance their dignity as they, in turn, make positive contributions to the society.

Science and technology programs generate economic growth by continuously revealing new knowledge that can be applied to develop new products and processes of commercial value in the global marketplace.

Neither the biggest or the most numerous social agenda nor the most intensive or expensive science and technology infrastructure alone can sustain a balanced society with foresight for its long range potential.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to speak for that important societal balance. I would not vote for one at the cost of the other. I have not asked my colleagues to do that either.

I would ask each of you to consider the prospect of canceling the space station in this light. This is not a narrow or confined decision that will allow the remainder of America's space development to continue on, unnoticing of the loss of just one initiative. This is the center and stepping off point of space development for the 21st century. Without the space station we effectively absent ourselves from continued manned space exploration. Please note that I have said ourselves, not the other 11 nations with whom were our partners.

The Chapman/Lowery amendment is a reasonable vehicle for restoring the space station funding. It accomplishes this by freezing NASA spending at the fiscal year 1991 level. Outside of NASA, it would leave all but two accounts in the appropriations bill unchanged, adding funds for veterans medical programs and reducing one housing program which the Appropriations Committee had already cordoned off against expenditure for essentially the whole fiscal year.

In more concise terms, the Chapman/Lowery amendment makes more than 90 percent of the needed adjustments within NASA. These are not easy reductions. They are taken to preserve the centrality of the space station for future U.S. space development and to protect the social benefits that a benevolent nation is committed to provide.

When Neil Armstrong took that historic step on the Moon's surface, he said:

One small step for a man and one giant step for Mankind.

Let my colleagues be aware that a decision to cancel the space station will provide an ironic twist to that legendary statement. We will make one small step of budgetary rearrangement and one giant step for America's withdrawal from leadership in the 21st century.

□ 1150

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, could Members be informed how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has 28 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Public Works Committee and the ranking Republican of the Water Resources Subcommittee, I commend the Appropriations Committee for funding the Clean Water Act title VI loan program at its authorized level, but I also want to express my concern about several provisions of H.R. 2519.

First, the bill provides $300 million for title II EPA construction grants to five cities for the construction of sewage treatment facilities. These cities are Boston, New York, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Seattle. When the Clean Water Act was last reauthorized in 1987, the decision was made to phase out title II construction grants in favor of State revolving loan funds.

The grants program expired in 1990. Therefore, these specific grants have not been authorized. Even more importantly, while these cities may have water quality problems, I am sure other cities around the country which are experiencing difficulties in meeting their treatment needs would also like to receive grants. Why do we single out these five cities? The simple fact that the $300 million was included in the President's budget does not answer my question as to whether or not we really want to return to a grants program and, if so, why these five, and not others, should receive special treatment.

H.R. 2519 also provides $46 million for a Rouge River national wet weather demonstration project grant for Wayne County, MI, primarily for management of stormwater. These funds have not been authorized and it is not appropriate that $46 million be provided for this special project.

Here again, other cities around the country are struggling to address their various water pollution problems.

The Water Resources Subcommittee has received testimony from many local officials, although not from Wayne County, on the financial struggle to meet their water quality needs. Why then are we suddenly giving $46 million and special consideration to Wayne County, MI? I know that Milwaukee would like some Federal help for its pollution prevention program and contaminated sediments cleanup. Why not give a few million to Richmond which has been quite forceful in testifying as to its combined sewer overflow problem?

Finally, I want to express my serious concern regarding legislative language which would allow the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority to use an out-of-State landfill, which is not required to be owned by the authority, as a backup facility for sludge disposal. I understand that EPA is concerned about this language, which affects an ongoing EPA enforcement case, and which is in opposition to an order by a Federal district court. In fact, this appears to be another example of using legislation to address the NIMBY syndrome—clean up Boston Harbor, but don't let it affect Walpole, MA. Perhaps there may be some reason for this language, but no hearings have been held on the merits of the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, not only do I have serious concerns about the policy implications of these provisions, but it is not appropriate to include unauthorized projects and legislative language in an appropriatons bill. This represents yet another assault on the proper authorities and jurisdiction of our authorizing committees.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the debate thus far has been interesting on the bill that the committee brings to us, because it starts from a number of premises that I think need to be examined.

The original contention of the committee was that space station had to be cut, because within their allocation, they could not do everything, and if we spent money for space station, we would have to reduce money for veterans, we would have to reduce money for housing, we would have to reduce money for EPA, we would have to reduce money for FEMA. We would have to do all of these things if the space station was to be funded.

What we found out was we developed an amendment, which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] will offer on the floor later on today, saying that simply was not true; you could do all of these things within their allocation, and you could still fund the space station. That is the amendment that will come forward later on today.

Mr. Chairman, having seen what we innovatively came up with, the committee then turned their argument and suggested that if in fact you did all of these things that we want to do, including freezing NASA, that that would be devastating to NASA.

The fact is NASA supports what we will bring to the floor later on today, and it is not devastating. Freezes are not devastating. You can in fact do many things within freezes. You can in fact adjust programs within freezes, and, ultimately that is what will take place. But this is not a devastating kind of thing to NASA. It is in fact a real way of managing within the allocation given to the committee.

□ 1200

It is true that $250 million of money was taken out of the Public Assistance Housing Program. The gentleman from New York referred to that.

Let me talk about that money for a minute. The committee itself fenced it until September of next year. It is money, some might call it funny money that was fenced until September of next year. It has no outlay effect and so, therefore, the question is whether or not it is really money.

We happened to find it. We used it as a part of our attempt to save what we think is an important national project, but it is hardly devastating to the housing program for the program to be fenced off until September 20 of next year. And we just decided not to spend the money in that particular area.

The committee has a sense of priorities here that is somewhat interesting.

For example, in some of the NASA accounts, in the ASRM Program, one can say that the ASRM's are an important part of the program. Most of us would agree, but they put $125 million more in that account despite the fact that the $125 million, the testimony for it is in order for it to supply the space station which they canceled. And so the problem is that some of their sense of priorities does not match up to reality.

The bottom line is this: This is a subcommittee that does not agree that manned space is a high priority. I would even say that some members of that committee probably do not believe in manned space at all. They think that robots are a better kind of space program for our future.

The British author Henry Fairlie recently spoke to that. He did before he died, and I think that it is important to understand what this debate is really all about. He says:

> The achievements of the unmanned spacecraft are important, but they do not tell us of the human soul, the soul of our civilization, and so of America at its greatest, the restless endeavor to know. That is the heroism.
>
> To put it another way, only men and women in space, seeking the knowledge, can make us feel at home in space, at home in the sense that we come to think of it as no longer "alien," and we will have a new and inspiring vision of our place in the universe.
>
> What has happened to America, its Presidents and its Congressmen, that they no longer are inspired by such a vision? Or by the courage needed to make the exploration?

That is the real question before the House today. Do we have the courage and the vision to move forward with the manned exploration of space and do so by creating the infrastructure necessary for that to take place? That is really the issue we are debating on the House floor today.

Much of this will be a debate about technicalities. It is the vision thing that is really important.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important to address the question of the $250 million. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALK-

ER] would have us believe that this is $250 million that the public housing agencies are never going to see and that it is never going to benefit their tenants. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact of the matter is that this money is fenced for the reasons that we fence money in these bills, and that is so it will not outlay in the current fiscal year. But it will be obligated to the housing authorities at the end of the fiscal year, and this is a program where it so happens that HUD does dole out the money by stages over the year. So there is nothing unusual about that.

Any suggestion that somehow in the fiscal year 1993 bill, if we do not have this money in this bill, we are going to pick up an extra $250 million for operating subsidies for public housing is ridiculous. The station is going to go up another $400 million. Where are we going to be able to double up on the public housing operating subsidy facing that kind of demand?

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Could the gentleman tell me what the outlay amount is in his proposal for that $250 million?

Mr. GREEN of New York. It will not outlay in fiscal year 1992.

Mr. WALKER. If it is not going to outlay in fiscal year 1992, it is not money that is going to be spent in 1992 and so, therefore, it becomes funny money, just as I described it.

Mr. GREEN of New York. If I may reclaim my time, that is not true. A lot of the things this committee appropriates money for do not outlay in the year when they are appropriated. For example, is the space station funny money because it is not going to outlay in the year appropriated? Is that what the gentleman is telling us?

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman knows that indeed the budget authority numbers are important. And I know that, too. The problem is in this particular budget authority number, we have $2.4 billion in. Most of it outlays in this year except for the fenced-in amount. The fenced amount does not. All we have suggested is that if we can fence it off and it is not going to outlay in this fiscal year, then it can be rolled over until the next fiscal year.

Mr. GREEN of New York. That is precisely where the gentleman is wrong. It cannot be rolled over until the next year, if the gentleman prevails, because he is going to impose an additional $400 million demand for space station on this subcommittee next year. Where are we going to find an extra $250 million in fiscal year 1993 when the gentleman is demanding $400 million more from us than he is demanding this year? That is ridiculous.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill includes funds for many important programs—veterans, environmental protection, housing, the National Science Foundation, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This is one of the bills, Mr. Chairman, that takes care of America and, through research, America's future. The needs of the present and the future must be accommodated in order for us to continue as a great nation.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member [BILL GREEN] and other members of the subcommittee have covered the principal provisions of the bill. I'm glad I am a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I direct attention to a particular problem which the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations and the Congress have to solve.

The subcommittee members realize that the space program is needed but feel that it should not be at the expense of essential domestic programs.

Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago it was my suggestion to the chairmen of the various subcommittees on appropriations that those essential programs of the Government which could not be funded under present limitations be funded and that we obtain a rule to prevent them from being counted in order to avoid sequestration.

That has been done by the executive branch time after time.

I support the space program, but I do not believe it should be used to drastically cut existing and necessary programs. I am sure that is also the intent of the subcommittee. In the report by the full committee, it was stated that funds for the space program were not included, without prejudice to the space program, in order to avoid cutting important existing programs.

Mention has been made in the press about ASRM—the advance solid rocket motor—facility presently under construction at Yellow Creek in my State.

The facts about that existing and ongoing construction are as follows:

First, NASA said that the most important reason to fund ASRM was to improve shuttle safety. Why? Because the new ASRM has fewer case joints and eliminates four critical 1 failure modes.

Next, NASA said that the ASRM design eliminates the necessity to throttle the space shuttle engines and that increases shuttle safety.

Next NASA said that all asbestos materials are being replaced—and that improves safety and health.

Next, NASA sold us the ASRM because it increases the shuttle payload by 12,000 pounds—recapturing much of the payload capability that was lost after the *Challenger* accident.

NASA told us that it was essential to build a new Government-owned facility to produce the ASRM.

Now obviously, ASRM would also be important to the space station because it permits the launching of both the laboratory and the habitat with fully integrated payload racks.

But that's not why NASA proposed the ASRM. They proposed it for the reasons I just stated—and virtually none of those had anything to do with space station. NASA proposed the ASRM because it wanted a new, more reliable, safer, solid rocket booster with increased payload capability.

May I say again, my original advice to the full committee as chairman—that these things that are essential should be off-budget and not used to bring about sequestration, is sound but also the committee position is sound. I know its intentions are good. I repeat again, the report was that the committee left it out at this time because of the effect it would have on existing important programs. We need both, and I think the committee approached it in the right way.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has 9 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a distinguished former member of our subcommittee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I find myself in a delicate and sensitive, position. I come before you today to ask that the body support an amendment that in some fundamental ways violates the work of my former subcommittee.

During the 8 years I served on the Housing and Independent Agencies Subcommittee, I worked very closely with both the chairman and the ranking member through many a difficult budgetary year. There is no question that our challenge, working with one another, was to find ways to be supportive of a manned space station as the fundamental piece of America's future role in manned space.

□ 1210

On more than one occasion, it became apparent that there was a fundamental conflict within the committee. The Housing and Independent

Agencies Subcommittee, is faced with an almost impossible challenge. How should we fund very popular and important people programs, housing programs, some of which have worked very well and, some of which have not? Veterans' medical programs are very popular, very important to people and most have worked very well, some not so well.

I find myself constantly amazed that within our subcommittee we often tend to fund those programs with very little in depth questioning of which programs have worked and which have not.

In addition, those people programs compete with space in a limited budgetary account that makes it extremely difficult for NASA to get the kind of treatment that it should.

So over the years, there has been an impact upon space station that has changed its mission. Today this is presented as an argument by the subcommittee for not funding a space station at all.

In responding to my full committee chairman's comments a moment ago, I wonder if we should not take a hard look at the feasibility of moving NASA's funding to the Defense Subcommittee where there would be a fair exchange of programs that should compete with each other in a different kind of way. It is not unwise for us to consider having a reasonable House number for space station to take to conference.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about adjustments within NASA. We are talking about, some limited additional funding for veterans. Clearly, that is a design to try to impact the politics within the subcommittee itself.

To make the choice to fund certain kinds of science projects and to totally zero out manned space station is a fundamental error. It will take us in the wrong direction. There is competition between scientific programs. We know that. That debate has gone on for some time. For us to signal the House's lack of support for space station by zeroing does not reflect the truly bipartisan support for the station in the House.

So I would urge the Members to seriously consider the Chapman-Lowery amendment when it comes before us, and I would urge an aye vote.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], an important and vital member of the subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank the chairman, Mr. TRAXLER, and the ranking member, Mr. GREEN, for the difficult deliberations that our subcommittee has been brought through to bring this bill to the floor and also for the amendment that will be permitted today so that the full House can consider the important issue of the space station. This is a most unusual procedure on an appropriation bill and the chairman should be commended for his openness on this issue.

I want to draw the membership's attention to today's vote on the space station and state that this is really not a vote about U.S. commitment to space exploration. We all share that commitment. It is really a vote about how best to achieve the finest space science and exploration, how to make the best set of scientific choices, and how best to invest in U.S. competitiveness under tight budget restraints.

Last year, this Congress almost brought our Nation to a halt as we struggled with the Bush administration to agree upon a tough, binding 3-year budget agreement. It has forced us to make tough choices to meet deficit-reduction targets and, in terms of this subcommittee, what it meant was that we received only a 5-percent budget mark increase for 1992, not even enough to keep up with the inflation over last year's discretionary spending. The reality of this subcommittee's mark is that it was even $1.2 billion below the administration's request.

So today we are faced with the results of our own actions. With 50 cents of every one of our tax dollars now going to pay interest on our national debt, our choices are narrowed, indeed. If you understand budgets and if you understand their out-year impacts, you will vote for the committee bill.

There are ever increasing demands on this committee, and as the decade unfolds, they will be even greater. Space station will consume, if it is to be continued, larger and larger shares of a smaller and smaller pie. Take veterans' care—with the World War II and Korean veterans now coming into the hospital system, we cannot even afford to buy replacement dentures for World War II veterans. We are turning away class B and C veterans at our hospitals. We find ourselves in the incredible situation of not being able to schedule veterans for operations even though there are empty beds in hospitals because we do not have the doctors and nurses to take care of them.

Or how about home ownership? Back in the 1980's, we saw the spending on home ownership and rental programs in this country fall from $35 billion to $15 billion. in this budget, we have only been able to restore it back to a level of $24 billion—$10 billion less than in 1980. The 1980's, our Nation learned a new vocabulary—the homeless—American citizens sitting on grates and on corners all over this country.

Our bill does not completely meet that need nor does it meet the needs of environmental investment.

We only provide $8.5 billion in this bill rather than the necessary $30 billion to $150 billion needed to clean up Superfund sites across this country.

Our bill, in fact, is already stretched too thin. But we do try to provide for NASA funding that keeps NASA strong. As we see our astronauts in the space shuttle today, we want to keep them safe and healthy. And the programs that we do fund, we want to work. We do not want any more *Challengers* out there. We want NASA to make sure it manages its programs well, not stretched thin, robbing from one program to meet another. But as the Augustine Commission reported,

> The space science program warrants highest priority for funding. It ranks above space stations, aerospace planes, manned missions to the planets and many other pursuits which often receive greater visibility.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to focus attention, if I might, particularly on the matter of funding for the EPA pesticide-disposal activities.

My concern for this issue stems from the fact that the EPA has allowed banned dioxin-containing chemicals, some 670,000 pounds of solid and 260,000 gallons of liquid 2,4,5-T/Silvex to remain in a warehouse located in downtown St. Joseph, MO, since 1986 when the chemicals were discovered at a fire at that facility.

This warehouse has never been licensed to store these toxic materials, I might point out.

My reasons for concern are obvious. The warehouse is located in the middle of a community of 80,000 people. The EPA is supposed to be the agency responsible for the protection of the public health and the environment from pesticide risk. Yet, at the same time, why have large amounts of dioxin-contaminated pesticides existing in the United States, in fact, this is the largest amount of pesticide of its nature existing in this country, been permitted to be at this unlicensed warehouse facility since 1986?

I have been working with the EPA, and I have been working with the State Department of Natural Resources in Missouri for the last 5 years, and it has become very clear that the options for removing the chemicals and either destroying them or storing them in a licensed facility are relatively nonexistent.

Finally, last year, the EPA published a solicitation for bids to relocate these chemicals, and it is currently considering bids to receive in response to that request.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the EPA has sufficient funds in its budget for the abatement, control, and compliance in pesticide programs to effectively resolve the situation in the St. Joseph warehouse. I do not believe that it is acceptable or appropriate to leave EPA-owned, and that is what these are, EPA-owned chemicals, toxic chemicals in an unlicensed facility in a highly populated area.

I only hope that if there were a fire or some disaster of that magnitude that firefighters are adequately prepared to protect the residents of St. Joseph from a possible disaster.

□ 1220

In view of the significant health implications to my constituents and to the amount of time that has passed with no solution forthcoming, I want to ensure that the EPA have the resources to address this problem as a priority in its next year fiscal year's budget.

Therefore, I commend the committee in its statement that is contained in this report that accompanies this bill, and I would like to read it. It is very brief.

The Committee has not taken a reduction in pesticides transportation, storage, and disposal for fiscal year 1992. However, the Committee is concerned about EPA's progress in disposing of liquid 2,4,5-T/silvex pesticides in St. Joseph, Missouri. It is the Committee's understanding that the Agency is actively exploring several options for final disposal of these stocks. The Committee expects that EPA will make every attempt to resolve this issue as expeditiously as possible and directs the Agency to report monthly on its progress in disposing of these dioxin-contaminated pesticides.

Mr. Chairman, again, I commend the chairman for recognizing what I brought to their attention in testimony earlier this year, in putting it in their official document accompanying this bill. There is a very clear message there for the EPA; that is, the eyes of Congress are on the EPA to resolve that matter and to resolve it expeditiously. We will accept nothing less.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD).

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the space station. I have served much of my career here in the Congress on the Subcommittee on Space, and I have come to realize that the space station is the centerpiece, it is the linchpin of virtually all that we are trying to do in the future in space. It becomes a part of virtually every other program and every other aspect of our space planning, and to kill it at this point would cast a mortal blow against our manned space program and planning.

It would also have a major effect upon other important space programs. It would certainly jeopardize the advanced solid rocket motor program, the new launch systems, the Space Lab missions the life science research. We could go on and on into areas where we would find the space station would seriously jeopardize if it were killed.

We have spent to this point approximately $5.6 billion on the space station. That is just U.S. dollars. That is not our partners, our international partners. For the United States to kill it at a time when we have such a major investment I think would be very shortsighted, and certainly would not be in the best interest of the economy in this country. It is one of the few programs that is providing a positive and favorable balance of trade in this country, $28 billion of positive trade balance for the United States in 1990 alone. If we killed this program, it would have a major impact upon our trade balance, and certainly would affect jobs.

We have over 200,000 jobs presently that are based upon our space program, and the space station would certainly cost major jobs.

The Appropriations Subcommittee went to NASA and asked them to redesign the space station because it was too expensive. We went to the time and expense and the trouble of redesigning the space station. They have now come back with their redesign at the moment now the committee has said we are going to kill it. The reason that they are killing it is because it now is claimed that it will not perform the functions that space station was designed to do. So they told them to reduce the design, reduce the functions, and then use those reduced functions in design as an argument to kill it. I cannot understand if that would be a legitimate reason to kill it.

I strongly urge my colleagues to salvage the space station. We can do it if we really put our heads to the budget. I encourage a vote for the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], chairman of the subcommittee, for yielding me this time. Let me salute him, as well as my friend from New York [Mr. GREEN], on another job well done.

Typically, from year to year the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New York put out very good bills that this House can have pride in supporting, as I do today.

I want to speak just for a moment here about the debate and the discussion on the question of space exploration and space stations. I admire the courage that has been exhibited by the two gentleman and their committees in making these tough choices. We are now reaching the reality of the whole budget process. We have to make some very tough budget choices. The gentlemen have made these tough choices. They have tried to balance the Earth's terra firma needs with its space needs.

I feel some of the debate tends to characterize those who oppose the upcoming Chapman amendment as being somehow troglodytes or somehow unable to see the beauty of space and the need to explore it. I am told that there is something like $13 billion in the bill which is a large amount of money. Thirteen thousand million dollars on space in its various shapes and sizes and configurations. So certainly we are not shortchanging space exploration.

To bring this down to Earth, I am told by officials in my hometown that it could sustain a loss of a million and a half dollars in operating subsidies for our public housing programs, which for the city of Louisville and the county of Jefferson are very important.

Therefore, I say that I think we ought to be very clear here. We are not depriving NASA of vital funds. We are not depriving space exploration. We are not zeroing out any of this. We are providing in this bill a substantial sum of money for this whole question of looking beyond Earth and making sure that we can capture the beauty of space and its talents.

However, we are also trying to take care of the Earthbound needs as well. Knowing these are very tough choices, I generally support the gentleman's bill and oppose the upcoming amendment.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUNDQUIST].

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of the space station.

Mr. Chairman, today the House has taken the time to familiarize itself with the details of the civil space program and the important role it plays in our international posture and our competitiveness and our technological leadership. We are concentrating our concerns today on the space station Freedom, but there are other worthy elements to the NASA Program. I want to take a moment to mention one in particular that is noteworthy. Also, a strong tie-in and interdependence with the space station.

The Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program was developed in the aftermath of the tragic *Challenger* accident of 1986 to significantly improve space shuttle flight safety and reliability by reducing catastrophic failure modes.

The reasons the decision was taken to proceed with the advanced solid rocket motor were threefold: First, the safety, of flight; second, the safety of manufacture; and third, the additional lifting capacity. The capabilities of ASRM have become more widely recognized. The national launch system, when it comes along, has already baselined the ASRM as the booster of choice for both the NASA and the Air Force versions. Commercial opportunities may well make the ASRM what is now being called the universal booster bringing added capacity and safety to both military, civilian and commercial sections of the U.S. space program.

It was conceptualized in 1986, and during research and development phase it has become critical to requirements

of space station Freedom and the national launch system. Space station has benefited by ASRM because, through increased payload performance provided by ASRM, space station can be more fully assembled and checked out on the ground, consequently reducing extra vehicular activity time in space. Moreover, because of the increased safety, reliability, and payload performance which ASRM provides, it is known to be critical to orbits of extended duration and NASA's overall future space transportation needs The ASRM will be operable beginning in 1996.

We will have an increased payload capacity by 12,000 pounds. They will reduce the long-term per-flight cost for the ASRM. The solid rocket propellant used in the enhanced motor is produced in highly automated, more uniform environment.

Congress is faced with the most difficult budget choices it has had to make in recent history. At the same time, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is on the threshold of going into the 21st century with a robust transportation program while continuing to make manned space flight the cornerstone of our mission.

□ 1230

The advanced solid rocket motor is critical to ensuring that man's journey into space is accomplished with a higher level of safety, reliability, and increased performance and cost effectiveness.

I urge my colleagues to support this vital, integrated, yet vital element in the space program.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 2519.

This is the fourth of the 13 appropriation bills to come before the House. I want to commend the chairman and commend the ranking member for adhering not only to the budget resolution, but the budget agreement with regards to discretionary limitation.

This bill provides $63.9 billion in discretionary budget authority and $61.7 billion in discretionary outlays.

I am pleased to note that the bill is about $1 million below the level of discretionary budget authority and about $18 million below the discretionary outlays as compared to the 602(b) allocations that were provided to this subcommittee.

I also want to commend the committee for making choices. That is what the budget agreement is all about, very difficult choices on some very important priorities, and I would just recommend to the Members that we in this body are going to have to make a choice when it comes to the space issue. It is a choice between whether you go with the space station or whether you want to provide increases to the other missions that are involved in NASA, or whether you want to go with those missions and eliminate the space station.

I do not think very frankly, that you can fund a little bit of each of those, because I think that is going to be the worst of all worlds in terms of NASA's mission What I would prefer is that Members make a choice between the space station and these other missions because in effect that is really what faces the House.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me very briefly?

Mr. PANETTA. Yes, I will yield very briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman confirm for me the language in his Budget Committee report:

> The committee assumes funding increases for NASA programs totaling $579 million and this funding is sufficient to support continued progress in the Space Station and the Earth Observation System.

Is that what the gentleman's report said?

Mr. PANETTA. That was in our budget resolution as passed by the House.

Mr. BROWN of California. The gentleman has not changed his mind on that?

Mr. PANETTA. I must say to the gentleman that the budget conference report provides even further limitations with regard to this subcommittee's allocations.

Mr. BROWN of California. But at the time, the gentleman thought we should continue the space station?

Mr. PANETTA. If the committee had followed and the conference had followed those same allocations, I would take the same position; but when you have less, you have to make choices.

Let me, If I might, engage the chairman in a brief colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the committee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], I understand that there is a $14 million emergency appropriation included in this VA-HUD appropriation bill for the administrative costs of veterans' benefits related to Operation Desert Shield. This is the first spending for fiscal year 1992 to fall under the emergency designation and I want you to assure the House that this $14 million is essential and directly tied to Operation Desert Shield. Would the gentleman please justify the $14 million emergency expenditure as contained in this legislation?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am pleased to set the record straight on this $14 million emergency funding. As you know, there will be a number of new claims filed by Desert Shield service personnel for veterans' benefits including compensation for service-connected disabilities, insurance, and readjustment benefits. These new claims will necessitate additional VA personnel to process Desert Shield veterans' claims so that these men and women can begin to receive their entitlement benefits immediately.

Mr. PANETTA. I am satisfied that this is a valid emergency and I am pleased to support the bill, and I thank the gentleman for this assurance.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I do so for two purposes.

First, I want to make it very clear that even without the space station, NASA will be a very robust agency with a very robust program.

The fact of the matter is that the funding level the committee recommends is in real, after-inflation dollars 40 percent above the level at which NASA was funded for fiscal years 1983 through 1986. There are not too many agencies of this Government that are having 40 percent real increases over their mideighties level of operations; so I do not think NASA has anything to complain about the total level of funding.

Second, to say that you are not drastically impacting NASA science programs because you are freezing them is ridiculous, and the people on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, ought to know better.

The fact of the matter is we have a number of programs at NASA as a result of the increase in funding since the mideighties, which are ramping up, most notably the Earth Observation Program, but also the advanced x-ray astronomy facility, CRAF/Cassini and numerous others. They know full well that a freeze in essence guts these programs because the programs are predicated on rising budgets as they mature.

Finally, I should like to use my time to call to the attention of my colleagues, in case they have not looked at today's mail, a letter from the League of Conservation Voters strongly urging Members to support the distinguished chairman and the ranking Republican by voting no on the Chapman-Lowery amendment. They say:

> The League of Conservation Voters is not alerting you that the Chapman-Lowery vote will be considered for inclusion in the 1991 environmental scorecard.

So I hope all Members are on notice on that.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as I may have remaining to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think when the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] made the statement that you have to make a choice, I think he set the course for this entire debate, because we do have to make a choice.

I do not believe that the American people today know that this Congress is about to make a choice or purports to make a choice that runs the white flag up on the space station for this country. I do not think the people know about that.

Let me very briefly say that there is a correlation between the Veteran's Administration, HUD, and this space station. There is a correlation between them, because there are medical solutions that await us up there. The space station is a solution to a lot of the medical mysteries that lie wasting away in veterans' hospitals. These are the things that the American people are going to think in the weeks ahead, and we must not make that choice at this time to turn our backs on those people who need and seek and are entitled to a decision that can be made in the laboratories with weightless environment at their backs and the needs of this country in front of them.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], a leader on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and a letter on the this subject.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, lest anybody be under the misunderstanding that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, does nothing but give NASA billions and billions of dollars, the authorization bill which we reported out and which the House of Representatives passed by an overwhelming margin reduced NASA's authorization request by $488 million for fiscal year 1992. We did so by cutting some of the programs that they wanted and by setting the priorities which the authorizing committees with their expertise thought were necessary. We did accomplish this $488 million cut by fully funding the space station.

So what the Appropriations Committee is proposing to do is to go below this line which the House approved by an overwhelming margin, and I think that effectively decimates NASA's program and probably puts America out of the manned space flight business for the better part of the next 20 years.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time, and I do so simply to rebut the suggestion that somehow this issue has sneaked up on the American people and they know nothing about it. The fact of the matter is in the May 20 Business Week there was an editorial, "Earth to Congress: Scrap the Space Station."

Our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], had a piece in the Washington Post: "Space Station Under Fire."

Time magazine had a long column in its June 10 issue: "Requiem for the Space Station. NASA's proposed house in the sky will cost too much and do too little."

The Washington Post has supported the position that our subcommittee took.

In an editorial today in the New York Times, it does the same.

So I think the public is well informed about this debate here because it has been in all the national magazines and the media.

□ 1240

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what the year of those news articles is?

Mr. GREEN of New York. It is this year.

Mr. HALL of New York. Just this year for a space station that has enduring contracts with the Japanese and 20 other countries?

Mr. GREEN of New York. Well, if I may reclaim my time, I think this is the time for the news magazines to write about it and they did.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I praise the gentleman from Michigan, BOB TRAXLER, for his leadership as chairman of the subcommittee, and also the gentleman from New York, the ranking member, BILL GREEN, for all their hard work on this spending package before us today.

The caps defined in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 have made this budget cycle an especially difficult one. The decisions to be made within the domestic discretionary category had to be the toughest of all. Knowing how hard the subcommittee worked on this package, I deeply regret that I simply cannot support the bill.

It is a well established fact that the Department of Veterans Affairs has been underfunded for many, many years. Members of the Veterans Committee, under the leadership of my good friend, SONNY MONTGOMERY, have stood before this body and forwarned of major problems just waiting to happen—all because of severe underfunding.

Perhaps part of the problem is that, under the current Appropriations Committee structure, the Department of Veterans Affairs is forced to compete with housing, science, and environmental programs that may also be worthy of funding. I suggest that the leadership consider adopting a separate appropriations bill for VA so that we can better focus on the basic needs of our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Veterans Committee are acutely aware of budget constraints, deficits, and competing programs worthy of Federal funding. But we are not asking for major increases in veterans programs, we are simply asking for basic funding for current services. This bill does not fund a current services budget for Veterans Affairs. It is as simple as that.

This bill funds excessive public housing subsidies. Instead of funding new and innovative housing programs that give tenants a stake in their future, the committee added $1.4 billion above the administration's request for costly housing construction programs that have been tried in the past and have proven to be ineffective.

Further, the bill provides $233 million more than the President's request for public housing modernization. But it is my understanding that there is about $5 billion of unspent funds already in the program. Why are veterans being turned away from VA hospitals for lack of funds when HUD can't spend theirs fast enough?

Now that the war is over, do not let their contributions and the contributions of past veterans slip from our congressional memory. On Saturday, the national victory celebration will be held to hail the tremendous contributions and enormous successes of the U.S. Armed Forces during Desert Storm. No doubt many of my colleagues will be lining Constitution Avenue cheering our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. Based on our actions here today, let this body demonstrate its true sense of gratitude to these brave men and women. Lets really give these veterans something to cheer about.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking for a more rational set of priorities in the appropriations process.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriation bill. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, BOB TRAXLER, and the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, BILL GREEN, for the package they have put together.

This is a particularly tough year for all of us. The continuing high deficit and the caps imposed by last year's summit agreement make it very difficult to operate existing programs, let alone create new ones. There have to be compromises and I support the priorities established by the Appropriations Committee contained in this bill.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee has been very vocal in its recommendations to the Budget and Appropriations Committees on increased funding levels to meet the health care needs of veterans and their eligible dependents. This bill recognizes the critical need in this area. The bill would increase funding for health care $265 million above the amount requested by the administration. Adequate nurse staffing is an important part of providing quality health care, and the subcommittee provides funds for 1,500 additional nurse positions. The additional funds for medical care will allow the Department to implement the physician and dentist pay bill enacted by the Congress a few weeks ago. The VA can not get good doctors unless it pays them appropriately.

I know that many members of the House have heard from their veteran constituents about the difficulty they are having in gaining

access to many VA hospitals. Many Members have urged me to work with the Appropriations Committee to get an increase for fiscal year 1991. I am pleased to inform my colleagues that this bill responds to that need.

The bill also addressed another critical issue—medical equipment. Because of inadequate budgets during the past decade, many VA hospitals are in dire need of replacement equipment. This bill contains an additional $90 million for this purpose. The shortfall in VA's medical equipment account is at least $700 million according to witnesses who have testified before our committee and based on our own hospital surveys. The Department's inability to replace obsolete equipment poses a real threat to quality care. This increase will not solve the current equipment procurement problem, but it will be a big boost to staff in the field who are mandated by Congress to provide quality care to their patients.

The cost of this provision will not add to the deficit, Mr. Chairman. The bill provides a source of funds to cover these costs. The funds will be derived from the modest fees some nonservice-connected veterans are required to pay for medical care and prescription drugs. These copayments were established as 1-year cost-saver in last year's Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act. This bill would lift the sunset dates on those cost-savings provisions. Mr. TRAXLER and I have agreed to this provision with the understanding that the scheduled termination of the authority to collect these fees will be extended for one year, provided that the funding for medical care is not less than the amount contained in the House bill, $13.5 billion. If there is any effort to reduce the amount in the other body, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan and I have agree that the 1-year extension will be dropped in conference. We do not intend that these fees be used to fund someone's personal project. I think we have that clear understanding and I appreciate the willingness of the Appropriations Committee to work with our committee.

The bill will help in several other ways:

It would provide $226.8 million for medical and prosthetic research—$10 million more than the amount requested.

The subcommittee also added $10 million above the amount in the President's budget for the operation and maintenance of our national cemeteries. We have ignored the funding needs of our cemeteries for too many years, and I am proud that the committee has heeded our advice regarding the need for additional funds.

It would add $4 million to restore 100 additional full-time staff in VA regional offices. Veterans deserve better service when they are seeking benefits from VBA, and this will help the situation in our regional offices. In addition, the bill adds $14.1 million for unbudgeted VBA costs associated with Operation Desert Storm. I have seen the justification for this addition, which will support 288 employees to provide transition assistance and to adjudicate the additional claims which will be filed by a large number of servicemembers leaving the Armed Forces. The Office of Management and Budget has claimed that the administration's budget included funds to take care of these veterans. This is simply untrue, Mr. Chairman.

In March 1991, Department of Veterans' Affairs Secretary Ed Derwinski, with OMB's blessing, said that VA had an immediate need for $12 million in the current fiscal year (1991) for claims processing and transition assistance "to gear up for a large and sudden influx of new veterans seeking benefits." Congress provided these funds and the President agreed that these amounts were related to Operation Desert Storm/Desert Shield.

The VA's budget for 1992 makes the express statement that it contains no funds for any workload associated with Desert Storm/Desert Shield.

Moreover, because of a very low mark from OMB, the 1992 budget projects a 38 percent decline (compared to 1990) in the number of claims from separating servicemembers for compensation and pension benefits, a 29 percent decline in claims for veteran (chapter 30) education benefits, a 23 percent decline in home loans processed, a 22 percent decline in veterans initiating vocational rehabilitation, and virtually no increase in veteran assistance activities, despite the huge demand for veterans assistance associated with the draw-down in military end-strengths and the mandate to provide a Transitional Assistance Program to these new veterans.

Given these declines anticipated in the President's budget, it strains credibility to say that this budget "assumes there would be an increase in the number of new veterans." The only way to square this assumption with the budget projections shown above is to assume that all of the old veterans would cease making claims or seeking assistance.

If OMB agreed that the VA needed $12 million for the 6 months remaining in fiscal year 1991 to "gear up for a large and sudden influx" of claims by new veterans, it needs far more than this amount to meet the surge which will hit its peak sometime in 1992.

Clearly, OMB is trusting that Congress has no memory of the events in March and April of this year. Otherwise it would not dare say that these funds are not needed. If they are not approved now, we will have a real emergency later.

The bill would add $76.7 million for major construction, including much needed parking garages at the Nashville and Miami VA medical centers.

Finally, the bill contains the necessary funds to colocate two regional offices in Bay Pines, FL, and Houston, TX. These new offices will be built on the medical center grounds, making it convenient for veterans and cost-effective to the Federal Government.

But there is language on page 10 of the committee report to which our committee is in total disagreement. The language states:

> The committee is aware of recent problems in starting up at least one of the new integrated hospital system sites. The purpose of these sites is to examine alternative technology for the future so it can be incorporated in the day-to-day computer hospital operations. The Committee expects the VA to resolve any problems in this regard and optimize the benefits from these five sites.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs does not agree with the position taken by the Appropriations Committee and, for many reasons, I hope the Secretary will not continue the operation of a private system at the Brooklyn site nor renew the contracts at the other four sites. Those systems cost far more than they are worth. The Department of Veterans Affairs operates 172 hospitals. The Decentralized Hospital Computer Program [DHCP] is installed in 167 of them. VA users developed the software language [MUMPS], which is the main reason the system is so cost effective. DHCP is a proven system also being installed in all military hospitals, following extensive tests monitored by the General Accounting Office. The only problem the committee has found in talking with VA users in the field is the lack of sufficient funds to purchase the hardware needed to make the system more effective.

Notwithstanding the effectiveness of the DHCP, several years ago the Appropriations Committee insisted that VA install independent health information programs by private vendors at three hospitals. By the end of this fiscal year, the total cost to VA for these three sites will be about $60 million.

After these three were installed, the committee directed the VA to issue two additional contracts. Although the Department expressed strong reservations, it complied with the Appropriations Committee directive and proceeded to install private systems at two other sites. The VA selected Chicago—Lakeside—and Brooklyn. No difficulties were encountered in the implementation at Chicago. But like the other private systems, the system is just not as good as the DHCP installed at comparable VA facilities, and is terribly expensive. For example, the cost to VA to operate and maintain the private computer program in five hospitals is estimated to be about $20.5 million for this fical year. The system developed by VA installed in the remaining 167 medical centers will cost $115.7 million. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the $20.5 million to operate the five private computer programs—which includes both VA staff and contractual obligations—is 17.8 percent of the total DHCP costs. This is a terrible waste of funds.

When the Appropriations Committee states that it expects the VA to resolve its problems at Brooklyn, one must ask the question why? Brooklyn is a disaster. As a result of continual and unyielding problems with the contractor, the Department is in the process of preparing a cure notice for failure to perform. According to the VA, little has been accomplished at this facility. Yet, its cost to VA in fiscal year 1991 is expected to be $4.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, DHCP is a proven, cost-effective system that works. Our committee is unaware of any substantial enhancements that have resulted from the private vendors. The $70 million already spent and the tens of millions to be spent in future years at these sites could be applied to the equipment backlog that currently exists in the VA. It could be used to fund installation of already developed DHCP clinical enhancements which remain on the shelf because VA's hardware capacity is already at its peak. The funds could be used to offset spiralling increases VA is facing in the cost of medicines and drugs.

It is my hope the Appropriations Committee will reevaluate its decision to operate these five systems. With the budget problems we have, we can ill afford to continue such extravagance.

On balance, as I said earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent bill for veterans and I thank the very able chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. TRAXLER, and the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. GREEN, for their leadership. I also want to express my appreciation to all members of the committee for the funding levels contained in the bill for veterans programs.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill for VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies is one of the most difficult pieces of legislation to be brought to the floor this year. It is difficult because the needs addressed by the bill far outstrip the resources available for appropriation.

The VA–HUD bill is the department store of appropriations bills. It funds everything from VA medical care to NSF research. It funds disaster relief, homeless programs, and the EPA Superfund. It funds the Consumer Products Safety Commission, the American Battle Monuments Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Selective Service. It represents an immense, unwieldly family of programs, whose children are pitted against one another in the annual battle for sustenance.

I wish to make it clear that the House Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies has provided great stewardship of its many charges. The chairman of the subcommittee, my dear friend, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable BOB TRAXLER, has served the subcommittee and the Congress with great distinction. He has been forced to make enormously difficult choices, and I have nothing but the greatest respect for the work he has performed.

Likewise, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, my wise and learned colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable BILL GREEN, has invested untold hours trying to build a castle out of a budget allocation made of mud.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation of domestic discretionary budget authority is fully $1.2 billion below the President's request for this bill. Unfortunately, the allocation reflects the Budget Committee's decision to reduce the space and science function by the same $1.2 billion. This has led to the unfortunate decision to terminate funding for the space station Freedom.

While I completely understand the circumstances leading to this decision, I also know that this bill is headed for a certain veto death without corrective surgery. Today, I call upon the many doctors in the House to fix this patient up, so it can walk on its own to the other body, then down Pennsylvania Avenue and into law.

Mr. Chairman, the reasons for funding the space station are many, and they will be discussed at length during today's debate. I would only note at this point that the future of manned space flight depends upon the establishment of an orbital outpost. We have already invested nearly $6 billion in the project, and we have made express commitments to our international partners to build the station. We have required NASA to redesign space station Freedom to fit within a more realistic funding profile. We did these things to retain our lead in aerospace technology; to perform groundbreaking research; and to one day realize the benefits of a far-sighted investment in new products, systems and technologies. If we pull the plug now, we will draw into question the ability of the United States to lead a long-term collaborative international science and technology effort. We will cripple our ability to attract foreign participation to other large-scale science projects, such as the superconducting super collider. The potential damage to the reputation of the United States as an international leader must not be ignored.

Mr. Chairman, I would also note that the bill in its present state provides only $200 million of the $855 million requested for the HOPE Program of HUD. HOPE—Home Ownership for People Everywhere—was authorized with great bipartisan support during consideration of last year's omnibus housing bill. The program is designed to enpower low-income Americans by giving them the opportunity to build equity in their federally assisted homes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides no funding for HOPE I—a part of the HOPE Program designed to help tenants of public housing acquire ownership of their units. I urge my colleagues to support an amendment to be offered today to transfer a very modest amount of seed money to the HOPE I Program. There are over 1.3 million units of public housing in America, and today's amendment would fund the conversion of only a fraction of 1 percent of those units to tenant ownership. It is time to try something new in housing policy, and the authorization for HOPE expires at the end of 1992. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to save this infant program from imminent crib death.

Mr. Chairman, I also would note that this bill fully funds the President's request for FEMA disaster relief. Neither the request nor the appropriation, however, begin to address the serious continuing shortfall in the disaster relief account. I call upon the administration to expeditiously assess funding requirements for disaster assistance and to deliver a request for funding as soon as possible. I will work with my chairman to ensure that we maintain an ability to respond to new emergencies and to address the needs created by present disasters.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am proud to observe that this bill contains $13.5 billion for VA medical care, an increase of $175 million over the President's request and $1.1 billion over the fiscal year 1991 level. It also provides $2.7 billion for the National Science Foundation. This is nearly the full amount of the 17 percent increase over last year's level sought by the President. It also contains significant increases for Community Development Block Grants, EPA Construction Grants, and public housing modernization. I note parenthetically that none of these increases will be jeopardized by today's amendments to fund the space station and the HOPE Program.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee for their effort.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the fiscal year 1992 VA–HUD and related agencies appropriations bill.

Many of these programs funded in this $80.9 billion measure are of great importance to my home State of West Virginia. This level of funding represents a $2 billion increase over last year among all programs covered by the bill.

H.R. 2519 increases by 9 percent the funding for medical care and treatment of eligible beneficiaries, and for the addition of 1,500 nurses for secondary and tertiary VA hospitals. The funding will also permit increases in special pay for doctors and dentists, additional primary health benefits, and 140 additional positions to expand the Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Program for veterans.

I personally regret, even in the name of staying within budgetary constraints, the extension for another year of last year's imposition of a $2 copayment for medication provided to veterans on an outpatient basis. I have heard from veterans in West Virginia who do not understand why this is being imposed, since many of them are on low, fixed incomes and barely able in many cases to afford medication.

The bill recommends a 5.2-percent cost of living [COLA] for veterans' pensions next year, funding service-connected compensation benefits for an estimated 2.5 million beneficiaries and pension payments for an estimated 999,000 beneficiaries with nonservice connected disabilities.

The bill provides $635 million for readjustment benefits, which will go to provide education and training assistance, vocational rehabilitation training, and special housing and transportation grants, serving 399,000 veterans and eligible dependents.

Also of great importance to West Virginia is the $522 million for VA and State facilities, which includes major and minor construction projects, and for the establishment of State veterans' home and nursing care facilities. Under these programs, the veterans facilities in Beckley and Huntington, WV, both in my Fourth Congressional District, are eligible to receive funds.

The bill, due to budgetary constraints, fund housing programs at a level of $19.4 billion in fiscal year 1992, representing a reduction of $125 million over last year for these important programs. Again, I regret that spending constraints, due to the Federal deficit which we are committed to bringing down, force us to reduce veterans' housing program needs.

I sincerely wish, Mr. Chairman, that it was not necessary to leave the newly authorized HOME and HOPE Programs unfunded, or underfunded. I recognize that the reason is that we are trying not to severely reduce funding for existing, and vastly important, housing programs. Even though the HOPE and HOME Programs are characterized as administration programs being put forward for funding by President Bush and Secretary of Housing Jack Kemp, the fact remains that Congress authorized them. I know, as well as any Member of Congress, that authorizing is one thing, and funding is yet another. However, funding battles should not be characterized in such political terms as them versus us, if indeed Congress intended to pay more than lip service to housing needs when it put its stamp of approval on HOPE and HOME Programs. Having said that, let me say that were it not for the spending caps under which we are forced to work, I would like to see more than token

funding of HOME and HOPE. These programs are no longer their programs, but our programs. We voted for them.

There is funding in the bill that provides assistance for an additional 74,500 low income families. The $9.8 billion in the bill, will benefit the following: $1.1 billion for 5-year housing voucher contracts—$8 million less than last year; $1.1 billion for existing section 8 housing certificates, for an additional 34,900 low income families in the coming year. Of this amount, $35 million must be used to assist families in imminent danger of losing their children to foster care due to a lack of appropriate housing. Funds are also provided to assist in meeting the housing needs of disabled, and persons with AIDS.

For the homeless, I am pleased to note that the bill continues to provide for the homeless, providing $536 million, an increase of $196 million over last year's level, for this purpose. This level of funding includes programs for emergency shelter, transitional and supportive housing demonstrations, SAFAH, and for section 8 moderate rehabilitation of single-room units for the homeless.

I am intensely pleased to note that the Community Development Block Grant Program is continued, and that the bill provides $3.3 billion in fiscal year 1992 for CDBG's. This funding level represents a modest increase—but an increase nevertheless—of $65 million over last year's level.

Mr. Chairman, one of the related agencies funded under this bill is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA]. Normally, I support funding for NASA, because it is important to our future leadership in space exploration as befits a world power. The bill, however, dropped all funding for the space station.

While the importance of the space station to West Virginia is modest in terms of money, some of those funds do go to West Virginia, including to my district. Currently, on-going contracts for space station programs amount to $1 million in West Virginia, rising to $4 million over the next 3 years. Given the expertise of West Virginia companies currently competing for these contracts, and the fact that their expertise is growing and expanding, future contracts for space station purposes can increase, allowing currently funded companies and new applicants to create new jobs.

I am supporting the reinstatement of funding for the space station today for the simple reason that the money is found by freezing all other NASA programs at last year's levels, and reprogramming funds from existing NASA programs for space station purposes. At the same time, the amendment to restore the funds also provides an increase of $11 million for veterans medical care.

All of us are bearing the burden of the spending caps and limited means of expanding funding for the programs that fall under VA–HUD—programs of such magnitude and significance to our constituents that it does not require further articulation here. But in West Virginia we need to make the most of every opportunity to create jobs and bring more Federal dollars into our districts. Reinstating funding for the space station will help do that in 30 States. I am committed to job creation for our State which lags far behind the rest of the country in achieving economic stability.

Mr. Chairman, also of utmost importance to my State, and to the Nation, is the provision of funds in this bill for wastewater treatment. The bill provides $2.2 billion in fiscal year 1992 for wastewater treatment grants, $95 million more than in fiscal year 1991. Of this amount, $1.8 billion is for grants to State wastewater treatment revolving loan funds. While this funding is referred to in the bill as grants, it is important to call to the attention of my colleagues that this is a loan program, called the State Revolving Loan Program [SRF], and it replaced the Title II Wastewater Treatment Facilities Construction Grant Program, which was phased out last fiscal year.

In West Virginia, and indeed in small communities nationwide, the use of the SRF is minimal, because small communities cannot afford loans. They can't afford the interest on the principal—and therefore they are letting wastewater treatment needs go begging because they simply cannot leverage the backing they need to go after the loans.

I am pleased to note that the Public Works and Transportation Committee, on which I serve, has begun a 2-year process of reauthorizing the Clean Water Act, which will include serious consideration of the Nation's $84 billion water infrastructure needs. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 916, to reinstate the phased-out Title II Grant Programs for wastewater treatment facilities construction. I hope that this program can be reinstated, and that it can be made to work in concert with the SRF, so that economically distressed, small communities can continue to receive grants, and larger, more affluent communities, able to leverage funding through municipal and other bond issues, can use the State revolving loan funds for their needs. With a dual program in place, and future funding that is adequate to both, we may come nearer to meeting the EPA and other standards Congress has imposed upon the States and localities for Clean Water Act compliance.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that FEMA funding is continued. I wish that FEMA could have received larger increases, for the need is great. I especially wish that the $134 million for emergency food and shelter could have been increased.

There are $2.7 billion for the National Science Foundation, reflecting an increase of $406 million over last year. This funding, among other things, supports science education activities and university research capabilities, which I support.

I am unalterably opposed to providing $15.9 billion for the FSLIC Resolution Fund, to continue the savings and loan bailout. I don't buy the statement that these billions are not counted for budget scoring purposes. All that means to me is that we are lying to the American public. Period. I can't very well vote against this bill because of this provision—it is too important in too many other ways to my constituency—but if I could, I would.

Again, I strongly support this appropriation bill, and urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass H.R. 2519 to fund VA–HUD and related agencies in fiscal year 1992.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2519, as reported by the Appropriations Committee on Monday and in opposition to amendments that would redirect the spending plan of the reported bill on housing, space-related programs, VA, and independent agencies.

Mr. Chairman, we are beginning to face the reality of the renowned budget summit agreement, here today, as we deliberate over one of the key appropriations bills. We must now consider the real limits and tradeoffs that exist in our spending choices. We can make fair decisions. We can make decisions that put the real needs of our citizens at the forefront of our priorities.

I think H.R. 2519 does that in a balanced manner. I am pleased that Chairman TRAXLER and his committee have prioritized spaceship earth and people as having more pressing needs than the needs of a space station. This was undoubtedly not an easy decision. It is, however, one by which we should stand.

The Chapman and Lowery amendment offered today would dramatically narrow the mission for NASA established with this measure. NASA has in the recent past become, because of the single project tunnel vision, the National Space Shuttle Administration. Tomorrow, because of the present policy path and the choice of that path, NASA could become the National Space Station Administration. Of course, NASA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, must have a broad mandate and retain such in practice and reality. We should not sacrifice the broad scientific missions by cutting the broad base of NASA programs by $1.7 billion for the space station as this amendment would do. Nor should we support the $250 million cut from public housing operating subsidies by this amendment. Operating dollars meet the real needs, benefiting the poorest of the poor in our society. Operating subsidies are the dollars that pay for the utilities and repairs to keep the housing for 1.4 million families safe, sound, and sanitary.

This bill appropriates almost $81 billion among the Department of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, FEMA, FDIC, RTC, and numerous other independent agencies. It manages to fund these programs at a level below the President's budget request, although above last year's appropriation.

Importantly, H.R. 2519 provides the funding for the housing programs authorized in the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act—some tried and true, and some new. It does so with a healthy balance that does cannibalize current programs for those that we are just beginning, such as HOPE and the HOME investment partnership grants.

Although I am disappointed that the committee followed the President's budget request to cut the Emergency Shelter Grants Program to $71 million, I am very pleased at the funding that would be provided for the McKinney homeless assistance programs, and for the new Shelter Plus Care Programs that were created last year. Including FEMA and the Interagency Council on the Homeless, this bill would provide $671.3 million for those homeless programs that are funded under this bill, not to mention those programs targeted toward homeless veterans.

I extend my appreciation to the committee for clarifying its intent with regard to the appropriation of $57 million for the Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless [SAFAH]. Many of us were concerned that the rough plan proposed in the administration's budget that would collapse many current McKinney programs from other Departments into HUD's SAFAH Program was being seriously considered. As the report language points out, funding decisions for education, mental health, substance abuse and job training programs for the homeless will be considered in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill.

The bill also provides for a number of other housing programs that I strongly support including the expansion of the Congregate Housing Services Program, the Neighborhood Housing Services Program, the preservation provisions of the Affordable Housing Act and the essential Community Development Block Grant Program. These and the other housing and community development programs funded in the bill are truly empowerment programs that are deserving of our support.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman TRAXLER, Representative GREEN and the committee and I urge my colleagues to support the bill as reported.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, today's VA–HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill presents a difficult decision. The space station is in unhappy competition with public housing operations and mission to planet Earth. After careful consideration, I have chosen to support the space station. The Augustine Committee stated: "If the United States is to have any significant long-term manned space program, a space station is the next logical and essential element." By continuing appropriations for the space station, we maintain our credibility with our international partners with whom we have agreements to build the station. The defunding of the space station will have a severe effect on the nation's economy. This program impacts more than 2,000 businesses in 40 States, employing over 50,000 workers, many of whom live and work in the State of Maryland.

However, this appropriations bill funds several beneficial programs that will suffer because they are pitted against the space station. I am deeply concerned that maintenance in public housing will be cut back. Maintaining our public housing continues to be crucial for low income housing. We should not build housing that we do not maintain. The Housing Opportunities Commission in Montgomery County, MD informs me that the county will have to increase significantly its subsidy because of this cut, and this is at a time when HOC is closing its waiting list of more than 8,500 households, who are requesting assisted housing.

Another program that will be affected adversely by space station funding in this bill is NASA's Earth sciences budget. It seems fair to fund the space station by freezing NASA's budget at fiscal year 1991 levels. As an environmentalist, I am unhappy that mission to planet Earth, a satellite program to study how the global environment is impacted by the Earth's population, will be slowed. A major focus of mission to planet Earth is to collect data on the effect of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and to use this information to plan for a sustainable future.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that this appropriations bill forces such a difficult choice. However, public housing maintenance will not end with this cut of $217 million. Mission to planet Earth will also continue, but the space station would be terminated by the lack of funds. The space station is an investment in jobs now and benefits to education, engineering, energy and environment in the future. I think the choice must be made for the space station today.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2519 and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

I particularly want to commend the committee for including funding in the bill to help clean up the Rouge River in my home State of Michigan.

The Rouge is Michigan's River. More than 1½ million people—many of them my constitutents—live near the Rouge. This river should be counted among the Crown Jewels of Michigan. Once upon a time, it was. Years ago, the Rouge was swimmable, drinkable, and fishable. Indeed, as a young girl some 80 years ago, my mother swam in the Rouge.

Today, the Rouge is an ecological casualty of our modern industrial society. The river is so polluted that it threatens the health, safety, and quality of life of the more than 1½ million Michigan citizens who live near it.

Ironically, the Rouge River has also come to symbolize the determination and environmental spirit of the people of my State. Despite the river's problems, the people of Michigan have not given up on the Rouge. Each year, thousands of citizens meet on the banks of the river to clear logjams and debris. Indeed, last Saturday, I joined the people of my district for this year's cleanup effort.

But the main pollution problem in the Rouge is not logjams and debris. The problem is raw sewage. Whenever there is a storm, the local sewer systems are overwhelmed and untreated sewage flows directly into the river. The demonstration project funded in this legislation will begin the infrastructure improvements necessary for the environmental recovery of the Rouge.

Thirty years ago, John Kennedy remarked:

> I can imagine nothing more wasteful than to pollute our rivers and permit valuable water to flow to the sea in conditions where other people cannot use it. Our goal must be the fullest utilization of every drop and gallon of water in every river system in America.

Today we take a step toward the realization of this goal.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, it shall be in order to consider en bloc each of the amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3 printed in House Report 102–99. Said amendments en bloc shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question and may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2519

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. TRAXLER, a few questions regarding this bill?

Mr. TRAXLER. I would be delighted.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. I thank the distinguished chairman for the opportunity to direct a few questions to him concerning this bill.

You note in your report accompanying the bill that there are a number of unfunded studies mandated by the Clean Air Act. In this report, the committee urges EPA to request funding for these studies in fiscal year 1993.

Mr. Chairman, among the studies authorized by the Clean Air Act were studies which will identify and evaluate sources of visibility impairment in class 1 regions—our national parks and wilderness areas. In particular, the act requires development of regional air quality computer models for this purpose.

As you know, Members on both sides of the aisle from my State, and both of our State's Senators, have been working with both the Department of the Interior and EPA on this issue.

It is an issue of great national importance that has received extensive national news coverage. It has first evidenced its national importance in Virginia, but it will become an issue across the land wherever there are class 1 areas.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to clarify whether it is the committee's intent that the Administrator of EPA take up this subject with the Secretary of Interior, and develop a joint strategy for EPA to have the required modeling and data base available at the earliest possible date?

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

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his question. Yes, that is the intent of the committee.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I further would request to know whether it is the committee's intent to have language along these lines in-

cluded in the joint statement of the conference on this issue?

Mr. Chairman, the committee will be pleased to consider including such language in the joint statement of the managers at the time of conference.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Finally, I would request to know whether the committee would consider carefully and make its efforts to include any funding provided by the Senate for this purpose when this matter comes to conference?

Mr. TRAXLER. Yes, the committee will take into careful consideration any funds provided for this purpose by the Senate when this matter is addressed in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I would advise the gentleman this is a very important program, and we will make our very best effort to that extent.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider the VA HUD Independent Agencies appropriations bill today, several points need to be raised. First, no subcommittee faces a more difficult challenge in meeting widely disparate needs and balancing competing interests than this one. How do we meet our obligations to those who have been disabled in the service of our country; to those who have no homes or lack means to find housing; to those whose livelihoods have been destroyed by earthquakes or floods; to all who have the right to clean water and clean air? How do we provide for scientific research and yes, even space exploration, that will reap benefits in the future? Each of these programs is vital in its own way and I believe that Chairman TRAXLER, Mr. GREEN and the subcommittee have done a commendable job in weighing the options. Overall, the spending in this bill represents only a 2.5 percent increase above the previous fiscal year.

Additionally, the subcommittee has called agencies to task for "top heavy" management and plans to hold the agencies accountable for such practices in the future. Wisely, the committee has not funded such things as the Points of Light Foundation because its governing commission has not even been selected.

The subcommittee has ensured greater protection of our environment through increased funding of EPA. The subcommittee also has chosen to meet some of the new obligations of the National Affordable Housing Act—in the HOPE and HOMES Programs—which I believe are the basis of meeting more of our housing needs.

In times of tough choices, the subcommittee and the full committee have suspended funding for the space station program. While I intend to say more on this later during the debate on the Lowery/Chapman amendment, I once again affirm this as a good choice. As the committee report states: "Funding the space station in 1992 would require the committee to reduce, eliminate, or curtail virtually every other NASA program and inadequately fund VA medical care, the National Science Foundation, and the Environmental Protection Agency—the fiscal year 1993 outlook is worse."

In other words, we simply can't afford to do it all.

Having said those words of commendation, I do want to interject one word of caution about a practice that is, unfortunately, not peculiar to this subcommittee. The bill, as reported, does contain some unauthorized and unrequested projects in such areas as VA major construction and EPA. For example—$48,800,000 has been designated for the El Paso VA Ambulatory Care Facility. This is to be a shared VA clinic with Beaumont Army Medical Center. While I am a strong supporter of VA/DOD sharing of medical facilities and a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I know that this project was not authorized by our committee nor was it a high priority in the VA's own construction plans. I am also not aware of any corresponding DoD commitment to the project evidenced in the recently passed military construction appropriation.

Finally, let me clear up a significant piece of misinformation from OMB about the budget scoring of $14.1 million provided for VA incremental costs related to claims processing and transition assistance. OMB would lead us to believe that these funds are not neeeded because they were somehow anticipated by the President's budget. That's nonsense. The VA's budget submission for fiscal year 1992 explicitly states that it contains no funds for any workload related to Operation Desert Storm/Desert Shield. The budget also assumed—despite the long-planned downsizing of the military and a new congressional mandate to provide transition assistance—a large decrease in the number of claims filed. As I have said many times during the past 6 months, we have done our veterans no favor if we provide benefits only to make them stand in line to get their check or file their claim.

I support the priorities set forward in this bill and ask my colleagues to join me in passing this legislation.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise to engage the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] in a colloquy. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the authorizing committee. To be honest about it, the authorizing committee did a very fine job in having a balanced approach to a space program for this country. That is, manned and unmanned kinds of projects.

My own feeling, and I have to say this publicly, is that there is prejudice on the part of some, and it is certainly an intellectual decision on individuals' parts toward a manned program.

Maybe we should have had a robot on the Moon as opposed to a man on the Moon. I do not know. Maybe we should have robots flying our airplanes today. This is the thinking of some scientific members of the community.

Mr. Chairman, I recall JOHN GLENN, who pioneered space, telling me the story that when he was a young astronaut there was a tremendous national movement against manned space programs and there were people who believed that only machines could do the job. Frankly, many of the astronauts in that early era were jeopardized in terms of their missions because of that bias.

I think, myself, that is what we are having the debate about today. We are really not talking about budget priorities because what the authorizing committee did, what the Budget Committee did in offering a balanced program, was to say that America needs space, the space program, for all the ripple effects it has done affecting every single person's life. We need the space program. There is nothing we do that has not been affected by the space program, whether we are talking about environmental programs, whether we are talking about health programs, whether we are talking about programs that relate to world hunger, et cetera.

We have needed all kinds of programs to fulfill the dreams of this country and the world. And to have a bias against having human beings involved in terms of manning these projects is really wrong because there has been an effective job done by the authorizing committee and by the amendment that Mr. CHAPMAN will soon offer that says, "Let us have a comprehensive approach to it. Let's not have a prejudice against one area and not another area."

So I think there is a balanced way to do it. You cannot have one without the other, in my judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to yield to the gentleman to ask him if that was his original point when he talked about the manned space programs versus the work that has been done.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my contention is that indeed scientific robotic programs are important as a part of our space future. There are certain things that we are not capable technically of doing with

man at the present time and will not be for some time, some of the outer reaches of the solar system, as an example. But there are some places where we are technically capable of putting man in as part of the loop. Those are where we get the greatest learning curve. That is where we get the greatest economic payback.

The glasses I am wearing came out of the space program, they are plastic glasses, very lightweight. So therefore they are very comfortable. They have scratch-resistant lenses on them. That is the only way you can have plastic glasses. It come from having the astronauts having to have shields on the front of the helmet, and this is the development from that.

We get all of these paybacks. We are not doing the space program in order to get those paybacks, those paybacks come as a result of doing the space program. We do not get that with robots. Robots we build with technology we know how to do. They go out and find things that we expect to see. That is wonderful information, it is good space science, but it is not the kind of developmental work that pays back to this economy at a 9-to-1 ratio.

So the gentlewoman is absolutely right, we need a balanced program. It is my belief that the Appropriations Committee is rapidly moving us in the direction where we will not have that kind of balanced program, that they believe thoroughly in only the space science aspect and that ultimately the direction in which they will take us will have us with no manned space effort whatsoever by the end of the decade.

□ 1250

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, let me reclaim my time by just saying this:

I am going to ask the Members who do not believe in a manned space program whether they would be willing to get on a commercial airliner and just have the airliner operated by automatic pilot. I think not. I think we want to have human beings involved in the space program, and that is really what this issue is all about.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of Article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, and for other benefits as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, 412, 777, and 806, chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 50 U.S.C. App. 540-548; 43 Stat. 122, 123; 45 Stat. 735; 76 Stat. 1198), $15,841,620,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than $9,711,000 of the foregoing amount shall be transferred to "General operating expenses" for necessary expenses in implementing those savings provisions authorized in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, the funding source for which is specifically provided as the "Compensation and pensions" appropriation.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 30, 31, 34-36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61), $635,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, funds shall be available to pay any court order, court award or any compromise settlement arising from litigation involving the vocational training program authorized by section 18 of Public Law 98-77, as amended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 19; 70 Stat. 887; 72 Stat. 487), $25,740,000, to remain available until expended.

GUARANTY AND INDEMNITY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $39,689,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses" to cover the common overhead expenses associated with implementing the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $85,870,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses" to cover the common overhead expenses associated with implementing the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program: *Provided*, That during 1992, within the resources available, not to exceed $1,000,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans (38 U.S.C. chapter 37).

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $1,368,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses" to cover the common overhead expenses associated with implementing the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by 38 U.S.C. 1798, as amended, $8,000: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $21,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the education loan program, $307,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses" to cover the common overhead expenses associated with implementing the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 31, as amended, $105,000: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $1,688,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the vocational rehabilitation revolving fund program, $936,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for "General operating expenses" to cover the common overhead expenses associated with implementing the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries receiving care in Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); aid to State homes as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 641); and not to exceed $2,000,000 to fund cost comparison studies as referred to in 38 U.S.C. 5010(a)(5); $13,462,096,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That of the sum appropriated, $8,750,000,000 is available only for expenses in the personnel compensation and benefits object classifications: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $375,000,000 is for the equipment and land and structures object classifications only, which amount shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the collections deposited in the "Medical care cost recovery revolving fund" pursuant to the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, not more than $77,000,000 shall be available in fiscal

year 1992 to cover the costs of collection activities.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. TRAXLER

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer en bloc amendments on medical care which were printed in the report on the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. TRAXLER: On page 7, line 10, strike out "$13,462,096,000" and insert "$13,495,096,000".

On page 34, line 20, strike out "$750,078,000" and insert "$744,078,000".

On page 46, line 9, strike out "$1,090,000,000" and insert "$1,084,000,000".

On page 49, line 9, strike out "$1,650,000,000" and insert "$1,630,000,000".

On page 68, line 9, strike out "$110,000,000" and insert "$109,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his en bloc amendments.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is really quite simple. It adds $33 million to the VA medical care appropriation, and it offsets this with a reduction in three salary and expense accounts and the EPA Superfund Program. As the Clerk read:

VA medical care is increased $33 million, HUD salaries and expenses is reduced $6 million, EPA salaries and expenses are reduced $6 million, EPA Superfund, $20 million; and NSF salaries and expenses, $1 million.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, these reductions have minimal impact on programs, and in all instances the amounts that are recommended, including these reductions, still provide more in the accounts in 1992 than was appropriated in 1991.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the level-the-playing-field amendment, and I think the House ought to understand what is happening here. When the Chapman amendment was crafted, we were able to find, not only enough money to fund the space station, but we were also able to find enough money to increase the account to Veterans' Administration level. In other words, we believed what the committee has told us up until then about the ability to do space station within the context of their allocation. We showed that we could keep the EPA funding at its appropriate level, what the committee had down. We found that we could keep FEMA at the right level. We found that we could keep Superfund at the proper level. We found we could do all of these things and, in addition, increase VA. When the committee discovered that the makers of the amendment had in fact done them one better in terms of VA, they said, "Well, no, we can't have that. We've got to come to the floor, and we've got to have a level playing field. We've got to have $33 million more in ours as well."

So, Mr. Chairman, if we have done nothing else in this exercise, we have forced the committee to readjust their priorities, but it is interesting where they readjust their priorities.

We are going to hear a lot in the next little while. We are going to hear that the League of Conservation Voters were shown a voting list in order to show that support. Well, I wonder if they told the League of Conservation Voters that where they are getting some of the money to do their increases is out of Superfund, $20 million of Superfund. I wonder if they told them that it is coming out of EPA expenses, primarily salary expenses for EPA personnel. I wonder if the League of Conservation Voters knows that, and, if they do know it, I wonder what they are doing.

Because the fact is that the committee, when it had to come up with its priorities in order to find $33 million for veterans did some things that I think may make some Members uncomfortable, and so we are going to have a debate here over a series of issues, but I would hope that the same committee that is telling us that we cannot take money out of an account that is essentially nonfunctional for nearly all of 1992 will then not turn around and suggest to us that they somehow have a better sense of priorities when their priorities are coming out of the hide of EPA, Superfund, and other programs.

So, I do not see any reason not to level the playing field if the gentlemen feel that it is necessary. We will have accomplished the goal then of getting a little bit of extra money for VA medical care, but I want to remind the House that extra money did come out of some important accounts, including the Superfund account, and in all honesty I would prefer us to have taken it from some other place.

The one thing that I think maybe we ought to be able to do, if we want to really level the playing field, is to allow us then to have in our amendment the ability to knock back out some of these things so we can hold Superfund harmless in this whole process. I would hope that maybe we can now readjust our amendments and say, "I found $33 million that they regard as nonessential that we maybe could put those back in and thereby have a little bit of debate about that sense of priorities." I do not know whether the committee will allow us to do that or not. That woud be a true level playing field.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] is shaking his head no. Of course not. We cannot have a real level playing field here because the committee wants to have its own way, wants to debate only on its terms. I would like to have a debate about whether or not it is better to cut housing subsidies which are nonoperative or whether it is better to cut the Superfund program, which in fact has some dramatic impact across the country. I think that is a real debate, too. I think the gentleman is intent on not letting us have that particular debate.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman would want the entire body to understand precisely what the numbers are, and, with his permission, let me just read them, and the membership will make their own decision of course. The HUD S&E account is a $825 million account. We did take $6 million out of that, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. TRAXLER. The EPA S&E, salaries and expenses, is $974 million, and we add, incidentially, 115 of that this year, and we reduced that by 6 million; that is true. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thought I was.

Mr. TRAXLER. And the S&E account we added a million to this year, bringing it up to a total of $101 million, and we do cut that by $101 million, I must say.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAXLER. It is also true, as the gentleman points out, that of the $1.6 billion Superfund account we did take away $20 million.

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. TRAXLER. The gentleman is accurate and correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thought I was, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], and I am in fact expressing it, and we have made the point with regard to the housing account, which we decided was the lesser priority because it is a $2.4 billion account, too. The gentleman knows at this point, I assume with information coming from the staff of his committee, that there are housing authorities all over the country calling in to Congress suggesting that their programs will be totally devastated by this account, which, as the gentleman knows, is money which is frozen off to at least September 20, 1992, anyway.

□ 1300

So there is a sense of priorities here. The gentleman has chosen Superfund to take his money from. We have chosen an account that will not be spent anyway to take our money from. I am suggesting the priorities are something that need to be discussed.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is important to note that the Lowery-Chapman amendment was drafted first and was given to

the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the members of the subcommittee that is bringing this bill to the floor. They then took the Lowery-Chapman amendment and drafted their own amendment, which is their prerogative, and I certainly do not denigrate that. But the rule that came out of the Rules Committee protects both amendments from points of order and also protects both amendments from a division of the question.

So what the gentleman from Michigan is proposing to do here to give Veterans' Administration the additional money is to reduce Superfund, but in our amendment we cannot bring Superfund back up the suggested level of the Appropriations Committee unless it is done by unanimous consent, and the gentleman from Michigan has already indicated he is going to object to that. That really does not level the playing field, because we would like to spend the $20 million more on Superfund and whatever is necessary for salaries and expenses in the EPA so that Superfund projects can get off the ground in greater number and perhaps be completed.

So the Rules Committee has somewhat killed the playing field at the direction of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Michigan by prohibiting a division of the question on this amendment, so we cannot get a separate vote on the $20 million they are planning on taking out of the Superfund. It also will not allow us to put the $20 million back in. I think that is a very salient point.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I think the House should focus on the fact that there are some problems here that need to be understood before we approve this amendment.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to point out to the House that the terms of the two amendments and the rules that circumscribe them were negotiated out before the Rules Committee by both parties, those offering the amendment and the subcommittee chairman and ranking minority member, and they were agreed to before the Rules Committee with the Rules Committee, and everyone understood that that was the playing field on which we were playing, and everyone at that time thought it was a level playing field.

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, was there discussion of the cuts the gentleman was going to make before the Rules Committee?

Mr. GREEN of New York. Yes. The distinguished chairman made it very clear where the money was coming from. You cannot put anything like that over on the Rules Committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if I recall, there was no discussion in the Rules Committee. The chairman in fact presented it as part of his written testimony, what his amendment was going to be, but there was no discussion in the Rules Committee about all this, and as a matter of fact I had not seen a copy of this amendment until after the Rules Committee had met on this, and I asked to see what the amendment was that was being made in order for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], because earlier I was there—and I do not think the gentleman was there then—and I asked about the Traxler amendment and was told there was going to be no amendment. Then when I went back, I found out there was going to be a Traxler amendment, and I was shown a copy of it at that point. But I do not remember any discussion, and I sat through the whole thing.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I can only say that I was there and made my presentation after the gentleman from Michigan made his presentation, and thereafter the proponents of the amendment made their presentation. It was quite well understood what we were doing, and it was quite well understood by everyone that the subcommittee chairman had been extremely fair and gracious in the way he had gone to the Rules Committee to give the proponents of the amendment the opportunity, which we do not often give Members, to reach across lines if they want in order to fund what they want to fund.

I really do object to any suggestion that there was any unfairness here. This was fully laid out before the Rules Committee, and everyone agreed we had been more than fair in how we were proceeding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not quarrel with the gentleman's point that everyone agreed that it was fair to have these amendments on the floor. I am not disagreeing with that. The question I have is whether or not we discussed before the Rules Committee, on this level playing field amendment, whether $20 million of that was going to come out of the Superfund.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the full amendment was presented to the Rules Committee, and they included it in their report as it had been presented to them. There were no secrets at all.

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

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I yield to the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, let me say on this rather arcane discussion here that we provided as much information on our amendment as was provided on the reinstated space station. As much information was given by both sides, and I have no problems with the information that was provided.

I think the difficulty here is that we need to understand that in finding the $33 million to add to the Department of Veterans Affairs, to create the level playing field, we looked at some accounts where it would do a miniscule amount of harm. We are talking about, for instance, in the EPA S&E account, where there is a reduction of six-tenths of 1 percent. We are looking at the NSF S&E account, where there is a 1 percent reduction. We are looking at Superfund, and that is an approximately 1 percent reduction. Let me say that those accounts are still, even with the reductions, above last year's numbers.

I think most Members would understand this situation very well, and I think they would appreciate the effort we made not to do harm to programs. In my opinion, we have funded the programs that the committee has supported over the years, and the Members of both sides would agree, I believe, that what we are doing is leveling the playing field.

If we could, I would like to get on to the real issue that is in front of us, and that is: If we put the station in, what do we take out? That is really why we are here today, and that is what we are discussing.

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I think the gentleman is correct. We had agreement that there is no reason why we should not have in this committee bill the $33 million. There are a lot of angels dancing on the head of a pin here to discern whether or not we can detect a half a degree's difference in how level that playing field is. I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], in all good faith, did know exactly where that money was coming from, and I think he is doing what he does best and that is to reveal the facts of the situation to all of us. There is a no harm in that either, but it does represent a little bit of maneuvering.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I do support the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

The amendments en bloc were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. CHAPMAN

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments en bloc made in order by the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. Chapman: Page 7, line 10, strike "$13,462,096,000" and insert "$13,495,096,000".

Page 24, lines 15 through 17, strike "$2,405,844,000" and all that follows through "September 20, 1992" and insert "$2,155,844,000.".

Page 60, line 6, strike "$5,194,600,000" and insert "$6,023,600,000".

Page 60, line 17, strike "$5,650,300,000" and insert "$5,157,075,000".

Page 61, line 4, strike "$398,700,000" and insert "$497,900,000".

Page 62, line 19, strike "$2,427,300,000" and insert "$2,211,900,000".

Page 63, line 6, strike "$12,952,000" and insert "$10,500,000".

Page 64, line after line 9, insert the following new paragraph:

Funds provided in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, shall be used for the same amounts, purposes, and programs as are provided for fiscal year 1991 under the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-507).

□ 1310

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, today I am offering an amendment, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], to the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992, that will restore virtually all funding for the Space Station Freedom Program.

Mr. Chairman, before I do that, and in the context of the discussion we have just had, I have a unanimous consent request that I would like to explain. That is, with the amendment just adopted by the House, we now have before the House a bill which makes certain cuts to accounts within the bill to fund an additional $33 million for the VA medical account.

As has been discussed, those cuts are to HUD, salary and expenses; EPA, salary and expenses; Superfund, some $20 million; and the National Science Foundation, salary and expense account, $1 million.

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATIONS OF AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. CHAPMAN

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend my amendments so that we can go back to the initial thrust, and truly level the playing field, so that we can have before the House today a clear decision on the Chapman-Lowery amendment, which would fund space station at $1.9 billion, taking the funds to do so from the HUD account previously noted in debate, and add $33 million back to the VA medical account, so there is a clear distinction between our amendment and the amendment which has just been adopted, which funds an additional $33 million from HUD, EPA, Superfund, and the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, to do so, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments being offered by myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] be modified by adding the following provisions: on page 34, line 20, strike out $744,078,000 and insert $750,078,000; page 46, line 9, strike $1,084,000,000 and insert $1,090,000,000; page 49, line 9, strike $1,630,000,000 and insert $1,650,000,000; and, page 68, line 9, strike $109,000,000 and insert $110,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, this would truly level the playing field and present before the House today the clear choices of the Chapman-Lowery amendment and the amendment that the committee bill just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modifications.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modifications to amendments en bloc offered by Mr. CHAPMAN: In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment:

(1) Strike the item referred to on page 7, line 10;

(2) Insert at the end the following:

(A) Page 34, line 20, strike "$744,078,000" and insert "$750,078,000";

(B) Page 46, line 9, strike "$1,084,000,000" and insert "$1,090,000,000";

(C) Page 49, line 9, strike "$1,630,000,000" and insert "$1,650,000,000"; and

(D) Page 68, line 9, strike "$109,000,000" and insert "$110,000,000".

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

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his objection.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is outside of the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. CHAPMAN

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, since objection has been made, at this time, in light of the fact that the amendment has increased the VA medical account by some $33 million, and we have been prevented from offering a clear choice as between the two provisions, I would ask unanimous consent to again modify my amendment that is offered by myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] by striking out $2,155,844,000, and inserting $2,188,844,000, the purpose of which is, since the funding has now been increased in the VA medical account, it is no longer necessary to reduce the VA-HUD account by $250,000,000. That would now be reduced to $217,000,000.

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

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] explain his amendment?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, since the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has now been adopted by the House and has increased by some $33 million on the VA medical account, which the Chapman-Lowery amendment would have done, it is no longer necessary for our amendment to increase VA medical, because it has been increased. Therefore, we no longer need to transfer $250,000,000 from the appropriate HUD accounts, but only $217,000,000, to fully fund NASA at last year's level.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] for that explanation, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the modification is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The text of the amendments en bloc, as modified, is as follows:

Page 7, line 10, strike "$13,462,096,000" and insert "$13,495,096,000".

Page 24, lines 15 through 17, strike "$2,405,844,000" and all that follows through "September 20, 1992" and insert "$2,188,844,000".

Page 60, line 6, strike "$5,194,600,000" and insert "$6,023,600,000".

Page 60, line 17, strike "$5,650,300,000" and insert "$5,157,075,000."

Page 61, line 4, strike "$398,700,000" and insert "$497,900,000".

Page 62, line 19, strike "$2,427,300,000" and insert "$2,211,900,000".

Page 63, line 6, strike "$12,952,000" and insert "$10,500,000".

Page 64, after line 9, insert the following new paragraph:

Funds provided in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, shall be used for the same amounts, purposes, and programs as are provided for fiscal year 1991 under the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991, (Public Law 101-507).

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, during the upcoming debate we will hear many arguments, both for and against funding for space station Freedom. I would like to open this debate by expressing my beliefs in this regard and to outline the Chapman-Lowery amendment, which will restore nearly full funding for the space station project.

A generation ago John Kennedy had a dream for America, a dream for our Nation to lead in space exploration and to benefit from its technological advances.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the Apollo Program stimulated unprecedented numbers of children to study math, science, and engineering. Yet today we are witnessing a serious decline in the ability of our children to perform in these very areas.

Mr. Chairman, in order to maintain our competitiveness, our children must be educated in math and science. Space Station Freedom is a powerful inspiration for America's young people, and allows them to see future opportunities for math and science skills. Space Station Freedom will provide a first class laboratory in space for materials science, microgravity research, biotechnology, life sciences research, and medical research. The laboratory will give us unique opportunities to study cardiovascular disease, hypertension,

osteoporosis, anemia, diabetes, and the basic immune functions. Such research can lead to new medicines to treat diseases like cancer and AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, to back out on our pledge at this time to our international partners to build a space station will seriously affect our Nation's credibility. Our international partners in this effort have made space station a critical element of their space policy. Plans and budgets that they have already adopted incorporates space station Freedom in their space future. They have pledged to invest $8 billion in this project, and have already paid $1.6 billion of that pledge.

Mr. Chairman, just this week, in hearings before the House Committee on Space, Science, and Technology, executives of these foreign space agencies testified that the cancellation of this project would make it difficult to cooperate with U.S. science programs in the future.

We must continue space station Freedom, to retain our credibility and technological leadership in the world.

Mr. Chairman, space station Freedom has a tremendously large economic impact on our Nation. The space station program has a procurement constituency of over 2,000 businesses in 40 States and employs over 100,000 people directly and indirectly. Many of these workers are skilled engineers and scientists who will be needed to ensure future U.S. technological competitiveness.

Mr. Chairman, while the economic aspect of this program is worth noting, I believe it is hardly the strongest argument for continuing space station Freedom. I believe that a vote to abandon the centerpiece of U.S. space policy in our program is tantamount to destroying our manned space program in this country.

Critics of space station will argue that the space station's objectives have been too narrowly defined and NASA's future lies somewhere else in the unmanned programs. It may be true that space exploration may be better suited in some cases to unmanned probes, but such a position, in my judgment, is terribly short-sighted.

Mr. Chairman, the space station is not so much an end in itself, as it is a significant step in a longer term program of expanding human presence beyond Earth and into the solar system. If we are to retain our goal of a manned space program, then this Nation must have a space station from which to learn and launch that program.

□ 1320

After the VA, HUD Subcommittee voted to terminate the space station, our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], encouraged the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], and myself, as members of the subcommittee, to offer an amendment that would restore space station funding. He expressed to us that the entire House of Representatives should voice their opinions on this issue, that space policy and the future of our space program should not be left to the voting determination of nine members of a subcommittee or the full Appropriations Committee. So it is with my chairman's encouragement and blessing that I am here today offering this amendment to restore space station funding.

In fact, we appeared together yesterday before the Rules Committee in an effort to secure a rule making in order the choice that the House will have today.

The Chapman-Lowery amendment would preserve the general priorities reflected in the committee's recommendation while still allowing the House of Representatives to speak on the issue of space station Freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. CHAPMAN was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. The Chapman-Lowery amendment would provide funding for space station from within the NASA portion of the bill by freezing all of NASA's programs at the 1991 funding levels. This would provide space station with $1.9 billion, the same amount of money station is getting this year. And no other NASA program, let me restate this, no other NASA program would receive a dollar less than it is receiving in this year's funding request and funding amount.

Under our amendment, as amended now and the bill as amended by the chairman, veterans' medical care will receive $33 million more than the original subcommittee mark. Under our amendment, all of EPA's program will receive the full increases provided by the subcommittee. That cannot be said now for the subcommittee bill. The subcommittee bill, the choice of the Chapman amendment versus the subcommittee's position now will cut Superfund by $20 million, will cut EPA salary and expenses. Our amendment funds EPA and Superfund at the full subcommittee mark, an increase of some $500 million over last year's or this year's fiscal year.

Under our amendment the National Science Foundation will receive the full amount requested by the President and provided by the subcommittee, an increase in NSF funding of some $406 million, a 17-percent increase in the budget of the National Science Foundation in an effort to double their funding as we all hope we can do over a 5-year period. The Chapman-Lowery amendment now does this because the chairman's mark cuts funding for the National Science Foundation. We fully fund the National Science Foundation.

Under the amendment, all programs for the homeless and community development block grants will receive full funding and full increases provided by the subcommittee. In the committee bill, the Appropriations Committee funded public housing operating subsidies at $250 million above the President's request, and this appears to be the issue and the concern of many of my colleagues. "Where," they ask, "Jim and Bill, where did you get the money to restore the funding?"

We went to the HUD operating subsidies account, where the subcommittee had plused up the funding some $250 million above the President's request, over $300 million, my colleagues, above the authorized level for this account. And we took that $250 million, which is fenced in the committee bill until the last 10 days of the 1992 fiscal year, and which CBO and OMB tell us cannot be spent anyway, and transferred that funding to VA and to NASA.

If the Appropriations Committee has effectively acknowledged that $250 million of their $2.4 billion mark is not needed to meet 1992 needs, then there is no reason to forward fund 1993 operating subsidy needs this fiscal year.

The Chapman-Lowery amendment will reduce those public housing operating subsidies by $250 million below the committee mark. However, and I want to say again, this program will still be funded at the full request of the President and the Secretary of HUD and above, above the current authorized level.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment will nearly fully fund space station Freedom. We are at almost 95 percent of requested funding. We do so without modification to the 602(b) allocation of the subcommittee and without any major impact to the other agencies funded in the bill. Since the offsets for restoring space station come primarily within the NASA account, I am aware that some Members are concerned about the effect this bill will have on other NASA programs. I would like to make a few points on that matter.

Many Members have received letters from the science community strongly reminding them that the recent Augustine Committee report on the future of the space program said that space science was a top priority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. CHAPMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. The Augustine Committee noted that the space science program should be given priority, but within the context of a balanced space program, one in which manned space activities are also a key element.

In fact, the Augustine Committee itself stated that manned space activities were of critical importance to the overall U.S. space program. The answer of the Augustine Committee to a manned space program is a resounding yes. The Committee bill, my colleagues, destroys this balance. It tells the space science community in effect that they can get their funding only if they help kill space station and the manned space program.

Cancellation of the space station would lead to a temporary increase in some funding for other NASA programs, but it would mark the loss of a long-term goal that this country has had for a generation.

The Chapman-Lowery amendment would maintain the balance between manned space flight programs and unmanned space flight programs and would maintain the 20-percent share the NASA budget has devoted to space science.

NASA itself has indicated that space station Freedom is an important national priority, and it fully supports the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

I understand the hard choices that we as Members of Congress must make in order to reduce our current budget deficit. However, we must not be shortsighted. We must not destroy America's role in manned space flight. We must demonstrate that we understand the important contributions the space station will make to our Nation and to our future and that we must be committed to remaining the technological leader of the world.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. I just want to take this time to express my admiration for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. GREEN of New York, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAPMAN was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAXLER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, they are both distinguished members of the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Subcommittee. And each has made significant contributions to this bill.

More importantly, in the course of our discussions, in conversations pertaining to the gentlemen's amendment, they have conducted themselves in the finest manner. They have absolutely kept their word on every issue that we talked about. They have set forth clearly to all parties what they wanted and intended to do, and they have assured everyone that this debate would be on the highest plane and the highest level.

I am very proud to say they are members of the subcommittee but, more importantly, good friends. I want them to know that they are now and they will be, irrespective of how this issue is resolved in the House later today. I am proud of both of them.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I think we ought to make very clear what the answer is on what was the $250 million and now is the $217 million. I realize the gentleman has not in the past been deeply involved in public housing finance and that most of our colleagues have not. I think we ought to understand that the way HUD puts out the operating subsidy money, traditionally only about 46 percent of it outlays in the fiscal year in which it is appropriated. That happens to be very similar to the space station, which outlays in a very similar rate.

□ 1330

Neither is funny money. The fact of the matter is that HUD outlays this money periodically as the authority fiscal years begin, and that is not something that is recent. The housing authorities whose fiscal years begin on October 1 submit their request to HUD by July 1, and are funded out of the last fiscal year money available.

If you take this $250 million or $217 million away from HUD, then in order to meet that October 1 need, HUD has to cut every housing authority so that proportionately there will be $217 million less available for operating subsidies for public housing in fiscal year 1992. It is as simple as that. This is not funny money. It is not something we are doing that is any different from what has been done in the way HUD has operated over the years.

Let me make one further observation, and that is that the gentleman seems to assume that we are just flinging money around because we added $250 million to this above the administration request. The fact of the matter is the administration has underfunded this program consistently.

Last year, for example, the administration request was $1,825,731,000. Ultimately, by the time the supplemental was done, we had to fund the program at $2,157,000,000, and that works out to almost $375 million more than the administration's request just in order to match the formula that HUD uses for providing this funding.

I think it is very clear that in putting in the $250 million above the administration request we are simply trying to have this bill be honest from the start instead of having to come back with a supplemental and try to find the money for it next spring when the administration's request will have proved to have been wrong.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Reclaiming my time, let me say that the gentleman is correct. I have not been an avid or real student of housing programs until this came up. Let me say that I have gone to school in the last few days about these HUD programs, and here is what I found out. I have found out that a formula was developed which the gentleman has referred to which presumably sets a budget for these public housing authorities to operate based upon the efficient management of a housing authority. It is a formula budget.

What we are doing here, my colleague, my fear is, and what I think has happened is we are in effect creating a $250 million, if you will, slush fund at the end of the year that, based upon the formula needs submitted to our subcommittee by HUD, we have fully funded the formula need. Now, what we are doing is we are doing nothing more here than creating at the end of the fiscal year another $250 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. GREEN of New York and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAPMAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are doing nothing more here than creating at the end of the fiscal year a $250 million pool of money which cannot be obligated, which cannot be spent, according to prior dialogue I heard here today, which looks to me is going to encouage inefficiencies, encourage public housing authorities to do those things so they can come in at the end of the year and say, "I have got to have extra money."

How can you say that we are not funding HUD when we are funding HUD not only at the full request of their Secretary, Mr. Kemp, and at the request of the administration, but at some $80-plus million above the authorization of the authorizing committee?

Mr. GREEN of New York. If the gentleman will yield further, this is the same Secretary Kemp who submitted a request that proved to be $375 million short last year by HUD's own formula.

Mr. CHAPMAN. We are not talking about that. We are talking about September of 1992. We are anticipating inefficiency.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

He makes a good point. The gentleman from New York wants to blame this all on the Kemp administration and on the Bush administration.

The fact is that, as the gentleman points out, the figure that is in the

gentleman's amendment is still above the authorized amount. We are still some $67 million above authorization.

One of the problems with this subcommittee is the fact that they seem to ignore authorizations, and in this particular case this is an authorized amount as well, and so it is a congressional amount, and I think the gentleman is entirely proper in pointing that out.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted, as a member of the authorizing committee, at this new found respect for our function. I hope it is long lasting.

I would point out that the chairman of the authorizing committee is here today, and I think he will agree with many of us who are on the authorizing committee that what the Committee on Appropriations did is exactly appropriate. We had a bargaining session last year. We had to get a bill out in conference. I do not think the authorizing numbers were given, in our mind, a degree of exactitude, and we knew that the Committee on Appropriations might do this, and we were prepared to be very clear that the money that is being appropriated here is all money that can be and will be used as the chairman of the authorizing committee will point out, but I do want to say that we appreciate this, and we will approach our authorization now perhaps with a little bit more optimism about the extent to which it will be deferred to.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, let me add a little more enlightenment on this topic.

Since 1975 the public housing subsidies have been allocated, as the gentleman from Texas said, to public housing authorities through a formula. This goes back to 1975.

The statute does not permit allocations to public housing authorities in excess of that formula, and based upon the current formula and economic assumptions, the 1992 needs for public housing authorities for operating subsidies will be fully met at the $2.16 billion level requested by the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. GREEN of New York and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAPMAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the additional $250 million can only be used to forward fund 1993 needs by obligating those needs in advance of 1992, or to provide discretionary windfalls to selected public housing authorities for costs beyond control, costs that exceed the formula, and not once over the last 10 years has the regular congressional appropriation exceeded the formula-based needs for operating subsidies.

I hope that answers it.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I guess the gentleman was not there when the HUD witnesses explained to our subcommittee why they consistently come in with an underestimate year after year.

That is because OMB orders them to make economic assumptions which are unreal. OMB orders them to assume that the incomes of public housing tenants are going to go up at a rate that equals inflation, and year after year, as the year goes on, they do not. As a result, year after year there is a shortfall, a shortfall which, in the current fiscal year, reached $375 million because of this artificial requirement which OMB is imposing on HUD.

We are simply trying to be honest with the House based on the experience of how much tenant incomes actually rise and how much the formula will ultimately require as a result of that. We are being honest with our colleagues by putting that amount in at the beginning so we do not have to come back and say that there is this terrible emergency and we have got to have a supplemental appropriation.

Our action is based on the Department's testimony to us, and I think the record is very clear that the reason the administration continually underfunds this account in its appropriation request is that its economic assumptions are consistently wrong.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Reclaiming my time, if I may, let me say that if that be the case, it is interesting that the committee has fenced the $250 million until the last 10 days of the fiscal year, and OMB and CBO say we cannot spend any of it within the fiscal year whether or not it will be expended. What we do now is that under the current committee mark there are real cuts to real people and real programs in HUD salary expenses, in EPA, in Superfund, and in the National Science Foundation. That is not in the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it has been an interesting explanation, and it was also interesting that it has been added to by suggesting that authorizations are no longer a serious part of the process here. I still regard authorizations as a very serious part of the process, and the fact is that the rules state that the committee is not supposed to exceed authorized levels.

I think we in the authorizing committees have a right to expect that what we do is taken seriously.

I was somewhat amused by the contention that they no longer are relevant.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. I think most people associate me as being a strong supporter of subsidized housing, having been on the authorizing committee for many years.

But I am confused about what the Committee on Appropriations did, because I just had the question asked "Do you do this every year? Do you fence every year with respect to this category?"

The answer I got was no. Now, I want to read to my colleagues, so that they know that in may heart of hearts I do not think we are affecting these programs at all in terms of what the gentleman did, because basically what he did was take all of the funds out of NASA with this exception.

□ 1340

Now on page 27 of the report, your committee's report, this is a new one. I had never heard of fencing in my life for the 15 years I have been in this body. This is a new one. It says "These funds should satisfy performance funding system." They are referred to the committee's recommendation as 2.405,844 for the payment of operating subsidies.

Now, remember, we are just talking about this category, operating subsidies. We are not talking about new construction. We are not talking about modernization. We are not talking about rental subsidies. We are talking about operating subsidies.

So the authorizing committee authorized $2.09 billion. I could make a big argument that that should be more, and I would be the first to agree. The Committee on Appropriations appropriated $2,405,844, about $400 million more, but then here is what they say, and I am not making this up. On page 27 they say, "These funds should satisfy performance funding system requirements. Language has been included in the bill delaying the availability of $250 million until September 20, 1992." They give, in other words, they give the housing authorities 10 days, 10 days to spend $250 million.

(On request of Ms. OAKAR and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAPMAN was

allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. By the gentleman from New York, Mr. GREEN'S approach, which is a new one, it is a new one for me. If I understood why, in fact, they do not consistently do it every year. I am of the belief that the gentleman's amendment that he is offering today does not affect housing, and I really believe that. I think he is taking the lion's share from NASA and doing what the Authorizing Committee said, and that was, "Let's have a balanced program, let's not have a bias against manned programs in NASA."

I urge Members to just read this report. I have to tell Members that I have become a student of this committee's operations, too, and I think it is very, very interesting.

Also, I would point out on page 24 under "Projects" it says as follows.

(On request of Mr. MCDERMOTT and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAPMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. "For payments in public housing agencies and Indian housing authorities for operating subsidies for low-income housing projects as authorized by Section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, $2,405,844,000: provided, That of the funds made available under this heading, 250 million shall not become available for obligation until September 20, 1992."

Now, I think the least that should happen in the future is that there be a little bit of honesty about what we are doing in terms of spending money on housing.

I want to thank the gentleman for his discovery on this because Members can be sure that I am going to be monitoring this business a little closer. I do not know what they want to use it for, perhaps they want to use it for special projects. I know it is a privilege to be in the Committee on Appropriations, and I know because of that, and I accept that. I never argued against it, that Members do have chances to put pet projects for their home districts and so on.

(On request of Mr. MCDERMOTT and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAPMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am one who would like to support the space station, and I called my housing authority in Seattle. The gentleman from New York, Mr. GREEN's analysis is exactly the one I got from the Seattle Housing Authority. For the last 10 years they received that money in September, and it has always come in a lump sum at the end of the fiscal year. So there is nothing new in this bill whatsoever. It is money that is needed by housing authorities. That is why the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] and I sent out a letter, as the leaders of the Urban Caucus on this issue.

It will affect every major city housing authority in the United States. I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time if I may, let me conclude. I know we are here to discuss space station, and Members can seek their own time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I have just received a letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, dated today, addressed to the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations. If I may read to my colleague what the Secretary of HUD says on this issue and on this amendment:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, DC, June 6, 1991.

Hon. JOE MCDADE,
Ranking Minority Member, House Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR JOE: I understand that the House of Representatives is currently considering the Chapman-Lowery amendment to the FY 1992 VA, HUD, Independent Agencies appropriations bill that would provide much-needed funding for NASA's space station in the coming year.

The amendment shifts $250 million from public housing operating subsidies to NASA and the VA. This $250 million is above the full funding level for operating assistance requested by President Bush in his budget for FY 1992. In addition, the $250 million is "fenced" until September 20, 1992 and would not be available to public housing authorities until that time.

The Bush Administration's commitment to space exploration is matched by its commitment to exploring solutions to inner city crime, poverty and despair. The Department of Housing and Urban Development supports funding for public housing operating subsidies at the full funding level requested by President Bush in his budget. If the Chapman-Lowery amendment passes, full funding of the operating assistance needed for public housing in FY 1992 will continue to be available.

Sincerely,

JACK KEMP.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] has laid to rest the idea that somehow the proponents of this amendment have found a treasure trove of money that is not going to be spent. However, let me just make the operating subsidy funding system very clear.

HUD, for years, has funded housing authorities cyclically during the year. They do not have to rush in 10 days to get this money spent, because they know they have it and they order all the housing authorities whose fiscal years begin on October 1 to submit budgets by July 1, which they then review, and on the basis of that review they make the money available at the end of September. They have been doing that for the longest time.

Strictly for reasons of budget accounting, we put in this fence. It does not change the HUD operations at all, but, for the budget powers that be, it gets this funding moving from the 46-percent outlay category to the zero percent outlay category, and thus saves our committee some money to do all the other wonderful things that all Members want Congress to do like the veterans programs, the space program, the environment. That is why that fence is in there this year. It is not new. It was in last year, too.

It is not found money. Real prople will be hurt if this money is taken out, and they are some of the poorest in America, the 1.4 million households that live in public housing, because the housing authorities will have less money to spend to keep up their homes. Let no one suggest that we are overspending on operating public housing.

The fact of the matter is that Secretary Kemp testified that in order to get public housing in shape to sell it to its tenants so they will not be saddled with rundown homes or face a huge repair bill, HUD is spending $30,000 per unit to fix up that housing. That is the price we are paying for having underfunded public funded operations in the past, $30,000 per unit to fix it up. It is very foolish, with that kind of backlog of deferred maintenance in public housing, for Members now to cut this account almost 10 percent and just make that problem worse. Real people are being hurt because they have underfunded public housing in the past. Real people are going to be hurt if we underfund public housing next year by supporting this amendment.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] and I are offering this amendment with a clear purpose. That is, to restore space station Freedom. In my view, to ensure America's continued leadership in space exploration and America's technological and scientific leadership in the world economy space station is the key to the future of the manned space program.

If the station is killed, the entire manned program will limp to an end in this decade.

The VA-HUD bill, as approved by the Committee on Appropriations, would terminate the program in fiscal year 1992. Our amendment would provide $1.9 billion, nearly full funding, to move this vital space and technology program forward.

During consideration of this bill in subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the chair-

man, stated that, given the 602(b) allocation be received, $1 billion below the House budget resolution, and $2 billion below the President's request, he could not fund the space station.

□ 1350

He made a difficult decision in an effort to protect other important domestic programs. This decision may be understandable, given the constraints he faced, but it will ultimately cost this Nation greatly in the future. Ending the station will damage our ability to develop new technologies in science and aerospace. It will undermine our ability to excite and motivate our youth in the fields of math and science, and perhaps most importantly, it will forfeit the leadership in space exploration won by the Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, and space shuttle programs.

Let me bring you back to the 1960's, the late 1960's. Trying to buy a pocket calculator, they were 300 bucks. Today you can go into any drugstore, any supermarket, and for less than $10 buy a calculator more capable than those that were over $300. That is just one of the spin-offs as a result of our space program.

Space exploration provides a tremendous boost for excellence in all fields. Without the station, we will lose this source of inspiration.

The Chapman-Lowery amendment will restore the space station program. Under the amendment, the space station would receive close to full funding. $1.9 billion will allow the program to continue efficiently toward deployment in this decade.

Our amendment is under the outlay targets of the committee bill. CBO scoring shows the amendment to be $87 million below the committee mark. It is a responsible approach.

Our amendment would freeze all NASA programs at the fiscal year 1991 level. This funds the station and allows all existing NASA projects to proceed at the current funding level. This included important space science programs.

Our amendment preserves the committee funding priorities for all other domestic programs. NASA will bear the burden for funding the station. Our amendment would also provide a $33 million increase for veterans' medical care. And now as a result of the chairman's unanimous consent amendment, they will equal what we have been able to do for veterans' medical care in the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

The only reduction from the committee bill outside of NASA would be the now $217 million increase above the President's request for HUD public housing operating subsidies. The committee itself fenced this increase until September 20, 1992, in essence making it unavailable until fiscal year 1993, because the CBO does scores this at no outlay.

Also, the administration estimates that an increase for HUD operating subsidies is not necessary due to declining energy costs for these facilities, and you heard the letter read from Secretary Kemp by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] that he is in support of this effort.

The Chapman-Lowery amendment is an honest alternative to the committee bill. We believe it is vital for the manned space program to go forward. This is what this vote is about. If you believe the United States must continue its leadership in space at a time when we no longer enjoy a monopoly as we have in the past, when we are severely challenged not only by the Soviets, but the Europeans, the Japanese and the Chinese in space, you will vote for the Chapman-Lowery amendment. Do not kill America's space program. Let us keep America preeminent in this vital area of technology.

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

Mr. Chairman, if the United States wants to be a premier player in the 21st century, we must become the premier scientific Nation, not just with scientific knowledge but with the *vision* and prestige of man's exploration of space. The future of the universe is in space.

If you believe in robots, why do you not fly on an airliner from Washington to Los Angeles on a robot? Why do they use thousands of pilots? I will tell you why, because they are smarter. When they have rough weather, they go on manual, that is why.

We have already allowed Japan and other countries to supersede us in the manufacture of televisions, household electronics, VCRs, bicycles, automobiles, farm equipment—such as tractors—heavy building equipment—big loaders, dozers, et cetera. The list goes on and on.

If we want to continue to exacerbate the decline of the United States, if we aim to become a second-class Nation, then we should go ahead and kill the space station, kill the space program, kill it all, save your money and straight to you-know-where, a second-class country for the rest of this century. How do you like that? Is that what you want to leave your children and your grandchildren.

In the 33 years since the beginning of space flight, America has established itself as the world leader in space exploration. Since 1984, America has been working on the next step to continue this leadership in space. It has been designing and defining plans for a permanent home in space—space station Freedom. Reflecting the growing international character of space activity, America invited the other space—faring nations of the free world to participate in the building of space station Freedom.

Today, the 13 member nations of the European space agency, Canada, Japan, and the United States have an agreement, with treaty status, in the largest cooperative international scientific and technological program ever undertaken—space station Freedom. The U.S. Congress already has made a major commitment to it, having already contributed over $4 billion toward its creation. Now would it not be unthinkable to destroy a program in which we have already invested so heavily? A program which is vital to the continuing growth of our nation and our world? A program which will keep the United States on the frontline of technology and a first, instead of a second-rate nation?

People say, what will creating the space station Freedom do for me? Well, for starters, it will provide first-class laboratories to study the effects on the human body and psyche of long duration exposure to microgravity. This new knowledge will be used on Earth to combat cardiovascular diseases, hypertension and osteoporosis. It will give us new insights into aging, anemia, diabetes, muscle atrophy, and the basic immune function. Biomaterial will be developed to use for artificial skin, tendons, blood vessels, and the cornea. Freedom also will have laboratories for microgravity, pharmaceutical and materials research, both new sciences. Among the goals are pharmaceuticals to treat cancer, diabetes, aids, and other diseases. Materials experiments will aim at lighter and stronger materials, improved semiconductors, new processes in recycling on Earth and much more.

The process of preparing for this adventure, and actually doing it, sets the stage for discovery of the unknown that traditionally has led to great breakthroughs in medicine, energy, transportation and materials.

All of this can significantly improve America's competitiveness is a world that is making rapid strides in technology, and is challenging every day the first place position of the United States among the world's economies.

Space station Freedom already is a powerful inspiration for our youth. It helps stimulate their interest in math, science, and engineering, and helps get them equipped for the marketplace of tomorrow. Young men and women are willing to take the tough courses but only if they see challenges and opportunities for their future skills. NASA can help inspire future generations of Americans, and space station Freedom will play a major role.

Building Freedom will directly and indirectly employ 75,000 people. The fiscal 1992 budget calls for spending more than $2 billion with more than 2,000 businesses in 40 States. The first element will be put in orbit in 1995, and permanently manned capability achieved in 1999.

Killing space station Freedom would send a clear signal that the United States is not committed to manned space flight and continued U.S. leadership in space. It would strain America's credibility with our international partners, which have already spent more than $4 billion on their parts of the project, and would be a deterrent to future cooperation in any major scientific or technological undertaking.

In the final analysis, we are far along in our commitment to space station Freedom, we have encouraged its production through our authorizations.

□ 1400

Mr. Chairman, we have invested heavily through our appropriations with the strong support of this subcommittee. I believe it would be the height of folly to simply cut off our support at this time. This is very much our future. We must continue our commitment if our country is to continue to be the premier player in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Chapman-Lowery amendment. I think that will make this possible.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues Mr. Chapman from Texas and Mr. Lowery from California to restore the funding for NASA's Space Station Freedom Program.

I do not claim to have any special expertise on our space program. However, as the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to point out that our failure to provide adequate funding for the space station will violate our treaty agreement with the 13 member countries of the European Space Agency, as well as with the Canadians and the Japanese regarding space station Freedom.

Our European, Canadian and Japanese partners in the agreement have already spent close to $2 billion to carry out their part-in the engineering and preliminary construction of space station Freedom. There are, to be sure, legitimate differences of opinion about the proper role and mission of this joint undertaking. Yet our refusal to fund this project at this time calls into question the credibility of the United States in undertaking joint scientific and technical projects with other countries.

In his letter of June 3, 1991 addressed to this Member, Canadian Ambassador D.H. Burney expressed deep concern over funding cuts and a possible withdrawal of the United States from the space station program. He noted that:

For the United States to withdraw at this point from the Space Station program will at the very least indicate that nations have failed in this important attempt to work together for the peaceful development of space and will profoundly affect the prospects for international collaboration in this area.

The Japanese Ambassador expressed similar concern in a letter of June 5 to me that the termination of this project would be a serious setback for international cooperation in space. In his view, "The International Space Station Freedom program, the largest scientific collaboration ever undertaken, could be an excellent model for our future cooperative efforts in science and technology. Looking at the opportunities lying ahead of us, I believe that it is critically important to see to it that the space station program will be brought to a successful conclusion with the continuing support of all participating countries."

Under the leadership of former President Reagan, the United States invited its friends and allies to participate in this largest international venture in science and technology ever undertaken. As a result of this initiative, the European Space Agency, its member states and the Canadian and Japanese Governments joined us in signing the Intergovernmental Agreement [IGA] regarding space station cooperation on September 29, 1988.

Pursuant to this agreement, the parliaments in West Germany, Norway, the Netherlands and Denmark have ratified treaty commitments committing their respective countries to a joint space station effort. Four additional European countries are likely to follow suit in the near future. I urge the adoption of the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

I would request, Mr. Chairman, that the full text of the Canadian and Japanese Ambassadors' letters be inserted in the RECORD at the appropriate time.

EMBASSY OF JAPAN,
Washington, DC, June 5, 1991.

Hon. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOMFIELD: I am writing to you personally to convey the serious concerns of my government over the recent developments in the House Appropriations Committee which, if left unchanged, could result in the withdrawal of the United States from the International Space Station Freedom program. I fear that the program termination would be a serious setback for international cooperation in space.

As you are well aware, the international Space Station program was instituted in 1984 when the then U.S. President Reagan invited the friends and allies of the United States to join the project. My government has ever since been one of the active U.S. partners in this large scale, long term scientific cooperative venture based on the Intergovernmental Agreement on Space Station Cooperation (IGA) signed on September 29, 1988 by the United States, the ten member countries of the European Space Agency, Canada, and Japan. This gigantic and scientifically significant undertaking is a reflection of the sincere desire of all the participating countries to work together and combine resources for the common cause of the advancement of science and technology in space. Japan, together with other participating countries, is fully committed to the implementation of this cooperative program and will remain so in accordance with the IGA.

As its major contribution to this international effort, Japan has committed to the development of the Japanese Experiment Module (JEM) at a total cost of approximately $2.3 billion. This module, designed for a variety of research activities in life science and microgravity science, is now being successfully developed. Roughly a quarter of the total development cost has already been financially committed through contracts by the National Space Development Agency of Japan (NASDA). Should there be a cancellation of the Space Station program therefore, it is all too obvious that the financial stake at risk would be very significant even at this point. Furthermore, the decision to participate in this program required necessary adjustments to the then existing Japanese space development programs and even the reorientation of NASDA's organizational structure in support of this joint program.

The International Space Station Freedom program, the largest scientific collaboration ever undertaken, could be an excellent model for our future cooperative efforts in science and technology. Looking at the opportunities lying ahead of us, I believe it is critically important to see to it that the Space Station program will be brought to a successful conclusion with the continuing support of all participating countries.

I ask you to do whatever is possible in your capacity as ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to attain an appropriate level of funding for the Space Station program in the FY 92 Department of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriation Bill on which, I understand, a House floor action is expected sometime tomorrow.

Sincerely yours,

RYOHEI MURATA,
Ambassador of Japan.

AMBASSADOR TO CANADA,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1991.

Hon. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOMFIELD: I would like to convey to you the deep concern of the Canadian government over recent funding action in the House of Representatives that could result in withdrawal of the United States from the International Space Station Freedom Program.

As you know, the Space Station is by far the largest cooperative space venture that either country has ever undertaken. The international partners have been investing in this program for more than five years and its development is now more than a quarter completed. For this reason alone, the United States, Canada, Europe and Japan all have a tremendous incentive to ensure the continued success of Space Station.

The Space Station is unique in the fact that it represents a landmark initiative betwen countries for the peaceful development of space. It tangibly demonstrates the willingness and commitment of the nations involved to ensure that space be developed in ways that will benefit all humanity. The United States exercised leadership when it invited other nations to join it in developing space in this way and the action sent a watershed signal to the rest of the world to this effect. For the United States to withdraw at this point from the Space Station program will at the very least indicate that nations have failed in this important attempt to

work together for the peaceful development of space and will profoundly affect the prospects for international collaboration in this area.

For your information and use I am enclosing copies of letters from myself and Dr. Kerwin, President of the Canadian Space Agency, to the Administration registering Canada's concerns over the funding developments in the United States regarding Space Station.

I urge you to ensure on-going funding sufficient to allow successful completion of this key international program.

Your sincerely,

D.H. BURNEY,
Ambassador.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Michigan, for yielding to me. The gentleman is one of the senior members of my delegation whom I dearly respect and oftentimes follow on international matters. Rarely would I go wrong in following his counsel.

Let me just make a comment on what I perceive to be the issue here in connection with these international agreements.

None of us, of course, is at all pleased that the agreements that are in place when we terminate the station will also be terminated. But legally and lawfully, under the clause in those agreements that says—and I want you all to hear this—those agreements all have an escape clause for each of the countries, including the United States, "subject to appropriations." Subject to appropriations." Subject to appropriations and that is what these agreements have.

But let me go on for a minute. The Japanese, the Europeans, they all know that clause is there and it works both ways, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has expired.

(On request of Mr. TRAXLER and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROOMFIELD was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, from the committee's standpoint the reason we did this is because we do not have the money that we thought we would have when these agreements were reached in 1987. That is a fact. Priorities change, and that is indeed what this vote is about, it is priorities of America.

Now, let us talk for a minute about agreements because you have to know that the amendment pending before us will abrogate an agreement in space that we have with the Europeans. We have one or two agreements that NASA has signed with them, and we do not want any misunderstanding about this: The amendment will cut $465 million out of the space science program and, in my judgment, CRAF Cassini program is gone, gone in the amendment that is pending before us.

That means we are reneging on an agreement with the Europeans on CRAF/Cassini. That is what this pending amendment does.

Now, the Europeans are building the probe for the Cassini mission, a probe that is going to land on the surface of one of the moons of Saturn and a probe that will cost the Europeans a few hundred million dollars. What about that agreement? Is it OK to abrogate that one but not abrogate the station amendment? I think not, I think not.

I call this to the committee's attention. I encourage you all to vote "no" on the amendment.

MR. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

MR. SENSENBRENNER. I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology had a hearing, and the major international partners of the space station sent their executive directors to testify before the committee. The exception was the Canadians, and the Canadian Government apparently has a policy that none of their officials appear before committees of Congress.

Mr. Lutton, who is the director general of the European space agency, testified strongly that he favored the continuation of the station.

In answer to questions that I posed to him, he said that the Europeans had already spent $1 billion in United States dollars on their part of station construction and that the cost to discontinue would probably obligate them to the expenditure of somewhere around $200 million, United States dollars, more.

The executive director of the Japanese space agency, NASDA, said that their out-of-pocket expenditures has already been $650 million. He would not speculate as to how much it would cost to terminate the contracts that they have already signed and to make whole their contractors. But I think it is safe to assume that another $200 million to $300 million would have to be paid out there.

You add that to what the Canadians are doing, and if we make the unilateral decision to discontinue the space station today, in effect we will have stiffed our international partners somewhere around $2.5 billion, United States dollars. That is going to have major consequences on the international arena, not only in terms of our scientific cooperation with international partners but in other areas of the conduct of American foreign relations.

Two and a half billion dollars, leaving our allies holding the bag in that amount, is a pretty nifty piece of change.

More significantly, Director General Lutton of the European Space Agency says if the United States backs out of the space policy, rather than losing all of this money that his member states have committed, they are going to seek to have some kind of a manned space presence on their own without American participation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. SENSENBRENNER and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROOMFIELD was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, I think what he is saying is they are going to try to recoup some of those losses by getting together with the Japanese, Canadians, and perhaps the Soviet Union, to put their own space station into orbit and cut us out. What an international disaster it would be.

What an international disaster it would be if everybody else in the world that was in space had their space station but we did not have, after being the leading country in manned space exploration ever since President Kennedy said that we will go to the Moon. And we went to the Moon on time and under budget because the Congress had a permanent commitment to go to the Moon, as President Kennedy had suggested, rather than subjecting every major project to a year-to-year appropriation.

Finally, in response to the other gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], there is nothing in this amendment or legislation that cancels the CRAF/Cassini Program. The European and Japanese partners knew what was in the amendment. They made no complaints about the potential cancellation of CRAF/Cassini because NASA is made whole in this space science account, and CRAF/Cassini will go ahead.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] for his comments, and, Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time during the Committee of the full House I will insert the complete text of the letters from the Canadian Ambassador, as well as the Japanese Ambassador.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment which would restore the funding for the space

station Feedom. I fully support the rest of HUD, the Veterans' Administration, and independent agencies appropriations bill as reported to the House, but I must vote to continue the space station project.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard this discussion here about all these agreements with foreign countries. We are continuing whacking at our research programs in these bills, authorization and appropriations, and I am very concerned about it. The United States is losing its credibility.

My colleagues have just heard the fact that Japan is participating in this project, the fact that Canada is participating in this project, European countries are participating in it. Now how long are they going to go along with this, with them spending millions of dollars, and then we just suddenly drop the project? And actually last year this very subcommittee instructed this space station exactly where they wanted to make cuts, exactly what they wanted them to do, and they followed it to a T, and then, bang, all the money is gone, just knocked out.

Mr. Chairman, what explanation is the committee going to give to Japan, and to Canada, and to other European countries, and especially to those American bright young students out there, bright men and women that want to go into the scientific field, and they see a program like this that has been working with the Congress for 7 years? This program is 7 years old, and has been moving along and making progress, and bang, for some reason there is no money.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an image that we better think about and we better study about.

I realize that the gentleman wants to talk more about HUD than they do in this bill, but I believe that the Secretary of HUD—I know him. He served on the Committee on Appropriations with us, and Jack Kemp does not send out any false information, and he says it is not going to bother HUD and not going to bother any agencies.

So, let us pass this amendment and keep this space station, and let the Senate do the same thing, and let us keep this program.

A strong manned space program has always been a part of our civil space objectives. The successes of the Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, and shuttle programs show what can be achieved if we put our minds to it. All of NASA's programs have continued to grow, including its science programs. Space station Freedom will ensure the continued success of our manned space efforts and our science projects.

Space station Freedom is the next important step in our return to the Moon and the human exploration of Mars. We must be able to experience and study the effects of long-term exploration of space. The space station will provide a life-science and microgravity research laboratory in space that is unparalleled.

The space station is the product of a close working relationship with Congress over 7 years. This program has undergone numerous design reviews and studies, and currently represents the highest priorities of the Nation's civil space agenda within a workable funding scheme. Last year, at the explicit direction of this subcommittee, NASA further streamlined the program and did it consistent with the specific design and cost cutting requests that came from this very Congress. Now, 7 years and $5 billion into design, testing, and production of the space station, the subcommittee suddenly cut off funding. This unpredictable budget environment must not be allowed to destroy our national space program.

We must consider our international partners in this debate. Japan, Canada and the European Space Agency have all spent substantial amounts of money on the project. They are committed to long-term manned space programs. If we abandon the space station and give up our position of leadership in space, these other countries will step in to fill our shoes. I don't want this to happen.

Killing the space station is not just a change in priorities at NASA, it is complete shift away from any manned space program. We would abandon this vital technological field to others. This is not acceptable to me.

We face very tough budget choices today. I do not think we should take the shortsighted view and ignore this investment in the future. We need to continue funding for space station Freedom.

The Chapman-Lowery amendment will restore funding for the space station. It simply makes the space station a priority from within NASA. The amendment is fiscally responsible and restores funding for a vital space project.

We must continue to be the leader in space exploration. Space station Freedom gives us that opportunity. This investment in our children's future is a small price to pay for the benefits to be derived from our increased knowledge of the universe.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Chapman-Lowery amendment to restore funding for space station Freedom.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment, which would restore funding for the Space Station Freedom Program. This vote is about whether we want to maintain our commitment to manned space exploration. But it is also about something even more important. It is a vote on whether the United States is committed to remaining the world leader in advanced technology and scientific research.

We are under a tremendous challenge from our economic competitors, Japan and West Germany and others. The success of our troops in the Persian Gulf revealed the importance of technology in maintaining U.S. national security. We need to recognize that the threat to our long-term economic security is just as great, and we must invest in areas that will strengthen this Nation economically. The space station Freedom is a long-term investment in the future competitiveness of the United States.

As the flagship of the civilian space program, the space station is critical to developing technological advances that will have applications in many areas. If we fail to recognize the importance of continuing to push forward our scientific and technological horizons, then we will fall behind those nations that do. Other countries such as Japan and Canada and the European Community are developing space programs, and are realizing the economic benefits to the areas of science, engineering, research and development.

The challenge we face today is very similar to the one that faced this country 30 years ago, when the Soviets launched the sputnik satellite. President Kennedy challenged the Nation to develop the necessary technologies that would allow America to land a man on the moon by the end of the decade. By focusing on momentum and commitment, the United States was able to regain technical and scientific superiority in the space race with the Soviet Union through dedication to the development of core technologies that thrust the United States back to the forefront of aerospace technology. We are still in a position of leadership today, but this vote may determine whether we are the world leaders tomorrow.

President Bush has offered a challenge to the Nation. He has made clear his commitment to the space station. Today we must respond to that challenge, or our space program may never be the same. The U.S. aerospace industry is one of the few that currently enjoys a favorable balance of trade. If we hope to compete with other nations in the expanding space services industry, we must continue our support for the space station. The station will allow the United States to develop new, marketable, and competitive methods of reaching, working, and living in space.

There is much more than national pride at stake. The space station Freedom is a critical element in strengthening our Nation's global competitiveness and technology base. In addition to providing critical microgravity and life sciences research capability that will benefit health care on Earth, the station will contribute to advances in new technologies such as robotics, high speed computers, lightweight alloys, high-accuracy navigation, and rocket propulsion, among many others. By establishing intensive research and development programs, space station Freedom will allow the United States to dramatically push back the high-technology frontiers of science and engineering and significantly improve the existence of mankind well into the next century. This is crucial step in finding a world where all people can flourish.

Beyond the technical benefits derived from the program, the space station will also serve as a source of inspiration to American youth to achieve excellence in education. If the United States hopes to remain at the forefront of high technology research and manufacturing, we must encourage our students to expand their knowledge in the areas of math, science and engineering. The United States currently faces a crisis in these areas as the number of bachelor of science and Ph.D. science degrees earned has declined since 1986. The number of doctoral degrees awarded to Americans has fallen from 2,400 per year in the early 1970's to 1,300 per year recently. Overall, projected shortfalls in Ph.D and bachelor of science degrees are expected to number 78,000 and 675,000 respectively by the year 2006. Between 1982 and 1987, the percentage of college freshman who planned to pursue engineering degrees dropped from 22 to 17 percent for men and for 4 to 3 percent for women. Overall interest in pursuing degrees in computer science majors declined from 4 percent in 1982 to 2 percent in 1987. What message would we send to these young people if we kill the space station? The Space Station Freedom Program should serve as a focal point to motivate young Americans tp pursue degrees in science and engineering, and will serve as a symbol of our country's commitment to achieving excellence in education.

We need to put this vote within the historical context of a commitment by the United States to the exploration of space. It is a commitment that represents a larger vision of the United States as the leader of the world community in space exploration and scientific and technological development. I urge you to support the Chapman-Lowery amendment, so that the United States may maintain this vision as we enter the 21st century.

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Chapman-Lowery amendment. It is unthinkable to transfer any funds from public housing programs. Such a move would set a dangerous precedent for funding priorities.

I do not understand how we can even consider reducing funds for public housing. Where have the sponsors and supporters of this amendment been? Have they not heard that there is a serious housing crisis in this Nation? That there are millions of people waiting to get housing—any housing, even old public housing units that are in disrepair.

I have recently heard the ludicrous argument that NASA supports this amendment to fund the space station; and that we should listen to NASA because NASA knows space. Well, NASA may know space, but NASA doesn't know diddley about housing and has an apparent lack of knowledge about the public housing needs of Americans living on this planet.

Further, the argument that funds to be cut from HUD would be fenced off until near the end of the fiscal year is irrelevant and nothing more than a red herring. The fact still remains that if the funds for HUD are available—even late in the fiscal year—they sorely need to be put to the use for which they were appropriated and intended.

Let me be clear: Those of us who oppose this amendment are not asking for more money for housing programs, though Heaven knows that if more money were available, it could certainly be put to good use. Rather we are simply trying to keep the funds already appropriated for this vitally important Federal program. Opposing this amendment does not gut funding for the many other worthwhile programs NASA has underway and on the drawing board. But adopting the Chapman-Lowery amendment would gut the public housing assistance subsidy.

Up to this moment, I have a 100-percent rating with the National Space Society because I have always supported the space station and other NASA programs. Yes, the space station is a good idea, but let's face it: we can no longer afford to blast money into space when we have too many real needs right here on Earth. Perhaps in a few years when we have dug ourselves out of the economic hole we're in now, we'll be able to afford things like a $118 billion space station. But not right now. And certainly not at the expense of those homeless, working poor citizens and families who have already paid too dearly for skewed spending priorities.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the Appropriations subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies thoroughly looked into the feasibility and practicality of funding the space station and made a very difficult decision on its future. I am willing to trust their judgment and that of the Advisory Committee on the future of the U.S. Space Program that we simply cannot afford it.

We as a nation are being forced to deal with the cold, hard reality of a national debt at a figure that is beyond comprehension as well as a skyrocketing deficit. We cannot do all of the things we want to do. Many of us would like to increase funding for such things as expanding the pool of eligible individuals and increasing the reimbursement rate for health care providers under Medicaid; providing long-term care and a universal health care program; higher education assistance programs; job training; urban and rural development; improving the air traffic control system; natural resource conservation; drug treatment, education and counseling programs; and, infrastructure improvements, to name a few. But we are told we cannot afford to do so. If we cannot find the funds for these vital people programs and endeavors, we cannot seriously consider funding the space station.

As I noted, I have generally supported our Nation's space program, but I must depart from that position now. I cannot in good conscience even begin to consider taking funds from real people and essential programs and earmarking them for some experiment in the great beyond.

I urge my colleagues to oppose Chapman-Lowery.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak today on behalf of the subcommittee and against the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the arguments which have been propounded on the floor today. It is good that this deliberative body should consider a project of this magnitude and seriousness at this moment in our Nation's history.

For those who are not familiar with the history of the space station in Washington, DC, before this House of Representatives, you may be interested to know that under the original estimate of cost and the original timetable the space station was to have cost us $8 billion and would have been ready next year. Today, as we stand and debate this project, the estimated cost is at least $40 billion, and some suggest that the overall cost of the program may be $118 billion.

□ 1420

We are dealing with a program far different than it was at its inception. It is a program which has not only exceeded the original cost estimates many times over but at this moment perhaps has no scientific mission whatsoever. I have listened with great care as my colleagues have described the fact that our failure to fund space station Freedom would somehow make the United States a second-class Nation. I wonder if we inspire any other nation on earth with a space station which has little scientific value.

I ask the Members not to listen to this Congressman's words as to the scientific value of this project. Let us turn to the experts. On March 15, the National Academy of Sciences concluded as follows:

> The Space Station would either be ill-equipped or unable to meet the basic research requirements for the two specific scientific disciplines for which it was intended: The study of life science and of ways to make materials in low gravity.

Then on May 8, the Council of Scientific Society Presidents, which represents virtually every field of science, called the station's contribution to science "greatly overrated."

If we are to fund this space station, then it clearly is not for scientific reasons; it is for the reason that we wish to fund and somehow continue to subsidize the contractors who are involved in this project. This has in fact become a WPA project for the aerospace industry, and I do not believe the nations of

the world can view our funding of this program as anything more than that.

Mr. Chairman, let me address another topic, which I think goes to the heart of this debate. How many times have speakers stood in this well this afternoon asking us to fund the space station Freedom, saying it was necessary to movitate our youth. We are all in favor of motivating the youth of America.

Let me read to the Members what we were told last week by the President of the United States and this administration when it came to motivating our youth. Last week the President announced that he was sending a plan to Congress to sharply reduce the number of Federal grants available to college students, except for those at or near poverty level. Local college officials have said that President Bush's plan could have a devastating effect on student aid on their campuses by further tightening the squeeze on middle-income and working-class students. They said that more students would be required to take out loans, use up family savings, find jobs, go to college part time, or drop out. If the President's plan is approved, Federal Pell grants would be received by 400,000 fewer American students from working families.

As we face the budget realities, this White House on one hand is cutting back on student assistance for working families and coming to this well with a tin cup begging for billions of dollars for a WPA project for the aerospace industry, supposedly to motivate our youth. Give me a break. If we want to motivate our youth, we should give them a chance to go to college and learn. Let us not on one hand fund a project which the scientific community has serious doubts about and then on the other hand suggest that there is not enough money to send our kids to school to learn the math and the science they need to compete in tomorrow's world.

Mr. Chairman, let me add this: The President stood before the people of the United States of America a year and a half ago in his inaugural address and said that our Nation has "more will than wallet." A lot a people applauded when they heard that. It was a grim reality. The budget deficit has forced us to make tough choices.

My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and this subcommittee have taken this challenge to heart. They have made a tough choice. They have said that we cannot continue a program which has costs out of control and a scientific mission which frankly cannot be verified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DURBIN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if we are truly interested in science rather than bragging rights, then we cannot support the Chapman amendment. If we are prepared to admit that every big science project in America is not necessarily virtuous or wise, then we cannot support the Chapman amendment. Our priorities in America have to change, and what is happening in this appropriation bill and this debate today is a suggestion that the change has to take place with the multi-billion-dollar projects which have endured massive cost overruns and at this point are out of control.

It we stood and listened to the President's inaugural address and nodded in agreement when he said that we have "more will than wallet," or even appluaded, I cannot see how we can stand on this floor today and support the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN]. If we in fact are going to have a balanced approach to science, if we are not going to shortchange every other NASA program to fund this one Federal behemouth, then we have to support the subcommittee in its decision. To do otherwise would be disastrous not only for science in this Nation but for our role in the world.

Mr. Chairman, let me close on one note: I cannot shed a tear for those who say that failure to fund this project will somehow disappoint the Japanese. Our role is not to encourage and somehow make happy the people of Japan or other countries. Our responsibility is to the American taxpayer. We continue to subsidize the defense of Japan and the defense of so many other countries whom we are afraid to embarrass by saying that we have to reorder our priorities. No, our first responsibility is to the taxpayers of this country, our own Nation, and our own children who will be shortchanged if we continue this project.

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

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on the amendment at this moment until I heard the testimony of the last gentleman. The pros and cons of this issue can certainly be judged based on the merits of the arguments on both sides. To attempt to polarize this issue almost in a partisan form, setting the administration over here against another group—against students perhaps—is to misrepresent the substance of this issue.

The committee has worked very hard on this issue over the years. There are very difficult choices when we have a program as important as NASA in a subcommittee that contains programs such as housing and veterans. When you have very fine Members such as my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, strongly advocating the importance of a manned role in space particularly the space station, I cannot believe that my colleague would use the kind of debate that would polarize rather than recognize our able Members on both sides of the aisle who are attempting to focus this debate in a balanced fashion.

I was also moved earlier by that portion of the discussion recognizing America's commitment to space as well as our responsibility to lead the world. In the field of scientific research, the leading power of the world must play a role if we are going to continue with breakthrough after breakthrough and also make a difference in the world economy.

Earlier today my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], talked about his glasses, lightweight plastic glasses that are technologically feasible because of a discovery made while carrying forth our space mission. A couple of weeks ago, Members may have seen me with a cast on my arm. It was made of a kind of plastic that is a special development, a result of experiments taking place in space. This is not the reason we are in space, but rather the result of investment there that is leading to economic change and opportunity. Continued investment promises to be a boon to our economy and the world economy throughout the next century.

Recently, we had a debate on the floor in which Members discussed the pros and cons of the superconducting super collider. It was suggested during that debate that somehow that program was going to take too many dollars away from science, so we should not go forward with that technology. The committee had cut $100 million out of the program. Nonetheless, the House made a judgment that the program was important enough that we should go forward with the balance of the funding. That project is another representation of our commitment with other allies throughout the world. Without its going forward, America cannot lead in the field of research and development.

The same arguments should be applied here. It is suggested by some members of the subcommittee that if we do not fund all of the space program this year, somehow that justifies cutting the whole program. That is not where we are in this House. We are in the midst of very difficult choices. The space station does deserve our support. I would urge the Members to recognize that if we are going to have a future in space, we must go forward with the House approval of funding for the space station.

□ 1430

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to give support to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr.

LOWERY], who have done outstanding work. I appreciate the work of the gentleman, and urge Members to give it their support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment. As a member of the subcommittee, let me first acknowledge my understanding of the dillema faced by my chairman, the ranking minority member, and the whole committee.

These are scarce resources. The administration's request for programs under our jurisdiction totaled $65.25 billion. The committee's allocation was $63.9 billion.

Today, it is critical that we not forget the history of space station Freedom. From the days of the Apollo era, great minds of the scientific community described a logical path of space exploration that included a permanently manned space station and a space shuttle.

In 1984 NASA was directed to move forward to build a space station and to seek international partners.

On September 29, 1988, international agreements were signed at the executive level to commit to pursue a joint space station program.

Clearly, the decision to pursue space station and the commitment to do it in cooperation with other nations has already been made.

To date, over $5 billion has been spent by the United States on this effort and over $1 billion by our international partners—the European Space Agency, the Japanese, and Canada.

The effect of this bill on our international reliability is far-reaching—the fact is that future accomplishments of our Nation in science and technology are increasingly dependent upon international cooperation. Not only does the termination of space station Freedom destroy America's leadership in space and prevent any future cooperative efforts to return to the Moon and Mars in our generation—it could have very real ramifications on other science and technology programs, where international participation is critical.

Yes, the space station Freedom program is expensive. I believe that the Chapman-Lowery amendment does an exemplary job of marshaling the scarce funds in our portion of the domestic discretionary budget to the multiplicity of competing programs in our subcommittee's jurisdiction.

This amendment increases funding for the veteran's medical care by an additional $33 million from the bill passed by the subcommittee—this level of VA total funding is $300 million above the President's request.

Further, the accounts for EPA, the National Science Foundation, FEMA, and other agencies are fully funded at the level that the subcommittee bill recommended. At this level, the National Science Foundation is funded at a 16-percent increase for research—in accordance with the President's request to provide a 5-year doubling path of funding for the Agency. Further, the Environmental Protection Agency keeps its $355 million increase above the President's request for its valuable environmental protection programs.

However, under the subcommittee bill, NASA would be subject to an over $207 million cut from last year's appropriated level. That's devastating while other programs are growing.

Which accounts are affected by this amendment? Well, it is NASA, itself, that is asked to prioritize its resources in order to preserve the space station program. And they are painfully willing to do so to preserve the future of a manned exploration in the United States.

NASA understands the consequences, and accepts them. Why? Because the NASA program must be balanced—and a move to cancel space station changes the entire complexion of an agency which was created to explore. What is NASA's mission? Why was the Agency formed?

The crux of the question boils down to the inevitability of space exploration and what role the United States will today decide to play in that history.

This vote is nothing less than the answer to the question of whether the United States is going to continue its manned exploration program, or step aside to let others take the lead.

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

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the amendment offered by my esteemed colleagues from the subcommittee, Mr. LOWERY and Mr. CHAPMAN and urge Members to take an independent look at the space station as a priority within—I say within—NASA.

The amendment would go in exactly the opposite direction—the opposite direction—from that recommended by the Advisory Committee on the Future of the U.S. Space Program—the so-called Augustine Commission. The amendment would fully fund the space station at the expense of the very space science efforts that the Augustine Commission recommended as our top space priority.

Mr. Chairman, for more than 20 years I have served on the authorizing or appropriating committees for NASA and I have always supported the space programs. Before coming to Congress I was in the business of space manufacturing.

In fact, when Sputnik went up in 1957 I found myself part of Wernher von Braun's operation making the very first solid rocket propellant casings which were often designed on the back of an envelope.

This taught me to appreciate the need to move forward and to expend all we can on science and technology. But, my friends, we must have priorities in our science and technology.

The pending amendment would turn aside the most fundamental recommendation of the Augustine Commission which tells us to concentrate on space science. It said that space science "ranks above space stations, aerospace planes, manned missions to the planets, and many other major pursuits which often receive visibility."

The pending amendment, however, cuts almost 16 percent from the subcommittee's recommendations and the administration budget request for space science.

In fact, my questioning of Chairman Augustine when he appreared before our subcommittee confirmed that the only reason—the only reason—to build the space station in its present configuration is as a platform to support a manned Moon-Mars mission estimated to cost $400 billion.

All of our other scientific missions—space sciences, earth sciences, life sciences, microgravity research—can be performed in other ways. Those missions will inevitably be starved if we proceed with space station and space exploration as presently proposed.

I have received many letters from scientists concurring with the subcommittee's decision. Let me conclude with an excerpt from a letter I received from a professor at Cornell University's College of Engineering, Prof. Joseph Burns. Professor Burns states that:

> * * * As a member of the National Academy of Sciences' Space Study Board, I have sat through many presentations about Space Station. During these presentations and subsequent discussions, I have been astonished that the long-term use of this facility was so ill-defined. While I believe that a Space Station should ultimately fly, the U.S. should not be spending a large fraction of its science and technology budget for the 1990s on the Station until our exploration plans are better defined.

This is sage advice and I urge my colleagues to support the Appropriations Committee recommendation.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I know my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], feels very strongly about this, but I have been looking at the scientific results of the Apollo mission, and, very frankly, there are none. The Soviets did an unmanned lander which took some soil samples back to the Soviet Union, and got all of the science we did with the Apollo mission.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGH-

LIN] agrees with me that science was not the main reason for sending the Apollo mission up?

□ 1440

Mr. COUGHLIN. By the same token, the other scientific efforts that we have underway today and that are being funded by this subcommittee provide the same inspiration to science, provide the same success in science, and provide better technology and better investment of our dollars in future technology.

Mr. BROWN. I know that the gentleman knows, and I agree with him, the science investment is the primary reason, but I would like to point out the United States became the world's leader in space by a mission that did not do any science, and the Russians, who did the science without a manned mission, were relegated to second position in the world.

Mr. COUGHLIN. And the budget that we are proposing in this committee will keep us first in the world in science research and exploration. We are talking about a budget that is 40 percent more in real dollars than it was in the mid-1980's and one that will keep us preeminent, not just in space but in manned space as well.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Several things are very clear about the amendment. One is that it will in fact fully fund the space station. What is not clear is the very real cost to humans and to science of fully funding the space station.

There has been much debate about the $250 million in operating funds for the public housing authorities and the 1.4 million families who live in public housing in this country. What this $250 million is is it is really money that helps in a very small way, helps them fight terror, helps them fight crime, helps build some semblance of normal life to allow children to develop appropriately in that public housing.

I would like to quote from Secretary Kemp, when he came before our committee this year to talk about funding for public housing.

Secretary Kemp said, and I quote, "By the time public housing residents are adolescents, they have contended with more terror than most of us confront in a lifetime."

The Secretary then went on to say, "There are no children in public housing. They are 9 years old, but they have seen too much."

What this $250 million is is not a special project for anybody, it is not some accounting gimmick. It is money that will enable us to fix locks where they have been broken by some crack-crazed drug addict who has broken into a unit. It is money that will enable us to weatherize a facility, to fix a broken window, money that will enable us to put in drug hot lines for public housing. It is money that in a very modest way, through millions of hundreds of thousands of public housing units, will allow people and will allow tenant groups to fight off the chaos and the terror that surrounds them. Taking this money out of the budget will have a very clear impact.

The impact will be to reverse progress that we have made in the past several years in fighting the scourge of drug addiction in our public housing. I think it would be a tragedy, a tragedy to deny these 1.4 million families the modest insurance against terror that this money for public housing operating subsidies provides.

There has also been talk about NASA and how much of the money for the station is just reprogrammed from what we are doing here. Space station is a project that has, as the Augustine Commission has said time and again, minimal scientific value. It is a platform. It is a platform to go on and do further manned space exploration.

Virtually all of the things that would give us any scientific insights can be done much more cheaply in an unmanned mission. What we will do with this amendment is to strip virtually all of the science out of NASA and turn NASA into essentially a public works and a transportation agency and away from its mission and primary mission for science.

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

I rise in support, and it is no surprise to anybody in this room, being from Houston, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], my friend and colleague, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY]. Being a member of the committee, there is a couple of things that really need to be said. I want to say first that I have the utmost respect for the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York. They have a tough job of prioritizing spending within their subcommittee.

Where I respectfully disagree with my chairman and my ranking member is the way that they prioritize the spending. I think that we can both pay for the future through future science, future space exploration, research, and others, as well as we pay for the mistakes of the past, the housing projects, the assistance for the homeless and others.

I think it is a matter of prioritizing the way we spend our money. Let me point out a couple of things that my friend from West Virginia pointed out earlier, because I want to stress it. There are huge increases within accounts in this bill, huge increases.

Homeless assistance is increased by over 50 percent in this bill. The American Battle Monuments Commission has increased their budget, by 25 percent in this bill.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I think the gentleman should understand that the American Battlefield Monuments Commission operates the military cemeteries overseas where there are buried American soldiers who fell in foreign wars. And unfortunately, with the decline in the value of the dollar, as opposed to other currencies, the dollar does not go as far and we have to make that up. I am sure the gentleman would not want those cemeteries to be ill-tended.

Mr. DeLAY. I would not want them to be untended, but I do not think we need to raise their budget by 25 percent. It has been doing quite well for a long time.

FEMA's budget was increased 40 percent. I could go on. National Science Foundation by my count will receive almost a 20-percent increase. And I could go on.

Do we need those kinds of increases at the expense of research in space?

In this bill, as we all know, NASA is cut about $217 million. Here are 44 grants, 44 grants and individual projects for Members' districts that amount to $219 million.

So the chairman and the ranking member and the committee, have a tough job. I understand that. And it is tough, because I serve on this committee and I know how tough it is. But I just submit to my colleagues that there are programs and projects in here that I do not think we need.

There are increases in budgets that I do not think we need to be making. Not only will this amendment go a long way to restoring the space station Freedom, it also would help secure this Nation's future as the leader in science and technology, and we have heard enough about that.

I would like to respond to the gentleman from California that the American people do not believe that no gains in science and technology came out of the Apollo Program. I mean, when they pick up their calculators, that was a development that came out of the Apollo Program. They see miniaturized electronics, that was also developed during the Apollo Program. So it is a little disingenuous to say to the American people that we did the Apollo Program just to have somebody walk on the Moon and we did not get anything for it. We did, and we would for the space station.

Today, however, I would like to just compare what the space station means for America to some of the needs many opponents to this amendment express in their statements. I found that many of the principles and ideals opponents

speak of can be found in the space station program.

Opponents of the amendment speak of the need for an increased medical care for veterans, a very admirable program.

But did you know that the life-sciences research aboard space station Freedom will have many health care benefits here on Earth? For example, space research in bone-calcium loss may lead to a cure for osteoporosis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELAY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, space research on white blood cell behavior may lead to a cure for cancer. Further, previous NASA space programs have provided medical advances such as insulin infusion pumps and other medical discoveries. Obviously, medical care, including veterans' medical care, has benefited significantly from the space programs in the past and will continue to prosper under the space station program.

Opponents of the amendment also speak of adding money to perform research on global warming and other environmental projects. We need to do that.

If these Members are really serious about our environment, they would be more than willing to support funding for the space station. Let us look at the facts. Space station Freedom would be a permanent observatory for Earth sciences. Environmental scientists would be able to continually view and study the Earth from a new perspective and characterize change over the next 30 years.

Earth observations from the space station contribute to Mission to Planet Earth providing a better understanding of our ecological system leading to solutions of environmental problems such as air and water pollution, deforestation, greenhouse effect, ozone depletion, and waste and resource management.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is important to put into perspective where these funds would ultimately fall. They will fall on precisely the people opponents of the station wish to help. The space station means increased medical care through medical advancement. The space station means increased environmental protection through extensive research in our planet, and our space station with its associated 50,000 jobs directly associated with the development and construction of the program means fewer Americans will require public support for basic needs like food and housing.

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

Mr. DELAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I would merely like to clarify a statement that I made in which I indicated that the Apollo Program did not produce the pure science. It was the most important advanced technology program in the history of this country, but it was only after we had finished that that we began to make larger investments in the science area per se.

The gentleman is quite correct about the benefits of that program.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the chairman clarifying that. If we would have built the station on the Moon, we would have gotten better science.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of space station Freedom. We in Congress find ourselves shackled by the weight of our own fiscal chains. Congress is faced here with a choice none of us care to make; for we either vote for the spending of the here and now, or spending for the future. This is the challenge before us. Are we content as a people, or do we have the courage to be visionaries? Some will say today that we have more pressing social needs and cannot afford space station Freedom, but I contend that the space station is also a social need. Investing in space gives us real advances in areas such as medicine, the environment and high technology. Previous programs have provided everything from pacemakers, to home insulation and supercomputers. What we are choosing here today is whether to be shortsighted in our thinking and use stopgap measures to heal our social problems, or whether to invest in our economic future. I choose to invest in the future.

To deny space, to turn our backs on the next frontier, is to deny the vision which has made America a nation unparalleled. Let us strike forward as a country. The space station represents our future. We cannot afford to let it die. President Kennedy said space exploration, "is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space." Support the space station. Vote for the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. I will speak to only two or three points, because I have spoken earlier during general debate on some other points, but I would like to speak on one point particularly.

The social and environmental demands of this country and the needs of this country in those areas could use up every dollar in our budget, every one of them, and we would be justified in doing so. But it would be shortsighted, and it would certainly leave out space and defense and infrastructure and a variety of other programs that we must support and fund.

I think that it is important that we recognize that even though this subcommittee is required to prioritize, this Congress is required to prioritize, and certainly space has been one of the high priorities in the past.

The committee, the Committee on Appropriations, required of NASA during the last year and a half to reprogram and to restructure the space station. NASA came in, after significant time and expense, with a reprogrammed, redesigned space station, and almost the moment they came in with the redesign, the rug is being pulled out from under them with no funding whatsoever. To me that is irresponsible. It simply would be, I think, a very, very poor procedure.

Certain levels of credibility must be maintained. We have heard from some here today that love to bash Japan, and I am aware that there are many who do not have a high regard for Japan's trading and partnership, but, nevertheless, the United States normally must carry a certain level of credibility, a certain level of responsibility with all of our trading and all of our partners.

In this case, the Committee on Appropriations unilaterally has canceled the space station. They did not consult the Space Subcommittee. It came as a surprise to us who sit on the committee and have sat for a long time. They did not consult NASA. It came as a surprise to NASA. They did not consult Japan or the European Space Agency or Canada, our very responsible partners in the space station, and to me that is irresponsible, and certainly will not go to develop credibility.

Lastly, several other major projects will be at stake. The SSC, the superconducting super collider, will demand; it simply cannot survive without international partners. The INTER project, the international nuclear thermal experimental reactor; we are in the final stages of siting that, and the United States site is on the verge of being selected. It is perhaps the preferred site. We are only weeks from that being selected with international partners of Germany, Japan, the U.S.S.R.

We jeopardize all of this, because we lose credibility with our international partners and, finally, virtually every State in the Union benefits from our space station project economically.

Legitimately, every one of us, if we find a base, a military facility, listed on the base-closing list in our district or near our district, we legitimately rise in opposition because of the economic problems it will create and the job problems it will create for our districts. Well, certainly the space station will have major economic negatives on each of our States.

Virtually every State in the Union will be significantly affected by it, and thus I think every Member would do well to find out how much the space station and the space program benefits their State.

In fact, it would be a poor vote to vote against the economy of their own States.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the long-term benefit of the space program and particularly the space station.

Again, it is the hub of virtually all we intend to do in the long-term future in space. Let us not remove the centerpiece of all that we want to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

We have had good debate today, arguments for and against continuing with the space program, but I must remind my colleagues that we cannot afford to sell off our future to buy our way through our budgetary problems.

We also have commitments to our future generations. We owe to the scientists and the space explorers of the future the opportunity to pursue careers in space, the opportunity to lead the world in space technology, the opportunity to have imagination as its only limitation.

□ 1500

Our space station Freedom is a powerful inspiration for our young people to excel and to stimulate their interest in math and science and engineering, and at a time in our Nation's history we are searching for new ways to encourage our young people to excel in science and math. Why on Earth would we destroy one of the best lures on these fields?

Space station Freedom is an inspiration to our young people that plays into their dreams and into their homes.

Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues who have argued this is something we cannot afford, I would like to remind those Members that our space program is yielding a 9-to-1 return on our investment. A 9-to-1 return. We fund this program for space exploration and research. What we get from this program, however, are products that give all citizens food products, new materials, new industries. A balanced space program acts as seed money for research and development on projects literally from A to Z that go into the marketplace and that fuel our economy.

Space station Freedom is a vital foundation of our manned space program. It is the largest international cooperative endeavor in science and technology in the entire world. Our reputation as a trustworthy, reliable research partner is on the line today.

This vote, to continue our investment in space station Freedom, is a vote to affirm the United States' leadership in space. To deny funding for the space station could position this Nation to a second-rate role in the explorations of space for the first time in 33 years.

We must create a climate where our youth can pursue careers in science and math. We must commit to our young people to create a world where we expand knowledge, and do not cut it short.

Americans do not deserve a dream deferred or a dream denied. We owe it to ourselves and to the future generations to continue the challenge of a dream fulfilled. Space station Freedom is such a dream. We owe it to future generations to make it a reality.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LLOYD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, the application of our scientific genius to solving real problems here on Earth is essential to our continued economic competitiveness and will result in improving health, and in advancing human dignity and national security.

From the announcement by President Kennedy that we would during the 1960's send Americans to the Moon and return them to Earth, the scientific accomplishments of our manned space effort have resulted in great advances, from goals as vital as achieving dramatic breakthroughs in medicine—such as the pacemaker—and in communications and high computing, to applications as down-to-Earth as ceramic cookware and agricultural practices, and as important to national and personal security as laser-guided missiles and air-traffic safety.

The policy which has led to these advances has been developed over the years by Congress and several administrations. A reversal of the national policies which have given our country a leadership role without any formal hearings on the reversal of that policy by the appropriate legislative committees will not only setback the cause of science, but also the principles of developing public policy through careful decisions by committees with legislative authority.

The amendment continues the agreed upon public policy without the sacrifice of other programs, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment.

(On request of Mr. LAGOMARSINO and by unanimous request, Mrs. LLOYD was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentlewoman for her statement and join her in it.

It seems to me if we are going to maintain the lead that we have had in science and space and technology, that we have to go forward with the space station. It seems ironic to me that it was only like a month ago that in this House we voted 361 to 36 for the authorization of the space station Freedom, and now we are talking about not funding it at all. I think it will be a great step backward. I commend the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. Chairman, when John F. Kennedy declared that America would go to the Moon, he did not justify it in terms of its cost effectiveness. He put it in terms of strengthening American leadership and expanding human horizons.

He did this despite the fact that, in terms of gross national product, the lunar missions were more expensive than space station Freedom will be. Indeed, the lunar missions took up a higher percentage of the Federal budget than the entire NASA budget does now.

The American public knew then, as it does now, that America's destiny is in space. They also know that there is more to space exploration and inhabitance than dollars and cents, and that you cannot put a price on knowledge.

Ironically, one of the prime benefits of our leadership in space has been to propel American leadership in space to a level which has kept us ahead to this day—and can be measured in dollars.

Our space exploration is directly responsible for an aerospace industrial base that currently provides 1.3 million quality jobs, and a $25 billion trade surplus, which is the largest of any sector of our economy.

In addition, many of the spinoffs resulting from our space program have become so commonplace we hardly even think of them. For example, antilock braking systems, insulin distibutors, and other medical devices are generated from NASA products.

Also, our modern computer age began with the space program. Ironically, in this debate on the space station, many of the speeches given by its opponents will be generated on computers that were a direct spinoff of our civilian space program.

Unfortunately, some would ignore the lessons learned from continually stretching our boundaries. Instead, they would allow this Nation to rest on its laurels, forgetting that the rest of the world will not stop if we pause to rest.

But we all know the world will redouble their efforts to surpass us—and they will surpass us.

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, did not look at the Moon rocks from the Apollo mission and wonder if it was worth all the expense for some simple rocks.

I, like the rest of America, saw the greater meaning behind the achieve-

ment. And yes, I basked in the glory of our achievement.

Unfortunately, the opponents of space station Freedom would use the former logic. They would forget that none of this money is spent in space—it is all spent here on Earth enhancing our high-technology lead. They seem to think there is no return on our investment.

Leaving aside the issue of the cost effectiveness, which I believe to be sufficient enough, there are other important points to be made.

For example, virtually every American under the age of 35 can point to a period in their childhood when they were captivated by our space program's endeavors. Most have had dreams of becoming an astronaut.

In addition to the undeniable patriotic and intellectual benefits of this excitement, this is the type of youthful exuberance that inspires thousands of our young people to pursue science, math, and engineering fields.

As we all know, these are the fields that will keep the American economy strong for the next several decades.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I have a few words to my colleagues who are apprehensive that the station is being drawn out and is over budget. I think it is important to realize that the bulk of the responsibility for this lies right here in this Congress.

We have never fully funded this project. We have underfunded and strung out the station and then blamed NASA. I am afraid this is becoming a trend with projects such as this.

The opponents underfund the project and then gleefully report it is over budget and behind schedule. Clearly, this is no way to spend the taxpayer's money.

Mr. Chairman, we can never forget the benefits this Nation reaped from our bold decision to explore outer space.

People are alive today. People are walking today. People are able to help themselves and be gainfully employed today by the spinoffs of NASA.

Whether tangible or intangible, these benefits are real and important.

Now is no time to turn back. We must continue to build on our past successes. The space station is the next step in that process. Support space station Freedom—keep the American dream alive.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Chapman-Lowery amendment, and I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for allowing this important debate to occur.

Those who are opponents and those who have been proponents have a most unusual opportunity here today to be treated fairly, and we know how important this issue is to people, regardless of which side of the issue they are on.

Let me begin by saying that this is really not a vote today about the U.S. commitment to space exploration nor our commitment to NASA.

□ 1510

We all share the commitment. It is really a vote over how best to achieve the finest space and science exploration, the best set of scientific choices, and how best to invest in U.S. competitiveness under very tight budget restraints.

I want to begin with the budget for a second. As the debate unfolds, I am reminded of many old sayings: "Don't nickel and dime something to death," "If it is worth doing, it is worth doing well," and finally, "Only God can do everything."

As I look at the choices available to this committee this coming year and in years hence, I really have to ask myself the hard question of where does the money come from to pay for everything we want to do, including a space station that would work? Last year this Congress almost brought our Nation to a halt as we struggled with the Bush administration to agree upon a tough, binding 5-year budget agreement. That has forced us to make tough choices to meet deficit reduction targets that were hard for all of us, and in terms of this subcommittee what it meant was that we received only a 5-percent budget mark increase for 1992 over last year, not even enough to keep up with inflation.

The reality of this subcommittee's mark was that it was even $1.2 billion less than the administration's request.

So we fell behind even some of the other subcommittees.

So, today we are faced with the results of our own budget actions and last year, right before the election, we all wanted to do what was responsible in terms of the budget. Now the chickens have come home to roost and we cannot turn our backs.

With 50 cents of every dollar now going to pay interest on the national debt, our choices are narrowed, indeed.

If you understand budgets and if you understand their out-year impacts, you will vote against this amendment and for the committee bill.

Now, some exceptions of the budget agreement have, unfortunately, already been allowed to happen. This makes our set of choices in real dollars even more narrow. Specifically, the multibillion-dollar savings and loan bottomless pit has been craftily moved off budget. Yet we must pay the bills.

The Persian Gulf war was moved off budget; and yet we must pay the bills.

We can see coming around the corner another taxpayer bailout of the commerical banking industry, and that will also amount to billions, and we will have to pay the bills.

There is no question in my mind that every single subcommittee and every spending program in Congress will be affected by those future choices. Now, there have been ever-increasing demands on this subcommittee and, as the decade unfolds, they will be even greater. The space station will consume, if it is continued, larger and larger shares of a smaller and smaller pie. A station originally conceived to cost $8 billion is now estimated by NASA to cost $30 billion, by GAO to cost $40 billion and over a 30-year period the experts say it will cost $100 billion, maybe $180 billion.

Now, what does that mean to other sections of the budget? To veterans? How many of you cannot serve the veterans in your districts, how many do you have to turn away, how many of you have to turn away veterans because you cannot get them served by the veterans department of this country?

How about housing? Has housing been closed in your city too? Or how about the National Science Foundation and all of the young minds that need to be educated in this country that we cannot afford to send to college? Or the environment? And I will say more about that in a second.

All are scored by our committee along with NASA.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. KAPTUR was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Let us talk about veterans care. With World War II and Korean veterans now coming into the hospital system, we cannot even afford to buy replacement dentures for World War II veterans who had their teeth pulled by the Government of the United States.

We are turning away class B and C veterans at our clinics and hospitals. We find ourselves in the incredible situation of not being able to schedule veterans for operations even though there are empty beds in hospitals because we do not have enough doctors and nurses to take care of them.

How about homeownership? Someone talked here about our homelessness earlier. Boy, do I want to answer that. Back in the 1980's we saw spending on home ownership and rental programs in this country fall from $35 billion down to $15 billion. In this budget we have only been able to restore it back to $24 billion, over $10 billion less than 10 years ago.

In the 1980's our Nation learned a new vocabulary, the homeless, American citizens sitting on every corner and grate in every major city in this country, and they are still sitting there. Our bill does not completely meet that

need, nor does it meet the needs of the environment. In this bill we only provide $8.5 billion rather than the necessary $30 billion to $100 billion to clean up Superfund sites around this country.

How many of you have Superfund sites in your district that are sitting there, leaking into your water and streams and rivers?

Our bill is already stretched too thin. But we do try to provide for NASA funding that keeps NASA strong. And as we see our astronauts in the space shuttle today, we want to keep them safe and we want to keep them healthy, and the programs that we do fund we want to work. We do not want any more *Challengers* out there. We want to make sure NASA manages its programs well, not stretched so thin, robbing from one program to meet another.

The space science program warrants highest priority funding as the Augustine report reminds us, and it ranks above space station, aerospace planes, manned missions to the planets, and many other pursuits which often receive greater visibility.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the point that the gentlewoman is making as to the impact of this on the veterans programs is something that ought to be strongly emphasized to this group here because, although the amendment does not touch the VA funding and hurt it this year, the station will require $400 million more next year and the year after that it is going to require another quarter-of-a-billion-dollar increase.

Plainly, there is no way that our subcommittee will be able to fund the veterans, as we want, if we have to look forward to those kinds of increases from the space station.

That is why I have letters here—and Members are invited to examine them—from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, AMVETS and Disabled American Veterans, all opposing the Chapman-Lowery amendment and all asking the Members of the House to stay with the subcommittee's recommendations.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for that important clarification. I wanted to say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], two gentlemen for whom I have the highest respect, shows exactly how very thorough our committee's decisions have been. I commend the gentlemen for trying to save the station and for the chairman and ranking member for allowing this debate to occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. KAPTUR was allowed to proceed for 2½ additional minutes.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, their proposal falls far short for several reasons, and let me state those. First of all, most importantly it shortchanges other NASA projects. We are talking about more than nickels and dimes as this decade progresses. The hits on other NASA programs will be devastating, and the hits on other accounts, including veterans, housing, the environment, NSF, and so forth, are also devastating.

The amendment would cause the Earth observation system to be cut by $145 million to a level of $191 million. This program is designed to place instruments in orbit around the Earth in order to study the Earth's weather and pollution patterns. EOS is the centerpiece of the Mission to Planet Earth Program, and it is a major priority of the Augustine Commission. That would be almost killed. The CRAF Cassini Program to study how planets form and evolve would be cut by $183 million to a level of $145 million. And we have talked about the problems a little bit earlier with respect to the European agreement.

□ 1520

The advanced x-ray astrophysics facility would be cut by $110 million, to a level of $101 million, and this is the third of the great observatories. The other two are the Hubble space telescope and the Gamma Ray Observatory, and we know Hubble had a few problems out there.

There would be a $75 million cut in mission operations and data analysis, and space transportation capability development would be cut by $277 million, and that is one of the priorities of the President's report on critical technologies. That program would be cut.

Four hundred eighty-three million dollars would be cut form the space flight control and data communications, and, frankly, that concerned me a lot.

The committee bill makes hard choices about where to invest NASA dollars. Four point five billion dollars for space shuttle production and operation is included, 4 percent more than requested, and that would provide for nine shuttle flights in 1992, and the bill also includes $375 million, 175 more than requested, for continued development of the new advanced solid rocket motor for the shuttle.

The bill also includes money for mantended microgravity free flier research and a study of a separate competitive life science space station.

Let me just say: Vote for space, not the space station.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for just a moment?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken up the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] on his proposition that we ought to look at these letters from the veterans groups. I find at least three of the letters that do not even mention the Chapman-Lowery amendment and are not, in fact, opposed to that. They do want VA funding held harmless. That is, in fact, done by the Chapman-Lowery amendment. So, the letters the Members ought to look at fairly suspiciously.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield? Just let me read one paragraph.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, this one happens to come from the American Legion.

We are aware of at least one proposed amendment which seeks a major reallocation of funds among program activities within the jurisdiction of the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Subcommittee. Although this proposal would not reduce the level of VA appropriations, its approval could seriously endanger veterans program funding as H.R. 2519 moves through the legislative process.

They oppose it, Mr. Chairman. I do not see what can be clearer than that.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] for yielding.

The gentleman must not have listened to me carefully. I said that three of his letters do not have that kind of language in it. He picked the one that did, and it seems to me that we better be very careful about it.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] would yield, let me take the next one to Chairman Traxler from the Paralized Veterans of America.

The amendment will call for a major redistribution of funds within the bill as approved by your Subcommittee and the Full Appropriations Committee. This redistribution will call for a modest increase in veterans' health care funding which is identical to a proposal you will also bring to the Floor. However, the balance of the Chapman/Lowery Amendment, in our opinion, will have serious implications for adequate funding lev-

els for veterans' programs in future years. For this reason, Paralized Veterans of America (PVA) must oppose the Chapman/Lowery Amendment.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment that I think the League of Conservation Voters has written about their concern about this amendment, and their concern was two-pronged. They were afraid that there would be across-the-board cuts in all of the programs under this appropriations bill, thus cutting EPA. That has not happened. So, I think at least half of their concern is addressed.

They were also afraid that there would be cuts in programs that collect earth science data, mission to planet Earth and the Earth-observing program; however, none of these programs are funded below this year's levels, and I would like to mention for those for whom the League of Conservation Voters voice is very important, as it is to me. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment. 1991 has proven to be a momentous year for Congress. From the decision to authorize Operation Desert Storm to the vote on fast track, we have made more pivotal votes this year than in any other in recent history. This vote here will prove to be one of those defining moments in history. We are about to decide whether the United States will have a manned space program. The choice we must now make is whether this country will be the leader in space development or are we willing to pass the baton to Europe or Japan?

There are still those who say, "How can we spend this money in space, when we have so many needs on Earth?" There are three answers to this question. The first is that the money is indeed spent on Earth. NASA's appropriation is not loaded into a rocket's nose cone or the shuttle's cargo bay and shot into orbit. It is spent on the ground, mostly in the United States, on goods and services and real people. The second is, that the product of this spending has paid back dividends far beyond the money invested. The third, and most important answer to the question, is that it's worth doing for its own sake.

The spinoffs from the space program are too numerous to count, and all of you use them. And I am not talking about the ability of our constituents to watch us on C-SPAN. I mean anything involving microminiaturization, minicomputers, reliable microswitches, image enhancers, and remotely controlled manipulators. Because of space-related research, your tires last longer. Firemen can better keep your house from burning down. The returns from the space program have increased our gross national product immensely. The products from space medicine, which could only come from a manned space program, have saved countless lives. The space station will undoubtedly produce new materials, new technology, and new learning. There are the examples that our colleagues have mentioned. Even more exciting, though, are the ones they haven't, because no one can yet imagine what they are. That is why we need a manned station, so that people can discover something new and apply it; whereas a robot would ignore it, because no one would have thought to program the computer to do anything with it.

But the most important reason for establishing a permanent manned presence in low earth orbit is that low earth orbit is the jump-off point for the universe. Once you get to low earth orbit, you are almost halfway to anywhere. This is not hyperbole; of the energy needed to reach the escape velocity of the solar system from the surface of the Earth, 46 percent of it is used in just reaching Earth orbit. To have a rational space program, we need both a means of reaching low Earth orbit, and a permanent presence there. The space station is vitally important if we are to develop and maintain the capability to get further than halfway to anywhere.

The results of this vote will be felt mostly by our children and grandchildren. Bequeathing them a huge national debt. However, I believe that the high payoffs of space development will better provide them the ability to pay off that debt.

If we are short-sighted enough to reject this amendment and kill the manned space station it will not mean the end of humans in space. The profits are such, that others will step into our shoes. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, the question we will answer today is: Will the language of the cosmos be English, or Japanese? Vote for the future. Support the space station.

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

Mr. Chairman, today is judgment day for the space station.

We can provide a space station that has the potential of bringing us the technical advances of tomorrow, or, once again, we can sit back and watch the international community pick off the ball and beat us in an area where the United States has always led.

We must not allow ourselves to become complacent. Keeping our manned space program functioning is of vital importance to U.S. competitiveness in the decades that lie ahead, and the space station is central to building the needed momentum. Cutting the space station will say to the international community that Americans are content being followers. That would be a travesty.

The space station is the scientific laboratory of the future. Thirty years ago we sent astronauts into space. Today, we send doctors and scientists. The advances they will make in medical science, materials research, and biotechnology are boundless.

America's youth is already disinterested in science and math. Cutting the space station will solidify this decline.

By cutting the space station we will be saying to our children that science and math are not a high priority in this country.

The space station will spur the interest of our youth in science. The Apollo missions directly resulted in a new generation of scientists in this country. We need to rekindle this interest in our children so more young people will move into these vital areas by challenging their minds. I can think of nothing more exciting to aspiring scientists than the vision of a space laboratory designed to unlock the mysteries of the universe and produce tangible advances for the human race. Apollo achieved this in the previous generation and I believe the space station will inspire the best and brightest of our youth.

Mr. Chairman, now is not the time to erode our commitment to the space program. A vote for this amendment is a vote for our future. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I rise to oppose the Chapman-Lowery amendment because of the admiration and respect that I have for the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and the chairman of the Space Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], as well as the ranking Republican Members seventh committee and subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] as well as the sponsors and other proponents of space station Freedom and the amendment.

I regret that I must rise in opposition to the amendment because I agree with so many of the points made by its proponents.

I agree with the supporters of space station Freedom when they say we need an aggressive and robust manned space program. We do.

I agree with the Members who say our current dilemma has been caused in large part by appropriators trying to micromanage the space program. I agree that it was wrong to divert most of the money cut from the space station to nonspace programs.

I agree when Members say that we must conduct life science research and microgravity research in space so we

can continue to explore the space frontier.

But Mr. Chairman, I part company with Members when they say that space station Freedom is the best way to move forward into space. Instead of opening the door to space, I believe this project could lock the door.

The amendment proposed today will fund the space station at the expense of many other needed and promising NASA programs. I am sure that the sponsors of the amendment hope that the other body will restore some of these funds. But this amendment is still a significant and ominous development that foreshadows the damage the space station can do to critically important space programs.

Next year, when NASA requests another $3 billion for the space station, more NASA programs will be sacrificed. And as long as the allocation is tight—and it will be tight for the rest of the decade—NASA will slowly starve basic science, R&D projects, and every other part of the agency in order to fund the space station.

The choice could not be more clear. The choice is between the space station and a balanced, aggressive space program. The current design of the station may well be capable of performing its trauncated mission—but at what cost? The facts developed by the GAO indicate it will become a budgetary black hole in space.

The space station was originally conceived to handle a myriad of tasks, including as a staging area to go to the moon. But it will not do that any more. Its mission is scracely more ambitious than that of our first space station—Skylab—but the cost is many times that of Skylab.

Rather than being fixated on this specific piece of hardware, we should focus on the mission that space station Freedom is supposed to perform—microgravity and life science research. There are a host of options to achieve that mission.

A few weeks ago this house adopted my amendment to the NASA authorization bill to have the National Academy of Sciences evaluate these options. I believe that some of these options will allow us to accomplish the same objectives as space station Freedom and at a lower cost.

If we build spacecraft based on the recommendation of that study we will achieve all of the objectives space station Freedom supporters claim are the other reasons, the nonscientific reasons, to build Freedom. We will maintain our space industry. We will provide America with a manned presence in space, and we will create the same amount of enthusiasm among school children and all of America.

As currently designed, the space station will not inspire Americans. It will frustrate them and further erode their confidence in NASA's ability to maintain this Nation's lead in space exploration. Shuttle delays, the very real chance of another *Challenger*-type disaster, and endless cost increases will severely diminish America's spirit for space exploration.

I urge my colleagues to act now rather than later. Vote against the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, in the 1960's, millions of Americans thrilled at the news of Alan Shepard's ride in space, and the triumph of JOHN GLENN touched us all with its daring, its mission, and its excellence. And those early victories set a breathtaking pace over the past 25 years. We recognize that the costs and risks of manned space flight have only increased over time—but as the challenge has grown, so have the rewards.

John Kennedy spoke of these things in Houston in 1962:

> The exploration of space will go ahead, whether we join in it or not, and it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space. * * * We mean to be a part of it—we mean to lead it.

President Kennedy's words still ring true today as we decide whether to forge ahead with a manned space station. This decision will affect our Nation's space program well into the next century.

For our Nation, killing the space station means stopping the manned space program dead in its tracks. Space station Freedom is the linchpin of man's future in space. The medical research that will occur in a weightless environment may very well lead to the cure for cancer. Some of our best scientists believe we can build a more powerful computer chip in space than can be produced on Earth. Though the station's mission has narrowed over the years, its potential for reward has not. The station will provide an unparalleled environment and laboratory for microgravity and life-sciences research, offering the chance for great advances in the medical, biological, and metallurgical fields.

Many products and processes that future generations will take for granted will be developed aboard the space station in our lifetime. Like all our previous efforts in space, the space station will yield countless benefits that we cannot imagine today.

Our trading partners understand the space station's potential—the Japanese, the Canadians, the Europeans are all preparing to follow our leadership. Without space station Freedom, they will surely look elsewhere. They will also move ahead of us in this fierce competition for the future. Indeed, Japan has already announced that if the Congress kills the space station, the chances for future joint science efforts are slim; their government may refuse to contribute billions of dollars to other United States-led science projects.

Last fall, Congress directed NASA to redesign the space station. NASA has complied with that direction and the new design deserves our support. Killing this program after 8 years of effort, 8 years of international cooperation and four billion dollars of investment would be an act of bad judgment and bad faith on the part of this Congress. To shift gears now, to reverse directions, to stop the advancement of manned space flight, will set the space program back for decades.

My 13-year-old daughter, Caroline, wants to be an astronomer when she grows up. She and other children like her have thrilled to the story that has been written over the years by America's space program. Space station Freedom holds the promise to future generations to aspire to become the scientists, engineers, astronauts, and explorers of the future.

Our generation faces a responsibility and a great challenge. We can keep America No. 1 in space competition; we can continue to lead other nations; or we can step aside and follow. The choice is a clear one. This Congress holds the fate of the space program—and the future—in its hands. The challenge before us, in the weeks and months and years ahead, is to make sure that all Americans can share in the dreams and promises of our country's space program, ensuring that it does remain one of the great adventures of all time.

□ 1540

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to restore funding for the space station Freedom. In discussing the space station, there have been many references, obviously, to the future. But in the immortal words of the late Redskins coach, George Allen, "The future is now."

We could speak of space exploration 35 years ago as a concept in futurology. But in 1991, we have already made the leap into space. Now that we have made the leap, we need some place to stand, and the space station Freedom is the place we need.

We should continue funding the space station in the interest of enhancing our competitiveness, as another means of extending our world leadership, and, yes, to expand our scientific knowledge.

The space station Freedom represents our efforts to remain competitive in an ever-changing world. There is a growing realization in the Congress of the importance of American competitiveness. As a matter of fact, ear-

lier this week the Speaker and I testified before the Committee on Ways and Means, which is to begin a whole series of hearings on the subject.

Remaining competitive means having a vision beyond next week. It means the ability to see beyond present requirements to meet future needs.

What about world leadership? Jean-Marie Luton, the director general of the European Space Agency, has outlined in a letter to Vice President DAN QUAYLE the importance of this issue to our friends in Europe, when he wrote,

The Space Station Project commands importance at the highest political levels in Europe, and, based on the United States' assurances following President Reagan's invitation to join the project, has been made a cornerstone of the European Space Agency long-term space plan.

Summarily cutting the space station has implications far beyond our own borders, obviously. This space station represents our responsibilities in the present and in the future.

Finally, the space station Freedom expands our scientific knowledge. As William Lenoir, the Associate Administrator for Space Flight at NASA, wrote me in his letter, "The Manned Space Flight Program remaining without space station Freedom would be reminiscent of the post-Apollo era, when the United States essentially took a decade off."

Mr. Chairman, the space station Freedom is important for our world leadership, competitiveness, and scientific discovery. As one of the ancients said, "Give me a place to stand, and I will move the Earth."

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to give the United States a place to stand in space, so that we can continue to move our country in the direction of always expanding the horizons of our knowledge.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. I will not talk extensively about the space aspects. There are divisions within. My own inclination would be to support the other science projects, and less so the space station. We are told that this is a very important project for our world leadership, and if we do not do it, we will cede leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I am not aware that any other country was planning a space station. If leadership went to that country that had a space station, I assume there would be somebody else planning to build one, and that is how we would lose the leadership.

But I want to talk about the housing aspect, because I do not think Members ought to kid themselves into thinking that this is a decision that can be made without consequences. The consequences are clear in this amendment in this form, and there may be other ways to do it, but this amendment in this form says to the poorest of the poor, you shall have less police protection than you would otherwise have.

It says to the poorest of the poor, your living conditions will be worse than they otherwise would be, because it proposes a 10-percent reduction in the appropriation for the operating subsidies for public housing.

Yes, there is a fencing here. The fencing is a way to deal with the budget and move some money that would be obligated in the last 10 days and not spent until the first 10 days from outlay category to budget authority category.

I wish we did not have to have some of these budget gimmicks. But understand one thing, and anyone concerned with housing and any of the committee staffs will tell you this: that is real money. We are talking about $250 million, which if the committee bill passes as is, is available for the living conditions in public housing of the poorest of the poor, from 2-year-olds to the elderly.

If the amendment passes, they lose that $250 million. We are not talking budget gimmicks, we are not talking anything other than reality. Yes, it is above the authorization. I am on the authorizing committee. We have gotten to a stage where authorizations have not been dealt with as if they were holy writ.

When we got to the end of the conference last year with our good friends over there and people from HUD and people from OMB, we agreed to that. There are a lot of things I would have agreed to to get a good housing bill out.

But now we come to the reality this year, what do we need? Here is what operating subsidies pay for: basic maintenance, garbage collection, police. We are talking here about the essential services for public housing. The amendment says there shall be 10-percent less than the committee talked about for the day-to-day lives of the people who live in public housing.

People say, well, public housing is not that great.

Right. So let us make it worse. Let us pass an amendment, which not in intent, but in effect, will degrade further the people who live in the most degraded conditions in our society. Cut $250 million out of the money that goes to keep the poorest of the poor protected, heated, keeping their environment somewhat free.

They all talk about our future. A future in which 2-, 3-, 4-, 10-, 12-, 14-year-olds in public housing live in worse circumstances rather than better, is not the kind of future that a world's leader ought to be aspiring to.

These are questions about the division within NASA. I think science is better served by the subcommittee's proposal. But whatever your position on this, it is indisputable, the chairman of the authorizing committee is here, the people from the appropriations subcommittee. There was some confusion. I understand there was confusion, legitimate confusion. But this is indisputable. We are talking about a real cut. We are talking about the people who live in public housing.

Why do these people live in public housing? Because they can live nowhere else. They live in housing that most of us are appalled to think about sometimes, because it is the best they can get. For the money they have in this society, that is all they can find. And the question is, shall we try to improve it a little bit, and I guess that is not even the question. The question is, under the subcommittee bill, shall we try to stave off degradation a little further? Because that is what we are talking about.

□ 1550

We are talking about a desperate effort to prevent the poorest of our fellow citizens from being further degraded. Yes, there are other goals to think about.

People talk about lightweight eyeglasses, and I like lightweight eyeglasses. But when a 3-year-old is confronted with living in the situation in which broken glass litters every place he or she goes and in which animal waste is all over the place, in which elevators do not work and endanger his or her safety, then if I had to make the plastic glasses wait a little bit, I would wait a little bit. I do not think that is a necessary choice, if we do the science right.

We are told we have to make hard choices, and then Members try to avoid it by saying, we can have it all. We can have the space station and it is only just games. It will not hurt the people in public housing. Do not, Mr. Chairman, fool ourselves that way. There is an absolute undeniable reality here.

The $250 million we are talking about comes from public housing operating subsidies, the basic maintenance, police, heating, the day-to-day physical living conditions of people in public housing. We are not even talking about quality of life, because we do not give them that. We are not talking quality; we are talking bare necessities.

Ride past the public housing authority on your way home and vote for this amendment and congratulate yourself on voting to reduce by $250 million the amount that is available to keep these people in decent living conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], has expired.

(On request of Mr. GONZALEZ, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the authorizing committee.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and join him.

I merely wish to add my voice to that of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. I think he has stated it better than I can. I do want only to say that I was here when the letter from the Secretary of HUD was read. I want to disabuse any Member's mind if he was impressed by that letter. The Secretary has never been for public housing.

When he was a Member of this House, his vote, the RECORD will show, never supported us on the authorization committee, on the requests that we were recommending for housing and public housing.

I have been on this Subcommittee on Housing the 30 years I have been here. And of course, I was here all during the term of office of the Secretary of HUD while he was a Member.

Last year he would have eliminated public housing. In fact, it was not until we got to the conference committee and it was only because I had a sort of a sit-down strike in the middle of the conference that the present structure that has been in place for 44 years was saved, because the Senate conferees had been convinced by this same Secretary that what they were doing was not going to do anything but destroy public housing structure such as we have known it, which is intricate. The financing mechanism behind it is intricate, and we would have lost that with no substitute ever, ever offered by the Secretary of HUD.

What he has done is to come and fight for projects that are costing $164,000 a unit, such as the Kennilworth project here in Washington, DC, in the name of what? Tenant management and home ownership by the poorest of the poor, if my colleagues can visualize that.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleagues, Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. LOWERY. I have followed the debate earlier today on this issue and have had substantial discussions and correspondence with experts in public housing and budget and have found that the arguments made for removing $250 million from operating subsidies necessary for the viability of the nation's public housing stock are patently incorrect.

The choice before us is to provide $250 million for the space station at the expense of thousands of low-income families who reside in public housing. It is an unfortunate circumstance that this laudable NASA project is pitted against the needs of the poor and the elderly in this country. But's let's face it: That's the decision before us today. We cannot be fooled by the myth that had been set forth today to suggest that the $250 million is not real money that would be available for the operation and maintenance of our distressed public housing stock.

I personally spent all yesterday afternoon and this morning researching this matter. I even questioned whether or not this is funny money. My unequivocal conclusion after discussion with the Budget Committee, Congressional Budget Office, Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials, the National Low Income Housing Coalition and several other organizations expert in either public housing or budget is that the so-called fenced funds will actually be available and spent by those public housing agencies that are in need of an adequate level of operating assistance.

The manner in which these funds are provided is somewhat complicated. Here again Mr. Chairman, the budget process that has now become sacrosanct drives us to these kinds of appropriation devices. It's very simple. Since many of the public housing authorities have fiscal years beginning in October it is possible and reasonable to provide their operating assistance funds late in the fiscal year and thus reduce a budgetary outlay impact for a given fiscal year. By fencing the funds the Appropriation Committee has simply recognized that the actual outlays from the amounts appropriated will not occur until 1993.

Now I would like to address the issue of whether these funds are actually needed or not. It is true that the amounts involved exceed the amounts authorized and the amounts requested by the administration. It is not true, however, nor was it ever true that those amounts were recognized as adequate to meet the full funding requirements for operating subsidies. The performance funding system [PFS] formula has traditionally understated the actual need, for whatever the reasons, some of which have been pointed out today. The Appropriations Committee has always been relied upon to provide for the full amount required. That amount is $2.406 billion, as provided in the committee reported bill. Reduce this amount and you are going to cut short the needs of the thousands of public housing agencies and the poor tenants. It is ironic to me that HUD Secretary Kemp should run around the country extolling the virtues of other programs against the public housing programs—which he says are falling apart—and then turns around and sends a letter that suggests we should deny the funds to fix it.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and not do further damage to the already distressed public housing agencies.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I do support this amendment. I support it because I support man's exploration of space, and I support the space station. I want to approach this portion of the debate with a question from a slightly different perspective.

That question is, who makes policy for this country? I think each one of us would say, "The Congress of the United States makes policy for this country." I think this bill would indicate that there is a qualifier on that answer. The Congress of the United States makes policy for this country except when the Appropriations Committe disagrees with the policy.

I invite my colleagues to look at two specific aspects of this bill. Just for a moment take a look at section 519. My colleagues all remember last year when we passed a piece of legislation that said every executive agency shall have a chief financial officer. This bill says that VA, HUD, and the independent agencies, they could have a chief financial officer but they cannot pay him. They cannot use funds appropriated in this bill to carry out the purposes of that act.

Then, of course, we know what it does to the policy that we have related to man's exploration of space and to the space station. For 30 some years, this Congress and the successive administrations have said it is our policy to have a manned effort in space. For a decade this Congress, the administration, and subsequently 13 other countries have said it is our policy to explore space from a manned space station. Hundreds if not thousands of hearings, dozens if not hundreds of witnesses, consultation with allies, consultation with the administration, plans, thoughts, debates here on the floor, all have gone into making up that policy.

With the stroke of a pen, a subcommittee of a committee of this House says, we are changing the policy. No hearings, no witnesses, no testimony, no consultations, no concern about the impact this is going to have on 13 countries that have said we want to go into space with you, none of those things. Just simply it is time to change policy.

It may be, but if it is, let us find out. Let us let those who would change the policy introduce a bill. It will be assigned to several committees, including Science, Space, and Technology. The gentleman from Texas who chairs the Space Subcommittee will hold hearings. The gentleman from California who chairs the full committee will hold hearings. We will have a chance to discuss it.

We will have a chance to review what the policy is now. We will have a chance to see what its impact is on this country and on our economy. We will have a chance to see what changes in policy would be, what the impact of that would be on 13 other nations who are with us. We can come to the floor. We can debate, and we can decide whether we are going to stick with the policy we have or change it.

I am sorry. I do not think that 2 or 3 or 4 hours of debate on the floor during an Appropriations Committee with about 10 day's worth of opportunity to consider what this appropriations bill would do to us is sufficient for us to change 30 years of American policy. So

I would say, if my colleagues love space and they love the space station, please support this amendment. If they do not care about space, if they do not care about the space station but they care about their prerogatives, as a Member of this body, and if they care about the process that we ought to follow in establishing the policy for this country, support this amendment.

This amendment is about more than space. It is about the way we run this country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF FLORIDA TO THE AMENDMENTS EN BLOC, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. CHAPMAN

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendments en bloc, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Florida to the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by Mr. CHAPMAN: Strike everything after the word "page" on line 1 of the amendment beginning with the number "7" through the word "page" preceding the number "64".

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the essence of this amendment is simple. It cuts the reallocation or the reprogramming of the $217 million out of the $250 million that was taken out of HUD that was given to NASA for space station purposes. The other $33 million never went to NASA, so we do not have to cut those figures. It cuts all of that. It leaves the last paragraph of the amendment, which says, "Funds provided in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be used for the same amount, purposes and programs as are provided for fiscal year 1991," et cetera, "under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee."

□ 1600

This, Mr. Chairman, gets us to the gravamen of this argument. Do you want the space station or not, and cutting away the complicating factor of moving money out of the jurisdiction of this committee which funds some of the most important things we do in this country? That is all.

We should not fall victim to the problems we created ourselves in last year's budget summit agreement. Guns for butter is no longer an economic theory with any relevance with regard to the budget process in this country. You can no longer decide to reduce guns and increase butter.

You now want to fund space station? Cut the poor, cut the elderly, cut children, cut the veterans. That is wrong. We are falling prey in this amendment to the very thing many of us did not like about the budget summit agreement, and what I do by virtue of this amendment, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, is to offer you the pure choice.

I come from Florida. The space station will probably have a significant context in Florida. Cape Canaveral is in Florida. I, like many others in many other States, have a significant interest in this. And I, like others in this Congress, have been happy that we have explored space and have reaped benefits that have been immeasurable in terms of what we have done over the years.

But we never, never had to make choices that were directly to disconnect other portions of the population to fund scientific research like we are being asked to do now. We never had that before. We never were faced with the choice of reducing food programs or social programs that were of significant importance to do this.

And so I am asking you to make a decision in your own minds that you are going to vote for the space station or not vote for it based solely upon the rightness or wrongness of having the space station.

We are decomplicating this process by removing the transfer of the money from the HUD housing program. NASA would then be authorized with the language in my amendment which basically leaves the last paragraph of the Chapman language as his amendment; NASA would be authorized to fund the space station project for 1992 up to $109 billion which was the 1991 allocation. That means that space station would go ahead. NASA would have to find the money within its own budget as the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] and the rest of the committee have decided that their budget should be. It is that simple.

We now take the appropriations level, give it to NASA and say, "That is what you get. If you wish to use some money for the space station, go right ahead."

My colleagues, I will yield when I am finished.

But, my colleagues, be cautioned about one thing, and I mean to do it with this amendment, this will then hold accountable the people at NASA to making the toughest choices, not for us to have to make a choice between cutting off housing programs and the space station, but NASA now having to decide whether they want to possibly compromise basic research, scientific programs, all of their other programs, by utilizing the money only that they are getting from the Committee on Appropriations which did not give them any money for the space station.

I will now say quite honestly that that will make them next year, frankly, very, very—well, there will be a lot of trepidation when they come in here, because both the authorizing committee and the appropriations subcommittee are going to be looking very seriously at the choices they made and what use they made of their own money and, frankly, whether or not they compromised the other programs that they came in and asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and his subcommittee to fund, because they were so important, because they put money into the space program.

That is the choice.

We have a policy in this country of wanting to pursue space and a space station.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Florida was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that policy we entrusted to the people who run NASA.

I do not know that we should tinker with it, but they have to be held strictly accountable.

This amendment will allow for them to make the toughest choices this year. They are going to have to choose their priorities very carefully, and when they come back in here next year, it is all going to be laid out on the record: "Did you compromise the rest of your programs because you chose to go into the space station, or were you able to accommodate all you wanted to do?" Those questions will have to be answered by them, and I believe that is the right time.

I have one more sentence, and I will finish.

But I will tell you this: This is very important, because we will no longer be asking ourselves to go across to somebody else's backyard and take out money which is directly responsible for the upgrading of the condition of the human life in this country.

I will not vote for the Chapman-Lowery amendment without this amendment. I personally will not, because I will not ever condone going into the kinds of programs like housing and asking them to sacrifice.

We are going to worry about foreign countries and our commitments to them when we are removing our commitment to our own constituents, to the humble, the poor, the young in this country by taking money out of their budget to fund the space station? Not me. Perhaps some of you. Not me.

I urge you to vote for this and give yourselves a true, true test of whether the space station is right or wrong for the country by voting only on NASA without the complicating factor of anything else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. GREEN of New York and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Florida was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, just so we all understand what it is the gentleman is doing, essentially

what he is doing is preserving only the last paragraph of the amendment on page 2?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GREEN of New York. The result is, therefore, the $217 million which is now coming out of the public housing operating subsidy would, instead, come out of NASA?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. That is correct.

Mr. GREEN of New York. And therefore, in addition to the level of cuts which the proponents of the amendment are proposing would have to occur in other NASA programs, there would have to be a still further $217 million cut in order to fund the space station?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. No. They have the right to fund up to $1.9 billion for the space station. They may choose not to and not have to cut any other programs. It does not represent a cut.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Maybe I will make some comments on my own.

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that was quite a last sentence that the gentleman had.

I need the gentleman to clarify one thing though. Earlier the House adopted, or the Committee adopted, the Traxler amendment which included $33 million in additional funds for veterans' medical care. Does the gentleman's amendment affect that $33 million?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Not at all, because the Chapman amendment never dealt with that $33 million as it relates to NASA, and the last paragraph being preserved only relates to NASA.

Mr. RHODES. So the Traxler amendment is not affected by what you do?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. No. I do not believe so.

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, if I read it correctly, your amendment now reads that NASA must use the funds within this bill in the same amounts and for the same purposes and programs as fiscal 1991? Is that right?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Funds provided; yes. That is correct. That is in the Chapman amendment already.

Mr. WALKER. Yes. I know. But the Chapman amendment also included some other language which was fairly important that the gentleman strikes, and let me explain to the gentleman, because I believe he is trying to be helpful, and I think he could end up hurting us badly.

Last year we spent $1.209 billion for the TDRSS program, but that pays it off. There is only about $32 million that needs to be spent this year.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I know where the gentleman is going. There is no other language in the Chapman bill except the reallocation of dollar amounts. There is no other language in the Chapman amendment.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, that is not true. In the Chapman amendment, what we do is we take that money and assure that that money does not have to be spent in that location this time, and by the gentleman's amendment, the way he has worded, we are literally going to waste $1.2 billion. It is going to be spent for something we do not need to spend the money for.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Let me reclaim my time again. The gentleman must understand that I have taken the language that already existed in the Chapman amendment. There was no qualification of that language with any other language in here notwithstanding what the gentleman intends to intimate; that is not the case. The language in the bill, or in the amendment, and if the gentleman wishes to seek his own time, go right ahead, but the bottom line is that none of the language in the Chapman-Lowery amendment qualified the language in the last paragraph of said amendment which is the paragraph that I have preserved as the only part of the amendment.

□ 1610

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of space station Freedom and the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

More than a generation ago, our country committed itself to the manned exploration of space. The record established by NASA in pursuit of that goal has been a highly successful one—not flawless—no great efforts are—but the record has been one of steady progress and ever-greater abilities to reach out into the heavens.

Today we stand on the edge of a decision that would mark America's retreat from global scientific leadership and an abandonment of the challenge of manned-space exploration. I ask the Members of this House to carefully consider the implications of endorsing this retreat.

The space station is the cornerstone of our manned-space program. Ending this program would mark the end of this effort, an abandonment of the challenge of manned-space exploration.

Further, the space station is not only the cornerstone of America's manned-space program, but in a very real sense it is the cornerstone of the Earth's space program. Fifteen nations have joined the United States in the space station project—Japan, Canada, and the 13 member states of the European Space Agency. Each of them looks to the United States for leadership and vision, and together they have committed bills in support of this project because they believe in it and in our ability to deliver on our promises.

For 3 years, the United States negotiated with these partners to establish the space station Freedom agreement—an agreement that carves up roles and guarantees that the burdens of this bold initiative will be shared. The result has been a complex web of commitments and understandings in which our partners have agreed to provide nearly $10 billion in support. The space station Freedom agreement was made between governments and has the force of a treaty; unilaterally abrogating that treaty will carry serious and long-lived consequences for our ability to establish new cooperative scientific initiatives.

If we back out of this important project, other nations will justifiably conclude that the United States is incapable of keeping long-term commitments and that the United States lacks the vision and will needed for effective leadership.

If we terminate the space station program, at a time of growing international and scientific interdependence, at a time when our greatest challenges require international partnerships, we will destroy the basis of trust upon which those other initiatives must be forged.

There are a wide range of scientific problems that can only be effectively addressed within the context of international cooperation. The health and prosperity of our planet, as well as that of future generations of Americans, hinges upon our ability to work productively with other nations to resolve these problems.

Research on global environmental change, sustainable energy development, agriculture, and biological diversity, to cite just a few examples, all require international partnerships sharing costs and knowledge. America's central role in weaving together these partnerships will be lost if the space station is unceremoniously terminated.

Leadership in world affairs is a fragile quality. It doesn't simply fall to the nation that has the most money or the largest armies. It rests as much on perceptions of will, steadiness, vision, and trust as on material strength. Killing the space station, without addressing our partners' concerns, without exploring alternatives for our manned-space program, will be perceived by others as an abandonment of leadership by the United States.

Leadership abandoned is leadership lost. Once lost, we will have to redouble our efforts to rebuild trust, to recraft a policy vision that others can

subscribe to, and reclaim our carelessly discarded mantle.

If ever there was a policy that could be described as penny wise and pound foolish, terminating the space station it is, because it will be nearly impossible to find partners willing to tie their scientific fates to our efforts in other scientific fields—leaving it up to America to bear higher costs and make less progress on global scientific challenges than if we could convince others to share the burdens of scientific and technological exploration.

For all these reasons, vote to restore funding for the space station, vote in support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says if we do not build a space station we will be ceding leadership to someone else. Who is the other country that will then build the space station?

Mr. BOEHLERT. We have heard testimony in our committee, just this week, from international partners from the European Space Agency. We know that they are anxious to pursue it, and I think there is the possibility of pursuing it with the Soviet Union.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The Soviet Union is going to build a space station?

Mr. BOEHLERT. There is a possibility that the Soviet Union will pursue it.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Smith amendment to the Chapman amendment terminate now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there object into the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, we are talking only about the Smith amendment, not about the Chapman amendment.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in fair play, we have been waiting here 3½ hours, and we have been waiting our time. I understand where the gentleman is coming from. However, we have been waiting 3½ hours, and it is the same group debating the same bill. That is not fair to the House. We have something to say, and we wish to be heard.

Therefore, I object.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would allow me to explain this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from New Jersey has the time under his reservation, and he may yield as he wishes.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the distinguished chairman that I share his concern over time. My request only relates to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH]. We will deal with time on Chapman at a later point in this discussion.

After the Smith matter, after appropriate Members have a chance to continue the debate on Chapman, we may or may not consider limiting debate. My request is only on the Smith amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, what is the gentleman's proposal?

Mr. TRAXLER. My proposal in the Smith amendment is that we terminate debate now and vote on it.

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

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the only problem I have with the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] is the fact that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] would not yield while we were trying to explore some technical problems that I think we have.

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

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to stay all night. We have scores of other amendments coming after we finish NASA, and we can have a late dinner here.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] withdraws his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the Smith amendment as well as to the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

I have great respect for the authors of these amendments and acknowledge that the issue they present is, in fact, a very difficult one. Moreover, it is frankly very awkward to find that in my first year as a subcommittee chairman on the Science Committee, I must oppose an amendment which will be supported by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], who is serving his first year as chairman of the full committee. I serve on the Science Committee in large measure because of my enormous respect both for my chairman's approach to science and technology issues and for the manner in which he leads our committee. However, on the difficult issue of the future of the space station—a decision on which there are honest differences in judgment—I must come down on the side of those space scientists who believe that the space station will actually undermine, rather than strengthen, our Nation's space program. Months, and in many cases, years ago—long before the bill before us today focused our attention on this issue—these scientists told us that the station was an ill-conceived program which would make the achievement of our objectives in space far more difficult and enormously more costly.

The fact is that in this year's budget, the station is simply not an effective expenditure of the funding that this Nation has available for space, science, and technology. We should not kid ourselves into thinking that by saving the space station in the House today, we will somehow be able to fund both the station and NASA's science programs in the appropriations conference. The fact of the matter is that the amounts available to the Senate to fund the programs in this bill are no larger than the amounts available to the House.

In this connection, it should be noted that, in order to make room for the space station in this year's bill, the Chapman-Lowery amendment guts not only NASA's space science programs, but also calls for a reduction of over $200 million in housing programs. Let there be no mistake that by preserving the space station this year, the impact of cuts in future years for programs in housing, veterans benefits, and environmental protection will be much more severe.

I salute the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] for offering us the clear-cut choice that their amendment presents: Funding the space station or funding a host of other valuable scientific programs within NASA. In my view, we should follow the lead established by the scientific community itself.

The incontrovertible fact is that the space station is not good science. Dr. Nicolaas Bloemberger, president of the American Physical Society, has stated that canceling the space station would have "the overwhelming support not only of physicists but of the entire scientific community". Dr. Tom Donahue, professor at the University of Michigan and former head of the space studies board of the National Academy of Sciences, has stated that "The space station has negligible scientific capability". The President's own science adviser agrees with this assessment. So do a host of respected scientific associations including the American Geophysical Union, the American Physical Society, and the Association of Scientific Society Presidents. In my view and theirs, the space station is more akin to a jobs program for the aerospace industry than a scientific endeavor.

In light of these facts, we should not regard the termination of the space station as a crisis, but as an opportunity to advance the credibility of the space program, both within the scientific community and the public at

large. We must remember that the space station is not the same thing as the space program. In fact, terminating the station now is a necessary first step in reassessing NASA's priorities, reforming its management, and re-establishing its credibility in the eyes of the taxpaying public.

Termination of the station will enable NASA to pursue the sensible agenda laid out for it earlier this year by the advisory committee on the future of the U.S. Space Program: The first priority should be space science; second, the study of the Earth from space; and third, to the extent that it is affordable, manned exploration of the solar system. Those are the correct priorities, and there can be little doubt that there are far more cost-effective means than the space station of pursuing the third priority. For example, we should begin now to join the U.S.S.R. in a common effort, using the Soviet space station Mir and the shuttle, to understand the effects of long-duration flight at low gravity on human beings.

NASA's reputation and productivity have been hurt in recent years by its tendency to reach beyond its capability to deliver. By focusing NASA's work on what is achievable—a sound science program, a well-designed mission to planet Earth, and a cost-effective manned space program—the Nation's space program will be far healthier in the long run. By keeping a space station program which serves no useful scientific purpose, NASA will only compromise its ability to do what it needs to do well.

I will not dwell today on the cost of the space station, even though there has been much discussion in recent weeks about whether the space station costs $30 billion for 10 years, or somewhere between $110 and $180 billion for 30 years.

Whatever the true costs of the station, they are reflective of a broader debate on the appropriate mix of big versus small scientific projects. The station—a big science project in the worst sense—will squeeze out a variety of small science projects far more valuable to the scientific endeavor, and particularly to the training of the next generation of American scientists.

Why is the funding of small science so critical? It is primarily because small science projects—conceived, designed, and conducted by benchtop scientists—are carried out in universities rather than in Government laboratories or aerospace companies. As a result, small science is critical to the development of the next generation of scientists, including women and minority scientists. Without an adequate small science base, the research infrastructure of our Nation's colleges and universities will wither, compromising not only the development of future scientists, but also the general education of all our college and university students.

There are other equally compelling arguments for protecting small science from the voracious appetite of the big science projects. Small science is flexible—it is easier to shift direction as results dictate—and it is effective—nearly all Nobel laureates work in small science. And small science does lead to technological advances as readily, or more readily, than does big science. The transistor, antibiotics, TV and VCR's, the computer, lasers, monoclonal antibodies, and CD's did not come from big science.

These big-science-versus-small-science arguments are anything but academic. If the proposed cut in the space station stands, there will be more funding available in future years for a number of small science initiatives both at NASA and at other agencies funded by this bill, including the National Science Foundation and the Environmental Protection Agency.

While I do not oppose every big science initiative, I do think that we have reached the point where funding for big science is severely affecting our ability to proceed with scientific programs far more critical to our Nation. In the face of an array of proposed science projects, each of which costs billions or even tens of billions of dollars, we must be wise enough to choose to proceed with the ones that are truly critical to the Nation's future. As the Office of Technology Assessment concluded in its recent assessment entitled "Federally Funded Research": "Not all [science megaprojects] may be supportable without eroding funding for the science base."

In conclusion, I would like to address those who would say that terminating the space station would signal an end to this Nation's willingness to inspire, to explore, and to undertake and succeed in high-risk ventures. I would remind my colleagues that, while the manned space program has been a source of pride to all Americans, there are many other dramas in science and technology which could excite a nation and inspire generations of new scientists. Just last week, I had the opportunity to visit Dr. Francis Collins, the University of Michigan researcher who discovered the cystic fibrosis gene in 1989. Dr. Collins' saga of creativity and persistence is a tribute to the highest fruits of our science and technology, a masterpiece of detective work that will save thousands and thousands of lives. It is a story that should inspire a nation far more than building a space station that serves no discernable scientific purpose.

This Nation faces a host of problems—in medicine, in the environment, in the provision of safe, efficient energy—that will demand the best efforts of all of our people. How many other promising young scientists like Dr. Collins could be supported if we had the wisdom to direct our limited resources to those activities which are truly focused on expanding the base of human scientific knowledge?

□ 1620

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to read a portion of a letter I have received from a distinguished space scientist that I believe reflects a very large body of scientific opinion:

> If the decision to terminate the space station is sustained, continued progress will occur in many different, important NASA R&D programs. These include the vital Earth Observing System, (EOS) component of Mission to Planet Earth, several major space exploration programs, including Cassini/CRAF, the Space Infrared Telescope Facility (SIRTF), and the Advanced X-Ray Astrophysics Facility (AXAF), and a wide range of smaller R&D activities. If, however, the decision is made to fund the space station program within current stringent budget guidelines, it is clear that there will be major reductions in these R&D activities. Such unprecedented reductions would decimate NASA's research program and have disastrous impacts on this nation's ability to pursue its space science program.
>
> If it is leadership in space that is needed, then provide it through projects that have a direct benefit to the technical and practical needs of this nation. Don't dissipate our precious funds on technology that leads nowhere in terms of our long term objectives in space. The termination of the space station program is not the end of manned space flight. Instead, it provides important refocussing into more productive areas related to use of the space shuttle and preparations for manned exploration of the Moon and Mars.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment before this House.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the expression of respect that the gentleman has indicated for me, and I share that with respect to him. I have high respect for the gentleman.

Despite that, we both disagree with each other once in a while. But we do not disagree about the importance of science. We are thoroughly in agreement on that. But the gentleman has set the standard that the scientists should have the prevailing voice with regard to the space station. I can tell the gentleman, through 25 years of experience, that the scientists have never supported, as a majority, manned space flight, and they do not today, and their criticism is quite right: It does not produce as much science as they would like.

The scientists also assert that they need at least 100 percent more money to fund basic research.

Does the gentleman think that that is a reasonable judgment, that we should also carry out?

Mr. WOLPE. As the gentleman from California knows, I have made the same kind of observations to the scientific community about the need for them to also prioritizes their own requests and recognize there is not an unlimited pie available for their efforts.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. CHAPMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the Chapman-Lowery amendment. I think that it is a possibility that the gentleman from Florida, who I think is attempting to be helpful in finding some middle ground, seriously complicates deliberations on this issue because, by the wording of his amendment in requiring, if his amendment is successful in amending the Chapman amendment, what his amendment would require is that the funds provided in the bill shall be used for the same amounts, purposes and programs as were provided in fiscal year 1991, which requires a $1.2 billion payment that is not required in 1992.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think it confuses the issue. I think the debate has been well framed by the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

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

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

Mr. LOWERY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote down the amendment. I understand that my colleague from Florida is trying to be helpful, to space station, but his amendment complicates this issue. We think we have the space station clearly framed in terms of freezing NASA accounts at 1991 levels. I might add there is a problem with the draftsmanship in the amendment. I would urge my colleague to withdraw, his amendment but if he will not do that, let us vote it down.

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

Mr. TRAXLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I too believe there are some real operational problems with the amendment as it is drafted. In talking to the majority staff and to the minority staff, I have found that there is a real kind of problem here with the $1.2 billion that we have to spend this year, but under the gentleman's amendment it would be the purpose that we would have to spend it next year despite the fact that the expenditure is not needed.

That, I think, would be a major concern and would, I think, handicap NASA to do the kind of things that the gentleman from Florida seems to want them to do.

So I too would oppose the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman understands that I did not file this amendment to the amendment to have this technical problem, if it exists, be a problem. Staff of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which the gentleman chairs, assured me that it was not a problem. Now we hear that it may be a problem.

In any event, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Chairman, is it not very possible that if in fact there was—if in fact there was, and I am not acknowledging that there is—a technical problem, that there would be additional money in this bill which they would be directed to spend if my amendment and then the Chapman amendment, as amended, will be adopted, they could come to the gentleman at any time and ask for a reprogramming in order to avoid spending money on a program that they did not have to spend any more money on? They would not be absolutely required to spend more money on a program which had lapsed or which only required a few hundred thousand dollars to pay off.

Am I correct that they in fact could ask for a reprogramming?

Mr. TRAXLER. Reclaiming my time to answer the gentleman's question, I do not know what his amendment does, but I can tell you absolutely that reprogramming is a standard part of the appropriations process in our cooperation with agencies.

But I reiterate I am not sure what his amendment does. And I want a very square, fair vote on the issue we have been talking about all day. I am afraid the gentleman is digging a hole for NASA that even I will not be able to get him out of in about 4 to 5 weeks from now. You may want to roll those dice, but I do not.

□ 1630

Mr. Chairman, this agency is severely impaired, many would claim, under either Traxler or under Chapman-Lowery. Please do not add to the agony of our troubles in this fashion.

Therefore, I reiterate that I oppose the amendment, and I hope we can have a vote on it very shortly and then proceed to conclude debate on the Chapman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] to the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The Chair will announce this is a regular quorum call followed by a 5-minute vote.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 139]

Abercrombie	Collins (IL)	Gekas
Alexander	Collins (MI)	Geren
Allard	Combest	Gibbons
Anderson	Condit	Gilchrest
Andrews (ME)	Conyers	Gillmor
Andrews (NJ)	Cooper	Gilman
Andrews (TX)	Costello	Gingrich
Annunzio	Coughlin	Glickman
Anthony	Cox (CA)	Gonzalez
Applegate	Cox (IL)	Goodling
Archer	Coyne	Gordon
Armey	Cramer	Goss
Aspin	Crane	Gradison
Atkins	Cunningham	Grandy
AuCoin	Dannemeyer	Green
Bacchus	Darden	Guarini
Baker	Davis	Gunderson
Ballenger	de la Garza	Hall (OH)
Barnard	DeFazio	Hall (TX)
Barrett	DeLauro	Hamilton
Barton	DeLay	Hammerschmidt
Bateman	Dellums	Hancock
Beilenson	Derrick	Hansen
Bennett	Dickinson	Harris
Bentley	Dicks	Hastert
Bereuter	Dingell	Hatcher
Berman	Dixon	Hayes (IL)
Bevill	Donnelly	Hayes (LA)
Bilbray	Dooley	Hefley
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Hefner
Bliley	Dorgan (ND)	Henry
Boehlert	Dornan (CA)	Herger
Boehner	Downey	Hertel
Bonior	Dreier	Hoagland
Borski	Duncan	Hobson
Boucher	Durbin	Hochbrueckner
Boxer	Dwyer	Holloway
Brewster	Early	Hopkins
Brooks	Eckart	Horn
Broomfield	Edwards (CA)	Horton
Browder	Edwards (OK)	Houghton
Brown	Edwards (TX)	Hoyer
Bruce	Emerson	Hubbard
Bryant	Engel	Huckaby
Bunning	English	Hughes
Burton	Erdreich	Hunter
Bustamante	Espy	Hutto
Byron	Evans	Hyde
Callahan	Fascell	Inhofe
Camp	Fawell	Ireland
Campbell (CA)	Fazio	Jacobs
Cardin	Feighan	James
Carper	Fields	Jefferson
Carr	Fish	Jenkins
Chandler	Flake	Johnson (CT)
Chapman	Foglietta	Johnson (SD)
Clay	Ford (MI)	Johnson (TX)
Clement	Franks (CT)	Johnston
Clinger	Gallegly	Jones (GA)
Coble	Gallo	Jones (NC)
Coleman (MO)	Gaydos	Jontz
Coleman (TX)	Gejdenson	Kanjorski

Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1651

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred thirteen Members have answered to their name, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, am I correct that this is a vote only on the Smith amendment to the Chapman amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would announce that pending is a request for a recorded vote only on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] to the amendments en bloc, as modified, previously offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. SMITH] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes will be allowed for this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were ayes 122, noes 296, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

AYES—122

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Aspin
Atkins
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Boxer
Campbell (CA)
Cardin
Carper
Clay
Coble
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cox (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Evans
Fascell
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Green
Guarini
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hughes
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kleczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowey (NY)
Markey
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Moody
Moran
Neal (MA)
Oakar
Olin
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Poshard
Price
Rangel
Reed
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Russo
Sanders
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Shays
Sikorski
Smith (FL)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Torres
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat

NOES—296

Alexander
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Derrick
Dickinson
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Fawell
Fazio
Fields
Ford (MI)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kildee
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Lowery (CA)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Marlenee
Martin
Matsui
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (IA)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman
AuCoin
Borski
Campbell (CO)
Dymally
Ford (TN)
Gray
Martinez
Mrazek
Pelosi
Sisisky
Vento
Williams

□ 1700

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. OAKAR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendments en bloc, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate that we discuss the space station at this time in the 1992 budget for NASA.

As I reflect on it, I think back about 500 years. There was a young man, 500 years ago, that traveled around Italy about this time trying to get a sponsor to be able to travel to find a new route to the East Indies. And he had to go all the way to Spain, but he found somebody in Spain, Isabella and Ferdinand. And they sponsored that young man, as we know, Christopher Columbus, and they knew him as Cristofo Columbo.

Without that vision that he had and without deciding to go where scientists and science at that time said he could not go, because at that time the contour of the Earth was such that they visioned that he would drop off, but he went anyway. As a result, here we are today. He had a vision that he looked into and said that there is a future out there. And if Isabella and Ferdinand had decided, as some members of the Committee on Appropriations have decided and other Members who have spoken as well have said that this space station is now restructured and too small to do all the things that need be done, they probably would have told him that the *Nina* and the *Pinta* and the *Santa Maria* were not large enough and big enough to go across that vast ocean. Therefore, he should not go. But they did not say that, they said, "Go, and with our blessing."

We have an opportunity today to reverse the decision of that subcommittee and look also to the future and not be afraid of that future, to say to the world that we will remain a leader and we will proceed with that vision of the future with the space station in order to obtain knowledge that is not attainable in any other way. The research on life sciences that would be done on the space station cannot be done in any other way. If Members are willing to say that they do not want to have any further manned transportation in space, then they will vote against the Chapman amendment.

Research in life sciences can only be done on the space station, and perhaps it will take a century to be able to travel, man to be able to travel back to the moon for a permanent habitat. Without that life sciences research, forget it. It is only with space station research with life sciences that man will ever be able to travel interplanetary. Without it, forget it. we are not going to do it, maybe somebody else will. Maybe another country will take up the effort and fund it. But we will not be doing it. Nor will we be able to do in the material sciences applications in space, the microgravity research and materials processing. The future of that will provide many, many new things, some of which are only being dreamed about today.

Much of the research that is being done, programs right now in the universities in our laboratories is geared to go on the space station for microgravity research. Without the space station, Mr. Chairman, we just might as well not fund those in this bill either because they have no application. We just might as well tell those scientists, forget it. There is not going to be any more expanded duration for man-tended microgravity research. Forget it.

□ 1710

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

Mr. VOLKMER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague Mr. VOLKMER for yielding. I think it was the Bible that said "Without vision, the people perish." Well to a large extent that wisdom is relevant to America, where we, without vision, would not be leading the world as we currently are economically, militarily, scientifically, socially, and spiritually.

The space station may not be perfect in concept or design, but to abandon it now would be to give up on the vision of space exploration for years and years to come. That decision would be a serious mistake for the future scientific and economic strength of America and that decision would attack the dreams of millions of Americans, particularly young Americans in school today, who dream the dreams of our future because of America's space program. That decision would also be in direct contravention to the policies enunciated by this country since the days that John F. Kennedy led this country into the glories of space frontiers. Let us vote for the Chapman-Lowery. amendment keeping the space station alive, realizing that its scope and concept and may need to be modified and modernized in the years to come. The future if at risk in this vote. Let us not abandon the future for shorter term priorities. Our children and grandchildren will never forgive us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has expired.

Mr. VOLKMER. There have been statements on this floor that some scientists say that the space station has no application for science. I disagree strongly with that.

As has been said on this floor earlier, I believe the former chairman of the Space Committee could verify that those are the same scientists who said that we did not need a space shuttle either because that same space shuttle would not bring us any science, and look at what it has done.

The only science that they want is interplanetary exploration with satellites. That is what they want. It is necessary, yes, but it is not the only science that we can develop.

But the only sciences that we can develop on microgravity and life sciences is with the space station, and if you do away with the space station, you do away with that, and as the gentleman from Kansas says, you are doing away with a vision for the future for generations to come into the next century.

With the space station, you have that vision out there for all of our young people to grow up in and say, "Yes, I, too, one day want to be in space." Without it, you just might as well tell them to forget it, they do not have to have any vision of ever being in space, and they can stay earthbound.

Remember, Christopher Columbus could have stayed in Italy, too.

I ask all of the Members to support the Chapman amendment and support the future of this country in space.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment the gentleman on his eloquent statement and the outstanding leadership that he is providing in helping all of us to understand this issue, as we should, and I thank him for his contributions. I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has again expired.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take that full additional minute, but I would like to mention that some of you may wonder why I stand here and have this opinion. It would be a lot easier perhaps for my district to take the position of the subcommittee. I neither have one employee of a Federal agency, NASA, in my district, or one contractor employee in my district, but it matters to me that we, as a nation, must look to the future.

I was subcommittee chairman of the Space Subcommittee in 1984 when we decided to go down this road, and I think that as a nation, will really be considered, in my opinion, second class if we decide to abandon the space station.

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

Mr. Chairman, the vote we will take here in a few minutes on space station Freedom will speak volumes about the vision of this House, the vision of this House as to the future of manned exploration of space, the vision of this House about whether we will put a man

on Mars in a reasonably foreseeable future time, the vision of this House about whether we will put a manned exploration of the solar system within the next century, a vision of this House about whether we will do the research necessary in order to have manned exploration into the further, distant reaches of the solar system, the galaxy, and universe.

I think that that is the word that many have used today for the simple reason that we, as a nation, have always stood for exploration and for vision and for putting mankind out front.

Yes, there is a great debate among some of our colleagues over the question of the scientific value of each step we take and how we best get there.

The fact of the matter is that there is applied science, and that there is other science, and there is a need for man to be out in the forefront of all the sciences.

The space station is a part of our heritage, and I think a part of our destiny.

Nobody can deny the benefits that have been gained here on Earth from the extensive scientific research in space. From medical science to our national defense, space exploration and research have been crucial to this country's development in the 20th century. How many more mouths have we fed? How many more sick children have we cured? How many more of the world's problems have we been able to solve because we, as a nation, have pursued extensive and forward-looking manned space program?

Yet, now, some of our friends have decided that 7 years into its development they are just not interested in the space station anymore. This is shortsighted.

This country needs a balanced and viable manned space program as it enters the 21st century. What the Lowery-Chapman amendment assures is that we will have a space station that is critical to that program, and it does so without reducing the subcommittee's mark for environmental protection, veterans, and many other priorities that I know are of great concern to our Members.

I served for quite a number of years on the Housing Subcommittee of the authorizing committee, and I know the great debate over that issue, but the minor amount of funds that are being taken from certain portions of those housing programs in this amendment today pale by comparison to the great advantages and gains we will have if we go forward with the space station, with a manned space program.

Mr. Chairman, space station Freedom is a bargain. A first-class life science and microgravity research laboratory facilitating scientific research in the areas of medicine, physics, metallurgy, materials science, astronomy, and a whole host of other fields that will be crucial to our efforts to compete in the high technology of the economy of the 21st century is embodied in this vote. More than that, space station Freedom represents our continued dedication to the frontier spirit that has been the cornerstone of this Nation.

The glory of science is knowing, and when we turn our backs on the quest for knowledge, we shortchange ourselves and our future generations. We cheat them of the benefits of science and the promise of a better world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we vote for the Lowery-Chapman amendment. It is the logical choice. It is the responsible choice. And it is the necessary choice for the future generations of this Nation.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I inquire of the Chair as to how many Members he has on the list.

The CHAIRMAN. At the moment, the Chair would advise the gentleman 16 or thereabouts, close to that.

Mr. TRAXLER. Suppose we were to request 3 minutes for each of those distinguished Members who are on the Chair's list?

Mr. ROE. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman suggesting something?

Mr. ROE. I think, in fairness, obviously, this is a very important issue to the Members of the House, as I know the distinguished chairman realizes. We have been waiting for 3½ hours to present our view, and I think it would be well to let the matter unfold a little bit, even though it will be a little bit later. It is that important an issue, and this gentleman from New Jersey wants at least his 5 minutes.

Mr. TRAXLER. I always seek to accommodate the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROE. And I always enjoy dealing with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Let me just say that I want to correct the gentleman, that it has been 4½ hours, and we are spending more time on this amendment than we did on civil rights.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I was going to recommend, as a form of compromise, that each Member have their 5 minutes but not be allowed, in the interest of time, to extend beyond the 5 minutes. Does that make sense?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the gentlewoman that obviously is up to the Members. Members may object to that request as to the extension of time.

Mr. TRAXLER. Maybe after three or four more Members speak, I might come back to the 3-minute thought.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his request.

□ 1720

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. During the critical decade of the 1780's Thomas Jefferson represented our new Nation as Ambassador to France. In 1785 he wrote home to a friend about some of what he saw in a changing Europe. He wrote,

> Science has liberated the ideas of those who read and reflect, and the American example has kindled feelings of right in the people. An insurrection has consequently begun, of science, talents, and courage, against rank and birth * * * science is progressive, and talents and enterprise on the alert.

Mr. Chairman, no one understood the mission of our democracy better than Mr. Jefferson. And no one understood better the critical connection between advances in science and advances in democracy.

If we hope to continue the insurrection that Jefferson began, if we hope to continue to make real advances for democracy, then we must continue to make advances in science.

As Jefferson did, we must make investments in the progressive enterprise of science. We must find the unfound, know the unknown, explore the unexplored. We must help America remain an example to others of how science can serve the great dreams of our democracy. To do this, we must pursue science to demand exploration of space. We must become a spacefaring Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it saddens me that a Nation as great as ours, a Nation as prosperous as ours, a Nation as creative as ours, is thought by some to be so burdened, so indebted, and so doubtful that we can afford no longer to be an example of world leadership in the exploration of space.

For a generation and more, we have led the world into space. Today we continue to lead the world technologically in aerospace and in aeronautics. However, our lead is fast slipping away. Our lead is slipping away because we have not made the investments, and we have not established the priorities that would enable the United States to secure that lead.

Do we really want the space program to be added to the lengthening list of America's technological fatalities? Do we want our national adventure in space to become a faint echo of our past, a fading memory of another, brighter day? Do we want to slip these jobs too overseas and watch from afar as the Japanese or the Germans build a space station themselves, and move ahead of the United States to assume the world leadership in still one more arena of global competition? Or do we want to be the example that Jefferson hoped that we would be, bold enough and strong enough and courageous enough to use our space program and our scientific advances as fuel for democracy?

Mention has been made today of the Space Studies Board's criticism of the latest configuration of the space station. The very same board also said that it "strongly endorses the position that a space-based laboratory is required to study the physiological consequences of long-term space flight." Mr. Chairman, we know of no way to conduct these essential studies without a space station.

Mention has been made, too, of the priority suggested by the Augustine Committee. What has not been mentioned is that the Augustine Committee stated that we need a balanced space program and that, "The space station remains, in our judgment, the essential initial building block of the maned exploration program."

Killing the space station may well kill manned space exploration by America for a generation. If we kill the space station this year, what will we kill next year? The space shuttle? The very idea of manned space flight? Is that the future we seek? Is that the America we want? Is that the example to the world that we hope to be?

Mr. Chairman, in a letter to another friend, in 1810, Thomas Jefferson wrote,

> I am not afraid of new inventions or improvements * * * where a new invention is supported by well-known principles, and promises to be useful, it ought to be tried.

That letter was written to Robert Fulton, the inventor of the steamship. In Fulton's day, many questioned the steamship. In our day, many question the space station. There will always be those who question the costs and the consequences of new ideas and new inventions.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the space station is supported by well-known principles. The space station will be useful to the advance of democracy. The space station will help America remain an example of leadership in science and space to all the world.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues today, I urge my colleagues to rise above their doubts, seize the future, provide new and needed support for the continuing exploration and insurrection of democracy that Jefferson began. Build space station Freedom.

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

It is appropriate that we are debating this legislation today on June 6, the 47th anniversary of D-Day of the Normandy invasion. Forty-seven years ago a terrific battle was raging in North France. As the President said, a battle to free suffering humanity, and the young men and women who fought in that crucial battle are now in their sixties and seventies.

As the veterans grow older, they are facing growing health care needs, and face additional services, services provided by the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Now, much has been said today in the debate about science and technology. Yes, we are all in favor of science and technology. Education is crucial, but the way I read this legislation, we are not cutting back in any of those programs because, as I read it, we are having the same level of funding in the 1991 bill as we had in the 1990 legislation. So we are not cutting. In fact, since the mid-1980's, spending on NASA is up some 40 percent. We cannot say that about many other projects, but we can say that about NASA.

This legislation will help. The legislation we have before Members today, as it is drafted, will help our veterans.

I want to extend my deep appreciation to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and to the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for their courageous stand. I appreciate their arguments. On the other side, I appreciate the arguments that are made against this proposal. Their arguments are powerful, but the problem is, we have a $320 billion deficit, and we have a responsibility to the American taxpayer. We must have priorities. Money does not grow on trees. Money comes from working men and women around this country who have to pay taxes, and heavy taxes. That is why it is so important.

I cannot get upset with the chairman, the ranking member, because we have unforgiving restraints set on funding in the last budget bill we passed last fall. It is to the credit of the chairman and to the ranking member that we came forward with a bill that did not short shrift our veterans. The bill before Members contains much needed VA funding. Perhaps the most significant is the $130 million boost in medical care. This increase will help to meet the growing and changing health care needs of our veterans. We have a continuing obligation to America's veterans. They served our Nation in a time of war by putting their lives on the line. Now our Nation must serve them in this time of peace by making sure that they receive the best possible care.

This legislation before Members is fair legislation. It is fair to the people that we have to represent, to the taxpayers. It is fair to the people, the veterans, and others who are helped in this legislation. Yes, it is fair for the future of our country, whether it is science, math, or high technology, because every dollar that we appropriated last year is being appropriated this year, as I read, in NASA. We are not shortchanging anyone.

It is important for everyone to have priorities, but when we have these priorities, we have to take, I think, into consideration not any one particular pet project, but we have to take a look at the entire legislation.

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

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

□ 1730

Mr. ROE. Hosanna, hosanna, hosanna, Mr. Chairman. After 4 hours I get a chance to talk with my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset having been chairman of this committee for 4 years and on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for 21 years, since I have been in the House, I want to pay my high regards to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN]. I do not think they expected me to say that. Also, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, that is because what you all have done, and properly so, you have raised the level of debate. You have raised the level of debate and I do not think there has been a debate in this House, including the civil rights bill, that has engendered the kind of respect and understanding and at least the chance to debate the issues of the Nation that you have created.

So I want to, as one Member of this House, applaud you for what you have done and for your efforts, although I believe you are dead wrong on this issue.

I wrote to myself while I was sitting here, frittering and fretting, trying to get to the floor, I wrote about bean counters and lemmings, bean counters and lemmings, bean counters, and lemmings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, bean counters are the people that go away, and they take their checkers and they put the little beans together and that makes it all right; as long as all the beans come together you have solved the problem.

Now, how about the lemmings? Four hundred and thirty-five Members of the House and, brother, we are going right down that path, getting ready to jump off each cliff that comes along.

Are we thinking for ourselves? We did not come here as a body of 435 people, we came here as 1, each man and each woman, to represent our 250 million people.

So does the House degenerate on this budget issue into bean counters and lemmings? Ask yourselves a logical question: Why should there be a debate about housing and space? The space program does not even belong in this category of the budget; it should not be there. There is no competition between housing and space.

On the veterans, there is no competition with veterans. We put it there, we collectively put it there and that is where the argument is now.

So the argument on housing and the argument on what we are going to do

for veterans is specious, it is dishonest—not that the Members who are bringing it up are dishonest. It is a dishonest issue. It does not belong there and everybody in this House ought to know that.

I think we ought to speak to that.

Environmentalists, going around and threatening people, "you are going to be on the hit list." God, run for cover, run for cover, because if that is all we are worth around here because somebody presumes to call themselves an environmentalist that you are going to be on the hit list, God, I would rather lose an election than kowtow to somebody putting me on any hit list, if it is the right thing to do.

Why do we not say to the environmentalists, "Don't threaten us," because let me tell you something, environmentalists, and I hope you will listen to me, if it was not for the space program there would not be any LANDSAT program. So as you are counting the forest burning up and being plowed under, and so forth, in Brazil, where your information is coming from, do you know what? It is coming from the space program. You are able to see to the future, you are able to see inside the Earth and you are able to use the technology that we have developed to do that.

We are fighting over social programs. What is the Government about?

A government is built for the people, it is to provide for the needs of our people. Let me tell you something: We are fighting over social programs. Did you ever think about one point, and share it with me if you can for a moment.

Mr. Chairman, I was courteous to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], and I hope he would please listen to me so I can finish my point? I would appreciate it.

How are we going to create the new wealth of America? The argument was good that was made on the floor. Yes, we have housing problems. Yes, we have aging population. Yes, we have veterans' problems. That is true. You are concerned about the outyears of the space program and you are right. It is going to cost more money next year.

But so is housing and so is veterans' affairs and so are the social needs of the country, including Medicare and health care.

How are you going to create the new wealth of the country? Where is it going to come from to be able to pay for those social costs? It has got to come out of the points that we are doing in science and technology, in international competition, global competition and advanced technology.

The space program returns $10 for every $1 we spend. We know that is true, and it is probably more. That is 10 times the wealth that is being created to provide for the housing and provide for the homeless and provide for the veterans.

If you cancel this program out, then what is next?

We have had that argument: What is next?

You know, I came to Congress 22 years ago and I think we were talking about some pride and dreams. It is not just what we do as bean counters and lemmings, it is what the country is about. We would never have been able to fight Desert Storm if it had not been for advanced technology. It could not have been done. And we saved lives doing it.

We say to ourselves what a great achievement that was, and it was, in the interest of our country. But think about the future. What about the dreams? Or is that just lemmings and bean counters?

Mr. Chairman, I would hope, if I may close on this note, I would hope we would support the Chapman-Lowery amendment because it is right. It is not going to solve all the problems, it is going to create additional problems. But we should create additional problems so that this body can solve the problems correctly and rightly in the interests of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. CHAPMAN.

We in the Congress are sometimes criticized for not being able to see the forest for the trees—for taking too much of a short-range perspective when considering projects or programs that will provide long-term benefits for our country and the American people. Regrettably, I must say that with regard to deleting fiscal year 1992 funding for NASA's space station Freedom, that criticism is abundantly justified.

I want to remind my colleagues that in all likelihood, unless we vote to fund the space station program for fiscal year 1992, the program will die. The Chapman amendment will not just determine whether or not the space station program receives funding in the coming fiscal year. Rather, the amendment's fate will determine the fate of the space station program itself. If the Chapman amendment is approved, America will proceed with its space station program. If the amendment is rejected, the space station will die.

The space station program holds the promise of providing this country, and all mankind, with benefits that cannot even yet be imagined—in areas as diverse as medicine, industrial production and basic science. A recent General Accounting Office study stated that the space station program could well allow the United States to develop crystals to improve computer technology, and to develop large protein crystals for use in manufacturing drugs to cure illnesses that cannot be cured at the present time. As the GAO pointed out, "the human and economic return [from] these endeavors—if successful—could be enormous."

Before you vote on the Chapman amendment, consider what medical advances could be realized from the space station program that could mitigate human suffering here in the United States and around the globe. Imagine overcoming the problems of osteoporosis, cardiovascular disease, cancer, and other afflictions. America can continue to play a leading role in finding cures for these afflictions—and the space station program will allow us to do so.

From its beginning three decades ago, the American space program has generated so-called spin-off benefits. American technology would not be as technologically advanced, medical care would not be as miraculously curative, and everyday life for Americans would not be as comfortable as it is were it not for our Nation's 30-year commitment to exploring and traveling in space. Weather satellites, communications satellites, advanced computer technology, advanced composite materials, lasers, CAT scans, and pacemakers are just a few of the 30,000 spin-offs made possible by our Nation's space program. Space station Freedom will likely stimulate new and even more exciting benefits in the decades ahead.

Cancellation of the space station program would jeopardize our entire space program. Worse, it would signal to the world that the United States is fully willing to abdicate its leadership in space—in the same way it has abdicated its leadership in semiconductors, land-remote sensing, automobiles, digital imaging technology, high-density storage, and advanced materials. All of those technologies were developed in the United States, and all of them were transferred to other nations. Will space exploration and the benefits it provides be next?

Japan, Canada, and the other nations in partnership with the United States have already committed to investing between $7 billion and $8 billion in America's space station program. They did so because they trusted us when we said that this project was important to us. If the United States reneges on that promise, we will risk cancellation of future cooperative scientific endeavors with the international community.

Mr. Chairman, there will be a space station. The only questions are whether or not it will be named Freedom, whether or not it will have the American flag painted on its shell, and whether or not the United States will lead the way in its development and deployment.

We must not abandon our Nation's long commitment to exploring space. NASA's leadership role in space and

aerospace provided a positive balance of trade for the United States of $28 billion in 1990. Voting to kill the space station will eliminate this economic benefit. Space station Freedom represents a pathway to the markets, the jobs and the economic opportunities of tomorrow. We must make this investment in the space station program if we are to improve our economic security in the future.

But the space station program provides other benefits as well. By providing our young people with an exciting new opportunity to travel in and learn about space, space station Freedom will serve as an invaluable stimulus for the astronauts and engineers of tomorrow to learn and to excel in science, math, and engineering. If today's students do not excel in these subjects, the United States will not remain competitive with other nations in the 21st century. Additionally, I feel compelled to point out that the space station program today employs nearly 100,000 Americans directly and indirectly. Termination of this project will adversely affect these hard-working Americans, and will negatively affect our nation's economy. The cancellation of NASA's Apollo Program in the 1970's resulted in the loss of 750,000 jobs in the United States. We must not repeat that mistake in the 1990's.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my friends and colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle, of remarks made by President Kennedy back in 1961, at a time when some Americans questioned the expense and the wisdom of space exploration—and questioned the very ability of the United States to meet and overcome the challenges of that undertaking. President Kennedy stood there, at that dais, and he asked the Congress to provide the financial and political support necessary for "landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to the Earth. And then the President cautioned, ["Let it be clear that I am asking the Congress and the country to accept a firm commitment to a new course of action—a course which will last for many years and carry very heavy costs. If we are to go only halfway, or reduce our sights in the face of difficulty, in my judgment it would be better not to go at all."]

Mr. Chairman, the Congress has the foresight, the courage and the resolve to make that commitment in 1961. And it had the foresight, the courage and the resolve to keep its commitment until Neil Armstrong and others after him walked upon the moon. I ask my colleagues to demonstrate that same foresight, that same commitment and that same resolve here today by passing the Chapman amendment.

□ 1740

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized for a unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] may proceed.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, we have been on this now for almost 5 hours.

I understand the Chairman has a list of names, and I think it is around 15 or 18 Members that are on this list.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is correct, yes.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, we can do this one or two ways. We can either say 3 minutes per Member, which will take us another hour, or we could say 40 minutes and shorten the timeframe for the Members who are on the list, and I suppose the Chairman will add Members if they were not on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] will decide between the two and make some unanimous-consent request at this point.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, we want to be fair to everyone, and so I ask, "Is there any consensus here? Do you want 40 minutes, folks, or do you want 3 minutes, or what do you want?"

Mr. Chairman, there is a division of opinion here.

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

Mr. TRAXLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Do an overall time limit, and just divide among the people who are standing.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I think, if everyone has 3 minutes, including myself, that I am being fair to me and fair to everyone. Do we have other Members who want much more time?

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

Mr. TRAXLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, some of us have been waiting around here for nearly 2 hours, and there is one gentleman who has been waiting for 2 hours or more.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, let me just do this then: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end at 7 o'clock tonight because we have about 4 or 5 more hours on this bill, and, if I do not get this unanimous-consent request, I will move and say that enough is enough.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] making a unanimous-consent request at this point?

Mr. TRAXLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Chapman amendment and all amendments thereto end at 7 o'clock tonight, and that we proceed with the 5-minute rule. That is all.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will proceed at this point under the 5-minute rule.

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

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of debate today and a lot of good points made both for and against the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN]. But I will tell my colleagues that I have heard people say that it is going to cost a great deal of money.

However, Mr. Chairman, I can tell my colleagues this: It takes money to make money. Money begets money.

My colleagues, if this is defeated, it is going to deal a severe blow to the American space and technology program. This is America's future. We cannot become Neanderthal in a high-technology world.

In addition, this is the future for our youth of America, and they cannot do it with a covered-wagon mentality.

Now we are talking about American dollars spent on American technology and American productivity for American benefit. Ought we continue to contract out to the Japanese, or the Germans, and, yes, even the Soviet Union, when we are moving in that direction, and should we depend on corporate America if nobody else is going to do it? Well, let me say this to my colleagues:

Just ask the Japanese, if you think you can believe them. Anybody here read the book "The Japan That Can Say No"? Well, if you read the whole thing through, and I'll have to say it's not the greatest literary production in the world, but it says their position and their feeling on it, and what they say is that American greed and profit are undermining our own American economy.

As my colleagues know, this is just ludicrous to even think that we are moving in this direction. We are going to give them our productivity, and we are going to give them our research and development. They think we are stupid. The Koreans think we are stupid. They closed their doors to our productivity; we opened ours up. We give them our technology, and they shut us out and do not allow us to buy it. America is giving to them to do for us what we do best.

Why do we do it? Mr. Chairman, it is agreed.

America's space and technology program is what made us No. 1 in the high-technology world today, but cutting it now to show a smaller deficit is ludicrous, and it is backward thinking. Look what it has done to the space program in the last 30 years, and there is

a whole list of things in computer technology, in the medical health field and in educational tools for the future of our country. To move forward with this space station is to move ahead.

Now are we going to allow Japan, and Germany and these others to dictate our future? What are we doing in all of our sci-fi, our scientific technology and all? What are we doing in magnetic levitation? We are behind in that. We are not pumping money into that, but we are starting to get into that.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell my colleagues that the Americans do not like it. They do not want anybody taking over the space program, and Americans do not want to be second class citizens in this space race. If we do not fight for our ability to produce instead of giving it away to other nations, our hundred-billion-dollar trade deficit is going to balloon even higher, and it is going to cost us more jobs, and we lose 27,000 for every $1 billion of deficit that we have. What we want is more American jobs because, if we have them, it means that we are going to have more taxes coming into the Federal coffers, and that in itself will help to reduce the deficit.

Now is the time to vote to show if we stand for or against American technology and American jobs. Let us give a damn for a change, and let us vote for the Chapman amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. Chairman, in the course of this debate we have been hearing how, if we did away with the space station, somehow that would leave money in NASA to do more basic science, that somehow this would mean a more effective space program, according to what some scientists are saying. I want to point out to my colleagues that there has been a debate ever since the beginning of the space program, and on one side it has been those who are interested in an engineering program, a technology program, a space exploration program, a manned space exploration program, and those who are advocating a science program, and we have a little of both overlapping as well.

But the bottom line is the space program is not a basic research program. It is not an academic program. It is a program where men and women explore space. It is a program which has rocket ships, and it is a program where these ships dock in space. It is a program where we went to the Moon. It is a program where we faced tremendous odds, and we overcame them. It is a program which at its very heart is exploration. It is not a basic research program. It is the exploration of the next frontier. It is the movement of our human race off this planet and into space and beyond and to other worlds.

Mr. Chairman, that is the nature of the space program.

□ 1750

It is not more research grants for university professors or research institutions. That is not what lies at the core of it. Yes, they need to make contributions, it is true, but we are talking about human beings in space, and let me tell the Members this: The space station is the logical next step. It is the logical next step because we need experience in space. We need to be out in space, we need to be working in space.

I recall the New York Times editorial I read this morning. It named off a couple of research possibilities and a couple of science possibilities, and it said this was not enough to justify going into space. I would say, yes, it is true, it is not enough, because there is so much more to be gained.

Is the space program not going well beyond the new crystal that someone was just talking about, although I would say that I would be much in favor of more research on these new crystals? It is more than the biotechnology we are going into there. The space program is our dream; it is our vision. It is what puts America at the pinnacle of nations.

We are the first nation to effectively move into outer space. I ask the Members to think about it. Think what that means to our national psyche, the respect we have all over the world. Think what it means to our leadership and the whole range of aerospace industries and telecommunications industries and satellites. This is major stuff. It is well beyond a few experiments here and there. It is the pinnacle of America's national achievement. It is something that we have done well. I frankly think we made a great mistake by curtailing our efforts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] has expired.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind the gentleman that we are proceeding under an overall debate limitation with all Members of the Chair's list receiving an equal allocation of time. The gentleman has been granted permission to revise and extend his remarks, and that there are others who will not be heard if very much additional time is granted to Members.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I will then ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to complete my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, we have done this real well. How many programs in the Federal Government can we point to and say, "Oh, was that a success!"

We went to the Moon and we came back. We probably should have stayed. We have had a wonderful program of men in space and women in space. We really can point to this as a success as we think about what we do here in Congress. We expend so much on social programs whose benefits we cannot quantify, and sometimes we even conceive them to be counterproductive. Here is something that has worked. Here is something that has not been throwing funds down some kind of a black hole. The whole world is watching this debate. This is a reflection of our national self-confidence.

Mr. Chairman, let us defeat the attempt to curtail the space station and support the Chapman amendment.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me express my respect for the views of all those Members who have spoken on both sides of this issue, because they have spoken sincerely and, I think, with a deep concern about the issue of the United States and our future role in the world. This is really not a debate over whether or not we are for or against space exploration. I really and truly believe that almost all Members here believe that we ought to maintain a leadership role when it comes to space exploration. And it is not a debate as to whether we are for or against other priorities such as those contained in this bill with regard to veterans or housing or the environment, because I think all of us share the concern that we have to try to adequately fund these areas as well.

The fundamental issue or the fundamental problem is that we are a Nation that is starving for resources. That is the reality of the budget agreement. The fact is that the constraints of that budget agreement mean that we have to decide priorities within each of these areas. We have to do that. We no longer live at a time when we can fund everything. I wish we could. That is not the reality of today's world.

We have to make fundamental decisions about priorities, and it applies to NASA just like it does to everything else. Members of the Committee on Appropriations every day are deciding on how much they are going to be able to provide for education and how much for health care. They are going to have to make fundamental choices, and that is what this subcommittee had to face as well.

We cannot fully fund both of these. Let me repeat that. We cannot fully fund both the space station and all the other missions at NASA unless we are

willing to somehow do away with the budget agreement, get rid of the budget agreement, break the caps, and, second, perhaps rip apart the other priorities that are contained in this proposal in terms of taking it from veterans or from housing or from elsewhere. Then maybe we could fully fund all those missions. Third, we could convert it into an entitlement program and pay for it. That is another option. But we all understand how unrealistic those options are.

So the fundamental decision here is, within NASA, what priorities are we going to decide on? I ask that because the allocations are tough in both the House and the Senate. The Senate yesterday made very strict allocations, so we should not look to the Senate to bail out both the space station and the other missions. That is not going to happen.

So we have three choices, and let us face it. One choice is to go with these other important missions in space and to eliminate the space station. Which is what the subcommittee did. The second choice is to go with the space station. If Members believe that the space station is where we ought to put all of our money, then we would get rid of the other missions and be honest about it and put it all in the space station.

The third approach is what is suggested in this amendment, which is essentially to freeze the funding on both the space station and the other missions, which means that they will all limp along, and that we will not fully develop either the space station or these other missions.

The subcommittee had to make a tough choice, but I think they made a responsible choice. It would also be responsible, let me say to the Members here, if they felt it should all go into the space station and do away with these other missions, to put it all in the space station. That, too, would be a responsible approach. But I think to suggest that we could freeze the funding on both the space station and the other missions and keep both of them alive is essentially saying to the country that we want what cannot happen. We cannot do them both.

I realize that Members will try to take the path of least resistance here, and that is what has probably gotten us in trouble in terms of the deficit in past years. Members should not make a choice that is just symbolic. We should not make a choice that is symbolic because we owe it to the space program to rethink our mission for the future, recognizing the resources we have. NASA has to do that, and the Congress has to do that. The subcommittee did its part.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to support the subcommittee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, if today the question is asked "Where will the destiny of humankind be defined?" The answer is clear. The destiny of humankind will be defined in the stars.

Can anyone doubt that men and women will one day explore the solar system? Can anyone doubt that men and women will one day permanently live beyond the bounds of Earth? Why as we speak, men and women, American men and women, are circling the Earth doing scientific investigation. Other men, Soviet men, are aboard a space station also engaged is real work and, in their case, semipermanent habitation.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, our generation has a unique opportunity, an opportunity granted only a few eras in history. We can see a bit of the future. We can see a bit of humankind's destiny.

But that opportunity also creates a unique challenge. Having seen the future, what are we prepared to do about it?

Other generations in other nations have been given the challenge of defining destiny, and stepped away from the task. Oh, they had excuses—it's too big a job, there are other things that have to be done first, we can't afford it, we shouldn't be asked to carry the burden, and many more—but the real fact is that history records only their failure. Great nations do great things. When they cease doing great things, they cease being great nations. Great nations decline when they shrink away from their challenges and reject the future they could have helped define. They then shrink in power, prestige, and the moral authority to act positively and progressively.

We have faced such decisions in our time. Today, on the floor of the House, we face a challenging moment. History may not judge us by the particular vote we cast here and now, but it will judge this nation on the direction in which that vote takes us.

If we know the future of humankind lies in the stars, and know that we are capable of technologically fulfilling a part of that destiny, why would we reject doing so? The space station represents our commitment to manned exploration and habitation of the universe. Why would we send robots to do the job instead? Why would be forego the massive economic and political strength that is inherent in space and high technology pursuits?

Our colleagues tell us that they would so reject because there are other priorities of more substance. I'm sure they believe that, but I am also sure they are as wrong as those who opposed exploration of the New World, those who opposed the Louisiana Purchase and the mission of Lewis and Clark, and those who opposed the Apollo program. Interestingly, some of the same distinguished voices of science who opposed President Kennedy's call to go to the Moon 30 years ago are today quoted anew as opposing space station, in most cases, for the very same reasons.

Were there failures in the aftermath of Apollo? Sure there were. Does the space program need to recognize the realities of our budget problems? Sure it does. But neither of these two things are reasons for stepping away from the responsibilities of national leadership. National leadership demands that we look the future in the eye and resolve to conquer its challenge. National leadership demands mustering the political will and courage to do the difficult jobs instead of the easy ones. National leadership means fulfilling our commitments to international partners who want to join us in the pursuit of peaceful goals.

If we reject space station, we will shrink away from national leadership. We will understand that humankind's destiny lies in space, but will determine that America's destiny does not. We understand that there are rewards to be reaped by challenging history's greatest frontier, but we will determine that America will not take the risk. And we will be poorer for having made such a decision.

In describing the impact of space exploration, Apollo astronaut Michael Collins observed,

> When the history of our galaxy is written, if the planet Earth gets mentioned at all, it won't be because its inhabitants visited their own moon. . . . What will be worth recording is what kind of civilization we Earthlings created and whether or not we ventured out to other parts of the Galaxy. Were we wanderers? Human history so far indicates we are indeed. It's human nature to stretch, to go, to see, to understand. Exploration is not a choice, really, it's an imperative.

Make no mistake about it: If the station is canceled this year, the appropriators will be back next year with a suggestion that shuttle flights be curtailed, and with further cuts to an already too-small exploration program. The U.S. Manned Space Program will come to an end.

Mr. Chairman, the abandoned Mercury launch pad at Cape Canaveral has a sign posted near it which reads, "Abandon in Place." The site is virtually a modern day ruin, decayed by the sand and salt air of the Kennedy Space Center, less than 30 years after it was used to launch the U.S. Manned Space Program. That launch pad is dilapidated because of progress, and because we moved on to better vehicles that could take us far beyond the confines of Earth's orbit.

If we don't support the Chapman amendment today we may as well put up an "Abandon in Place" sign on the rest of our space infrastructure. And, this time it won't be as a result of innovation and imagination, but the outcome of our lack of vision and our in-

sistence on remaining checked by our earthbound fetters to the past.

James Michener, author of "Space," said at a 1979 Senate hearing:

> There are moments in history when challenges occur of such a compelling nature that to miss them is to miss the whole meaning of an epoch. Space is such a challenge. . . . Therefore, we should be most careful about retreating from the specific challenge of our age. We should be reluctant to turn our back upon the frontier of this epoch. Space is indifferent to what we do; it has no feeling, no design, no interest in whether we grapple with it or not. But we cannot be indifferent to space, because the grand slow march of our intelligence has brought us, in our generation, to a point from which we can explore and understand and utilize it. To turn back now would be to deny our history, our capabilities.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, Wernher von Braun said the value of a discovery can sometimes only become clear in the wake of the discovery itself.

Little could Columbus have known or imagined what he would find when he first asked Isabella for money.

As we debate our 1992 budget, it is hard to imagine, but well to remember, that only 500 years ago, Columbus and his scraggly crew founded this magnificent jewel of America. Our partners in the space station thought enough of Columbus, his courage and accomplishments, that they named their space station module after him.

We must have the courage to make that project a reality. We must not allow ourselves to be so engrossed in our own present that we cannot envision the future on which our children's well-being depends. We must have as much vision and as much daring as that simple seafarer.

I rise in support of the Chapman amendment, fully aware and very respectful of the tough choice I am making and the tough choice we are making here today, the choice between long-term investment and short-term immediate need, the choice between our vision of the future and our responsibility to respond to the problems of the present.

□ 1810

Indeed, this is a choice worthy of the full House, not a choice for the committee but a choice for each one of us representing the people of our district, committing the Nation to a course in the future that I believe will benefit every citizen in America and every member of Earth's ship in our times.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, my generation has always been challenged to boldly go where no man has gone before.

Reared on "Star Trek", Moon walks, and star wars, we have come to believe that outer space is our manifest destiny. And if we take ads in today's Washington Post to heart, we must also conclude that funding space station Freedom is our patriotic duty.

I think it is time, however, to take our direction from yet another "Star Trek" movie, the one in which, as my colleagues may remember, Mr. Spock learns the very human lesson that the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the one. Spock demonstrates that axiom by sacrificing his life for his fellow crew members.

The Appropriations Committee has made it clear that there is no room in their allocation to do it all. In a Dear Colleague letter, Chairman TRAXLER and ranking member Mr. GREEN state succinctly, "There is no wiggle room, no place to hide. It is space station against every other program in the bill, including NASA's other programs."

The space station, as its costs grow, will most certainly squeeze out other programs in the years ahead. It is time then to support the needs of the many, the veterans, the homeless, and all citizens who deserve clean air and clean water and sacrifice the needs of the one, the space station.

It is a mistake to think we will slip in our position as a space leader if we do not fund space station Freedom because it is yet to be determined what space station Freedom must accomplish to make it successful.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to boldly go where no man has gone before, we should provide our Nation with meaningful objectives. We should concentrate instead on the other useful NASA projects which could reshape the Nation's space and science goals.

I urge my colleagues to make the wise fiscal and scientific decision by eliminating space station funding as recommended by the committee and to vote down the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

Now, I know those who support the Chapman amendment are sincere in their motive. I also know that they would prefer not to cut veterans or housing or other valuable programs to make the space station possible. Fundamentally, with that logic, they would propose that we make this choice to spend but are clearly uncomfortable admitting that we must make other tough choices to cut. Building a multi-billion-dollar space station will lead inevitably to higher taxes or higher debt. Neither of those options will help to make our Nation great in the years ahead.

Again, I urge a no vote on the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my fine colleagues, Mr. CHAPMAN of Texas and Mr. LOWERY of California.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for Congress to stop playing with the future and start building it.

NASA's space station is today under attack from within this chamber by those who mistakenly see it as a luxury.

Mr. Chairman, America's space program is not a luxury but a necessity. Our world is transforming from military confrontation and toward economic competition, and space exploration is part of that New World Order.

Throughout the last 30 years we have seen time and time again how space exploration has helped educate our children, stimulate high-technology industries, and generate countless medical breakthroughs.

The space program also has stimulated the Nation's aerospace industry, which represents our biggest net exporting industry.

This is why I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

I have been a Member of this body for 17 years. During every one of those years, I have championed housing, environmental, and veterans programs. Mr. Chairman, I simply would not support an amendment that I thought would harm these programs.

Mr. Chairman, the Chapman-Lowery amendment will provide funding for space station Freedom without having any adverse effect on the Environmental Protection Agency or the National Science Foundation programs. In fact, under this amendment these programs will grow.

Some Members opposed to this amendment would also have us believe that it will take money away from housing programs. This belief has no foundation in reality.

These are misconceptions.

The Appropriations Committee itself has acknowledged that the $250 million this amendment withdraws from HUD is not needed to meet 1992 needs.

Some Members opposed to the Chapman-Lowery amendment would have you believe that if we have a space station, it will crowd out other science research.

Mr. Chairman, as a senior member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and as a representative of California's Silicon Valley, I have been a long-time supporter of science research and technology.

So let me put this science issue to rest.

A vote in favor of the space station is a vote in favor of America's most visionary science programs.

On the other hand, eliminating the space station will not result in a great increase of funding for other science

research, as some Members have been led to believe.

Of the $1.8 billion that would be saved in fiscal year 1992 by cutting out the space station, the net increase in funding for science programs within NASA comes to only $62 million—$62 million.

That's just 3 percent of the $1.8 billion that was cut—hardly a convincing argument that cancellation of the space station would be a boon to science programs.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, some Members opposed to the amendment are painting the space station as some kind of monster that will somehow grow out of control and cause cuts in other government programs in the years to come.

Let us be clear.

This is a 1-year appropriations bill, and the Chapman amendment contains absolutely no cuts in any program or agency in the out years, nor will this amendment cause any cuts in any agency in the years to come.

Those are budget battles that will have to be fought each and every year.

Our decision this year is about one thing and one thing only—whether or not to continue with the space station that will be the heart of our Nation's space program in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, our space program is about where this Nation will go and what we will do in the international laboratory of outer space.

Right now the astronauts on the space shuttle *Columbia* in orbit above the Earth are carrying out life sciences experiments that will begin to lay the groundwork for permanent manned capability on the space station Freedom.

Mr. Chairman, are we going to turn our backs on this important work?

Should we tell those astronauts to pack up and come home?

That is what this vote is about.

Even worse, Mr. Chairman, are we going to turn our backs on our children?

How can we even consider short-changing future generations of Americans by putting the future on hold and eliminate space station Freedom as a national priority?

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we can. I strongly urge a vote in favor of the Chapman amendment.

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

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

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman on his statement.

This is a decision I do not want to make. I envy my colleagues who see this as simple: Either the space program is so clearly preemptive to them that the decision is easy, or that the Nation's housing needs so clearly exceed the need for space exploration that the decision is almost self executing. For me no such simple solution suggests itself.

I am a former local housing authority board member. I believe the problems of the homeless and the housing needs of low income American's are critical and have always supported the fullest funding possible. I ached to see the public housing program eviscerated during the Reagan years.

Likewise, I have always supported the space program as our's and future generation's frontiers—fully equivalent to the frontiers on Earth that our forbearers possessed for thousands of years. I believed for as long as I can remember that space provides an important and perhaps essential outlet for a human need of a sense that there are new worlds beyond those we know: That space exploration replaces terrestrial exploration as the safety valve for a kind of collective human species' claustrophobia.

Space provides for us, as the New World provided for generations past, an opportunity to exercise humankind's intellect, imagination, courage and sense of romance that no other human endeavor can quite duplicate.

So this vote is, for me, a dilemma, a terrifying choice. It pits very concrete human needs that face us here and now against somewhat more abstract, if just as real human needs—needs which, if ignored, can distort the future outlook of mankind.

It is a choice between important realities and important intangibles.

What would we decide if we were a parliament in Spain trying to choose between a 10-percent cut in funding for housing or, on the other hand, the purchase of the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria*?

One thing suggests itself strongly: Had we not tripled the national debt in a single decade, we would not have to make this choice. We mortgaged so much of our future during that credit card financed tour of nostalgia with President Feelgood.

But, we did it and recriminations now aren't going to change the results. I'll leave it to history to make the ultimate judgement on those years. But we can leave to no one else the decision that must be made today.

I have to, painfully, reluctantly and with an enormous sense of frustration come down, this time, on the side of the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria*. I will not abandon the housing needs of this Nation. Future space ship captains need secure homes in which to grow and learn and dream. But today, in this specific vote, we decide whether we will abandon a major commitment to humankind's frontier. And I simply can't do that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I feel very much like the mythological boy must have felt as he watched the parade go by as he exclaimed, "The emperor has no clothes." Amidst all of the lofty rhetoric that we have heard concerning the space station, the stars in the heavens and the skies, I think it is time for us to understand that the more emotion, the less reason. So let us come back down to Earth for a few moments and discuss where we are.

The space station amendment, which we are discussing at this moment, would earmark some $1.9 billion for that project. In the amendment some $33 million as a fish hook for some folks is given to veterans and a quarter of a billion, $250 million, is taken from HUD projects and put in there. That leaves $1.65 billion that has to come from somewhere. Where is this going to come from?

Well, of course, it has to come from other NASA projects. But downstream I think we see the continuation of those missions as well and maybe this year we will take a little bit from the HUD projects, but in the long run, I know where the money is going to come from. 1.9 this year, 2.3 next year, 2.8 next year, and $4 billion thereafter until the $40 billion or thereabouts is reached. Where will it come from?

First the projects that fall off undoubtedly will be the joint DOD–NASA projects.

□ 1820

Then as the budgeteers look at the budget year after year after year to fund the space station, there is only one place and one area where the large amount of money is declining, and that, of course, is in the Department of Defense funding.

So I think that it is reasonable to say that in the days and years ahead, the project will be funded out of that.

We see a need to keep our national defense aboveboard. We see that we have had a history of bringing this national defense up to a high level, but if we allow it to slip as it was back in the late 1970's, we may very well see Desert One problems as opposed to successful operations that we have had in more recent years.

Let us not kid ourselves. We cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We must make a decision.

I think the way to make this decision would be for this amendment to be defeated, for this conference to make priorities with the NASA budget, know what missions are doable, know what missions are not doable, and then proceed from there. If we do not do that, we will be making a sad mistake, and in the long run I know who will pay the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, with so much having been said, there may be few arguments that can be added to a very long debate, but there are some emotions I would like to revisit, like those images of young persons walking down the path helmet in hand ready to begin America's exploration of space, or those first few words of JOHN GLENN telling America that orbit had been achieved, or the sight of our flag on the Moon.

Mr. Chairman, some of us were only schoolchildren when this epic journey began, and now it is for us to decide

whether, on those days we were beginning down a long path of human exploration to encompass the whole solar system, or whether it ends here.

The ambition, the pride, the promise ends here on this night in this Chamber with this vote, because, my friends, make no mistake about it, this vote is not about a reduction in spending, not about a change in direction in this space program. It is a judgment about whether the manned exploration of space by this country, by American astronauts, will end, never to be achieved again, and whether, indeed, that giant leap of mankind turns out to be a rather small step after all.

The space station is part of a continuum, an unbroken chain from Apollo to shuttle to interplanetary travel. Break it once, and it will not be constructed again.

I know that choice is difficult; veterans, housing, economic needs; but for all of these wants, there is not a Government program, no new source of funding, just this: economic growth, of a growing economy based on learning, discoveries of science, the space program itself.

Space and science are not a problem for these wants. They are the answer.

It is no coincidence, my friends, that the one part of our economy that is functioning the best, our one net surplus in trade, is aerospace. No coincidence. It is the result of three decades of space exploration, of investing in science that is producing the very revenues we need to meet these very needs.

There was a time when the decision for exploration, of scientific breakthrough was ours alone. It would be made in this Chamber or it would not be made at all. That is not true any longer.

Space will be explored. There will be new breakthroughs in science. The only question is whether America participates, whether or not the breakthroughs of medicine and new materials and computers are shared by Americans or are dominated by others, and whether the citizens that are served by those breakthroughs, their veterans, their homeless, those in need in their countries are served or ours, or whether, indeed, as the promise of the space station would have it, we do these things together.

For 30 years we have made these judgments. We have decided to take up the challenge, and our credibility is so strong that when the Japanese reached the judgment of whether to have a space program, they decided to do it with America; so strong that when the Europeans decided to have a space station, they decided to do it with America and invested $1 billion.

If we fail, they will now proceed or proceed without us.

My colleagues, we have never failed to make this judgment before, never failed. Do not tonight.

We will not revisit this moment again. For the future of our science program, of our economy, of what we are about as a nation, keep America in space. Support Lowery-Chapman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

I think there has been some misinformation and suggestions given, and just briefly I would like to point out to my colleagues that there is no increase under this amendment in the space budget. It does not take a nickel away from the already voted-upon appropriation within the committee for veterans, et cetera.

I think it is wrong to put fear in veterans, as a strong supporter of their programs, that somehow this competes with them. It does not, and the amendment in no way touches their benefits.

Soon, Congress and the administration will make a crucial decision regarding the future of the space station, a manned scientific laboratory in outer space. I believe strongly that the space station should be developed. It is at the core of the entire NASA program. Without it, the American people will have lost an historic opportunity to expand employment, commercial, scientific and educational bases.

Americans can be proud that we emerged as the leader in space technology. Ever since the 1950's, when President Eisenhower challenged the Soviets' leadership in space, after their stunning development of the sputnik, the social and economic spinoffs from space technology have transformed our lives here on Earth. The scientific knowledge gathered from our space efforts led to advancements such as innovative insulation of clothing and homes, preservation of food and improvement in the quality of drinking water. Without our adventures in space, we would not be able to enjoy satellite television, enhanced airplane fuel economy, sophisticated computer technology. Further spinoffs resulted in the development of ambulatory cataract surgery, laser surgery, insulin pumps, catscanners, and the purification of cardiovascular medications.

The space station laboratory will continue to benefit mankind in ways we cannot yet imagine. Many of the discoveries cannot be projected, but we do know some of the potential spinoffs. Study of calcium loss in a gravity-free environment, for example, will allow us to address the problem of osteoporosis and find a cure for it. Scientists can also tackle hypertension and other cardiovascular diseases and conduct studies of cancer and immunological disorders. The space station environment will allow stable and ordered growth of protein crystals, leading to the development of new vaccines and drugs to prevent and cure diseases like diabetes.

The space-based laboratory will also offer a unique base to observe environmental degradation, agricultural production and weather patterns on Earth, providing opportunities to deal comprehensively with problems such as ozone depletion, the green house effect, acid rain, food production and world hunger. Above all, pioneering in the unknown will continue to stimulate America's creative genius, in itself reason enough for the existence of the space station.

Americans can be justly proud of our space program, but Greater Clevelanders in particular have reason to be pleased with our contributions. We are home to the Lewis Research Center, the only NASA site in the entire Northeast-Midwest region of the country. For 50 years, it has excelled in energy and propulsion technology. It is an anchor of our economy. Every day, 4,500 workers walk through the doors of Lewis to meet the challenge of our Nation's future. The Lewis Research Center has generated billions of dollars in contracts for Ohio businesses, creating further spinoffs and economic ripples. Since Lewis is responsible for the power and electrical systems for the space station 1,000 new jobs have been created for 1992 alone, involving 134 Ohio businesses.

Education in Ohio has also benefitted. Nine Ohio universities and 17 firms have formed the Ohio Aerospace Institute, located at Lewis. In 1 year, nearly $1 million in scholarships and almost $2 million in Federal funds have been granted to Ohio academic research. In addition, hundreds of junior and senior high school students from our city and suburban schools attend workshops and benefit from summer internships. For America to remain a globally competitive Nation, we must continue to invest in future technologies. If we abandon the space station, the Japanese, French, and others are waiting in the wings to completely take over. For the sake of the many practical applications whch have already improved our quality of life on Earth and will continue to do so, and for the sake of our country's future, we must save this valuable program.

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

I have all sorts of material from NASA and the administration, and I was all prepared to say many of the things that my colleagues said over and over during the last few hours. As I watch the debate, it occurred to me as we come toward a close, maybe the most amazing thing about this afternoon has been the length and the intensity, passion, the fact that so many Members of both sides of the aisle felt compelled to come down here and to speak out.

This has been, for an amendment of this kind, an unusually long debate. It has been an intense, emotional outpouring, a passionate, bipartisan pleading for a yes vote. For a yes vote for the future, for a yes vote for men and women in space. Members might ask, why have Democrats and Republicans alike spoken out? Why have liberals and conservatives alike come down here and asked for a yes vote. I think because this is the dream, the dream in many ways of our childhood. Many Members grew up when manned space was simply a dream. Even the youngest Member of this House was born before the first man walked on the Moon. We all remember vividly that moment, and the fact that that man was free and an American.

In a very real sense, Neil Armstrong's spirit is here in this Chamber, urging Members to vote yes, so free men and women and continue to go into space.

I remember as a high school student reading of the magic future in magazines that no longer exist—Collier's, Saturday Evening Post—where writers said, "Yes, it is possible someday to have a different future, to reach out, to explore the unknown." That was the period of sputnik, a time when Americans did not invest enough, and when Eisenhower had to lead an effort to catch up with the Soviet effort.

Then as a college student, I listened to John F. Kennedy magnificently pledge to go to the Moon. His spirit is in this room in a bipartisan plea that our future not be cutoff, that we not turn our backs, that we not lose the future. In the tradition of John F. Kennedy, we owe a yes vote to our children and to the future.

It is easy to be negative. In 1850, Daniel Webster stood in the other body and he ridiculed the idea of going West. He joked about California. Members should read someday the speech in which he described my good friend's State as a State that had no future, no economic worth, no hope, a place as barren as the Moon. If Members read those words they would not be able to imagine that he is talking about what is now our largest State, an economy eighth largest in the world. Yet because he lacked vision and courage, he suggested America turn its back on the future when the future was California.

Now, some of our good friends would have the United States, out of cheapness, out of arguments involving other less risky, less romantic, less daring reasons, turn our back on the future.

I will close with this thought: There are a lot of things computers can do. There is a lot of stuff scientific instrumentation can do. In the end, over and over, as recently as the war in Iraq, we have proven that the human being on site with their own eyes, their own mind, their own senses, makes a difference. When we go into the unknown, it is very helpful to have a human being with all of those facilities, in the middle of that unknown.

This may be one of the most important votes we ever cast, because if the station dies on this floor tonight, if the Japanese and the Europeans and the Canadians and others learn, "Do not trust America, do not commit your money to work with the Americans, do not rely on the unreliable allies whose Congress cuts you off a third of the way through, and all the future efforts to go through the unknown, are alliances with the Russians, the French, the Germans, Japanese, and Canadians, but not the Americans," then we will all pay dearly.

On the other hand, if we vote yes tonight, we are reaffirming the commitment that John F. Kennedy made. We are reaffirming the tradition of Neil Armstrong, and we are moving together to give our children and grandchildren a far better future.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat reluctant to take this time because I know there are others who perhaps would like to speak, and certainly more able speakers than I. However, I will do this because I do think this is important, and I do think we have had a good debate.

My own attitudes towards the space program were shaped early in life and arose out of reading science fiction and the work of great scientists. I think most people do not realize that the great scientist Newton developed equations by which he could predict the speed at which a body could leave the Earth, and in a sense, set the stage for the planetary exploration of today. H.G. Wells, of course, wrote marvelous books about space exploration, going to the Moon and so forth. Many other authors did.

One of the most profound emotional experiences of my life was when we had the first Moon shot, and I took my father who was then nearly 80, and one of my neighbors, who was about 10, down for that event. Throughout the life of my father, who recently passed away, he said that that was the most significant moment of his life, watching that first vehicle leave the Earth and go to the Moon. My nephew has said the same thing over these past 20-odd years.

So this is an emotional attachment. It is something that I have lived to want to see. Our exploration of space, and it has been the greatest pleasure of my life to have an opportunity to have some influence on it. Then I have found that it is more than emotion. I have found that the future economic growth of this country depends upon how much we are willing to invest in science and technology and research and development. Over the past 25 years, we have averaged a fairly constant 2 percent of our gross national product investment in what OMB calls "civilian research and development."

During that same period our competitors, the Japanese, the Europeans, particularly the Germans, starting from a much lower level, about 1 percent of the GNP, moved up to the point where they now have a 50 percent larger investment than we do.

□ 1840

The charts over here, which we used on Monday, illustrate this.

Today the Japanese spend about 3 percent of their GNP on civilian R&D compared to our 2. Now, when they crossed the line and began to exceed us, our balance of trade in advanced technology products became negative. The reasons are simple: They are making more investments in trained manpower, in research and in advanced technology. That is not the only factor.

I do not want to oversimplify it. They have cheaper capital and other things. But the investments in research and development, commitment to developing new knowledge and exploiting it makes the difference.

Half of this country's investment in civilian research and development is the space program and when the space program in our budget begins to turn down, and that is exactly what this appropriation bill does, it reduces it below last year's level; when it begins to turn down, you can be sure that our future as an economic leader in this world, not just the space leader, is going to turn down also. When half of our investments in civilian R&D are in the space field and we begin to cut those down, that is going to be the final score that shows that this country no longer has the leadership potential.

You will see the negative trade balances going more and more to the critical technologies. We have the documents, we have reports coming out of our ears, which show that that is exactly what is happening.

So my emotional attachment to the space program, which is lifelong, has not gone away but it has been replaced by a solid, pragmatic economic and political analysis that our future as a leader in the world, the economic health of this Nation, the ability of our children to expect a higher standard of living depends on our willingness to commit ourselves to the support of this program. I promise you the space station means, if we lose it, that from now on we see a 10 percent per year decline in our investments in space, and that will be reflected in the health of this Nation.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told all sorts of marvelous things about the space station this afternoon; it is going to cure cancer and do all sorts of wonderful things for mankind. That is, of course, the same story we were told by NASA at the outset of the program; it was going to be a marvelous astronomical observatory, it was going to be a wonderful platform for Earth sciences, it was going to be a marvelous place to do microgravity materials processing, and above all it was going to be a marvelous laboratory for life sciences.

What has happened? In the case of the astronomy community, the National Research Council put out a study of priority projects for astronomy and astrophysics for the next decade. Not a one of them goes on the space station.

Dr. Sally Ride did a report for NASA on the future of NASA, where she brought together what was involved in Mission to Planet Earth. Her report makes it clear that Mission to Planet Earth cannot make much use of the space station. Mission to Planet Earth requires polar and geosynchronous orbits, and the space station essentially will be in equatorial orbit.

So, really, it is of no use for a Mission to Planet Earth.

As for the microgravity research and the life science research, I shall again read you the comments of the Space Studies Board of the National Research Council on the latest configuration:

> In the judgment of the board, the proposed redesign of Space Station Freedom does not meet the stated national goal of enabling the life sciences research necessary to support extended human space exploration nor does it meet the stated needs of the microgravity research community.

So, all these hifalutin things you have heard about what the station is going to do for science and space travel and the like really get knocked in the hat when you look at the hard reality of the program.

What they do not tell you is what they are cutting, because what they are cutting is going to hurt human beings, it is going to hurt life science, and it is going to hurt science and it is going to hurt our exports.

Let me just go through that a little bit. The amendment cuts space science and applications by $460 million below what the committee has, $500 million below what the President requested. That will include a cut in life sciences of $10 million below what the committee has and it will include a cut in Earth sciences of $118 million.

We are told how important it is to do research for exports and manufacturing technologies; there is no industry where we are more preeminent than in the aeronautical industry. But we are not going to stay there if the proponents of this amendment have their way and cut $79 million from aeronautical research and technology as they would do.

As for manned flight, they cut space flight control and data communications $526 million below what the committee did. And of that amount, they cut $187 million from shuttle production and operations capacity and they cut $225 million from space shuttle operations.

How are we going to have human beings in space if they are not going to allow us to keep up the shuttle, the only vehicle we have for getting human beings into space.

My colleagues, I plead with you, I know the romance of the space station; but when you take a hard look at it as the science community has done, it just does not work and you are killing other NASA programs which have real importance.

Finally, although the proponents of this amendment have very cleverly crafted it so that this year it is not touching the VA or the environment, the fact of the matter is that their program requires a $400 million increase next year and requires a quarter-of-a-billion-dollar increase a year after that and for the rest of the decade. And there is no way that our subcommittee is going to be able to provide the kind of funding it ought to be providing in 1993 and the years after for the veterans programs, the environment, the National Science Foundation and the homeless if we have to take the kind of hit that the space station will inevitably impose on us.

I say to you very simply that is why the League of Conservation Voters, that is why all the veterans organizations, all the housing groups, everyone else who has an interest in this bill is pleading with you to defeat this amendment and stay with a committee that had the courage to make the hard choices.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Lowery-Chapman amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lowery-Chairman amendment to fully fund space station Freedom. This is not an easy vote for me to cast, but it is a necessary one.

The future of our Nation, and indeed of all humanity, fundamentally depends on our vision and our commitment to move forward, to take risks and to expand the boundaries of human knowledge and experience.

The manned space program has played a critical role in expanding our knowledge of our own world, has improved the quality of life for millions of people, and has opened the doors of the solar system to us and our children.

But there is far more at stake with space station Freedom than the romance of manned space travel.

The future of American preeminence in science and technology is intimately bound with our commitment to pursuing the goals of the Space Station Program.

Budget constraints force difficult choices. The HUD funds cut by this amendment will come from critically needed operating funds for local housing agencies. At a time when millions of Americans are homeless or live in substandard housing we have a moral responsibility to provide adequate resources for Federal housing programs.

Likewise, I am concerned about the claims of opponents of this amendment that its passage will result in future cuts in EPA's budget. As a committed advocate of environmental protection, I have long supported increased funding of EPA. I will vehemently oppose any effort to reduce EPA's already inadequate budget.

But it is terribly shortsighted to use budget constraints as an excuse not to invest in America's future. U.S. leadership and competitiveness in a vast array of critical technologies and industries, our international competitiveness, and ultimately our standard of living depends on a prudent and sustained commitment to projects such as the space station.

Just last week the House approved a defense authorization bill which contained $2.9 billion for SDI. I have long argued that, rather than wasting billions of dollars of taxpayers money on a weapons program that will not work, that we don't need, and that will undermine existing arms control agreements, we should invest those monies in our manned and unmanned space programs.

Such a reallocation of resources would provide NASA with the funds it needs to adequately fund its mission, eliminate the need for the kind of budget cuts necessitated by this amendment, and use scarce government funds for a productive, rather than destructive, purpose.

The only logical next step for the U.S. Manned Space Program is to develop a permanent space infrastructure. The space station is a critical part of such an infrastructure. It will be a unique laboratory for research across a broad range of disciplines, including materials research and the biological sciences. A necessary prerequisite for any future manned space efforts will be the knowledge and experience we acquire through the space station.

Without the space station, the space shuttle is left without its prime customer, and will itself become only marginally useful.

If we don't build the space station, there is no longer the need for the new heavy lift capability that was intended to be another pillar of our space program.

Without the space station, there is simply no manned space program. It will not be an easy task to reconstitute this program once we have killed it.

If we cancel the space station, our aerospace workforce—in NASA and the private sector—will wither. The bright young scientists and engineers who might have been drawn to the space program by the challenge and promise of Space Station Freedom will search elsewhere for career fulfillment.

A strong and robust aerospace industry is critical to our future international competitiveness. If we kill the space station we will be driving yet another nail into the coffin of that industry.

Further, the abdication of U.S. international scientific leadership in space would be nothing short of a national tragedy.

We should also not underestimate the grave threat cancellation of the space station poses to all future international scientific cooperative efforts.

The space station is the largest international scientific effort ever undertaken. With 11 foreign partners having committed nearly $8 billion to this project, and having revamped their own national space program to accommodate the space station in a central way, our abrupt cancellation at this time will do irreparable damage to U.S. credibility and will spell disaster for future U.S. attempts to muster international support for bold new science and technology projects.

Let me remind my colleagues that the money used to build the space station is not being sent into orbit. It is being spent here on planet Earth—creating highly skilled jobs—78,000 of them so far, and putting money into communities in 40 States. More importantly, we are building a community of scientists and engineers who will spearhead U.S. technology development well into the next century.

Space Station Freedom is not an investment in merely a space platform, it is an investment in America's future.

More importantly, it is an investment in expanding the horizons of the human race. The philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer once said, "every man takes the limits of his own field of vision for the limits of the world."

The Manned Space Program is an effort to expand the limits of our vision into our solar system and the universe beyond.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Lower-Chapman amendment to restore funding for the space station and continue our assault on the frontiers of human knowledge.

□ 1850

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

Mr. Chairman, I realize the hour is late, and we have heard long debate, and so I will try to limit my remarks.

However, Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

There have been many speeches on the part of the amendment. I respect all those people. I understand where they are coming from. But I think we must look at two aspects of this amendment: what it gives us and what it takes away.

First, in terms of what it gives us, I, too, believe we have to explore space. I, too, believe that we need the kind of scientific and industrial throw-offs that space exploration gives us.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would argue to my colleagues that what this amendment will do is force NASA to eat its young. Every new program in space science, in satellites, in everything else, will be squeezed out by the space station. It is not a program that is at the cutting edge of science. It is not a program that is at the cutting edge of any of the new things we need to know to keep America preeminent and economically No. 1. It is something that does provide jobs. It is something that people see has impact in their district, but, when we talk about space, and we talk about vision, and we talk about what has to be done to keep man's knowledge at the cutting edge, no scientist I know believes the space station is the best way to go, and, in a day when NASA's budget will be limited, to put such a huge proportion of money into the space station will not move us forward into the future, but will move us back.

Mr. Chairman, a great nation is able to realize that one big shining project may not be the way to the future, and lots of slow, carefully thought-out, developmental projects are.

Second, I talk about investment. This takes away money from public housing.

Now we have already invested in this country, not in present value, but in previous value, $60 billion in building public housing. We know how desperately needed it is. We have all seen the waiting lists in city after city, and to take that money away; this is the maintenance money; it is as if we bought a huge expensive car, and instead of maintaining that car, we started putting our money into buying a new car. It makes no sense. Yet when we take away public housing operating subsidies, we are taking away the daily mending, repairing and upkeep of our Nation's $60 billion investment in public housing. There were better places to take the money from. They could not have found a worse place because we cannot afford to build much new housing, we must preserve the housing for the poor that we have, and cutting public housing subsidies ruins that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues on two bases, on the basis of preserving an investment we have, an investment on Earth, and on the basis of keeping us at the cutting edge of what is really science and not just gold plating in space, we must rise to the occasion and defeat the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] for an excellent statement. I agree with him in total. He said it well.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise, along with so many of my colleagues, to ask for this body's support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment to overturn the decision of the Appropriations Committee to dramatically reduce spending for fiscal year 1992 for the space station Freedom. With $4.65 billion already having been spent, I question the wisdom of abandoning the project.

Further, everybody will agree that America's credibility is on the line—curtailing funding in fiscal year 1992 will surely decimate the Freedom, jeopardizing our relationships with Canada, Japan, and the European Community. After all, they have already contributed over a billion dollars to defray the construction and design costs.

Shutting down the station at this juncture will assuredly have repercussions throughout the manned space program—in fact it could be the deathknell for the entire space effort. The Freedom is a vital component of our future space infrastructure, providing us with a celestial platform from which we can go on to explore the cosmos, including the Moon and Mars.

True, funding station in this budget cycle will mean that other NASA programs will not be funded at optimal levels in the next year. This would include EOS, the Earth observing system. Under the terms of the Chapman-Lowery amendment, EOS would suffer a cut of $146 million from the President's request, but I maintain that this reduction would allow us to more clearly define the proper course and goals for the project. Less aggressive EOS funding in fiscal year 1992 will mean that we can proceed more carefully, more deliberately, on this extraordinarily complex engineering project.

Further, if station is canceled, we are jeopardizing the future of EOS, which is also dependent on international cooperation. Not funding station will call

into question our reliability as a research partner.

Also, we cannot lose track of the fact that the Freedom represents and investment in our future. Operations aboard the Freedom will move us ahead in the areas of microgravity research, medical sciences, and materials development. This will translate into an important competitive advantage for America in the international trading arena.

It is unfortunate that the the nature of Representative TRAXLER's bill is such that we are forced to make difficult choices among such disparate priorities as VA health care and the NASA budget. In light of this reality, the Chapman-Lowery amendment represents the most logical distribution of funds within the 602 B allocation. It will help us to respect the funding needs of HUD, EPA, and the Veterans' Administration. At the same time, it will permit us to maintain a balance within NASA between space science and manned space exploration. Importantly, this is consistent with the findings of the Augustine Commission.

Ultimately, we must understand that without the station, we are condemning the space program to a uninspired, undirected existence. We must restore a reasonable, rational vision to the space program—support station by supporting Chapman-Lowery.

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

Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment. I commend the speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCMILLEN] for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment which would restore funding for space station Freedom.

Funding space station Freedom is not to choose the manned program over space science. The space station will enhance all of NASA's science programs in the long run. A robust manned-space program was proven to strengthen overall NASA growth, especially its science programs.

Space station Freedom will provide a permanent manned facility in space to study the effects of long-term space travel. It will provide a life-science and microgravity research facility that will be second to none.

The potential of a space-based laboratory to provide vital scientific breakthroughs is extraordinary. Many research opportunities are being developed by NASA's centers for the commercial development of space. The center at the University of Alabama in Birmingham is conducting biomedical research such as the development of human protein crystals in microgravity. Such crystals, which cannot be developed on Earth, can be developed on the extended-duration operations of the space station. These crystals offer the hope of new medicines being developed in much shorter times than are currently available. Additional centers at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and at Auburn University are conducting research in the areas of microgravity-materials processing and advanced-power systems which is well suited for the space station. The science potential on the station is unparalleled.

Some argue that the Chapman-Lowery amendment guts NASA's science projects. This is simply not true. The amendment holds NASA's spending at 1991 levels for all accounts. There are several accounts that were funded in 1991 that are not needed or are reduced in 1992. The gamma ray observatory, Mars observer project, upper atmosphere research satellite, and the global geospace science project are good examples. These programs alone will allow NASA to reprogram more than $120 million to other science projects. This reprogramming will restore funding to important initiatives such as the advanced x-ray astrophysics facility and the Earth-observing system.

The Chapman amendment does not eliminate NASA science projects that opponents of the amendment would have you believe. It simply slows the increases for some of those projects. Let's not be short sighted in our vision of the future of the manned-space program and NASA's science projects. A vote for the Chapman amendment is a vote to invest in our future.

Support America's space program. Vote for the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we have the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], and myself left on the list; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. He has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend a previous unanimous-consent request, that the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] be allowed 3 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] 3 minutes, and I will close debate with 5 minutes.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, are there other Members' names on the list?

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous consent earlier was an agreement that all debate on the Chapman amendment end at 7 o'clock.

Mr. TRAFICANT. However, Mr. Chairman, I would ask, "Weren't there other Members' names on the list?"

The CHAIRMAN. All Members' names on the original list, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] knows, were called, and there is not now time for Members who were not listed at the time of the limitation.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, Robert Browning wrote it years ago and it is appropriate to our debate today.

Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp
Or what's a heaven for?

Man has been studying the heavens since he has been able to see them. We have been reaching for the stars through the centuries in poetry, in prose, in song, and in science. It is only in the last few decades that we have finally "slipped the surly bonds of earth" and climbed to the Heavens.

I grew up watching the space program go up. The Russians launched sputnik in October 1957, and the Nation responded to the challenge. We tried and failed and tried again—but we presisted. My heroes became Wally Schirra, Gordon Cooper, and Alan Shephard. Manned space missions gave us, vicariously, the thrill of the unknown, the daring of the astronauts, the successes for our country as we competed with the Russians and won. Neil Armstrong walked on the moon and we took that giant step with him staring at the television set in disbelief and unquenchable pride.

Each launch, each mission, each walk in space added to a storehouse of information. Then, in the 1970's we decided to skip a decade. The 1980's brought as the shuttle and the 1990's were to bring us the space station.

This Nation needs a vision for the future. The space station and manned space exploration are that vision. Although unmanned spacecraft have an important role in a balanced space program, there is simply no substitute for the hands-on laboratory experiments and exploratory voyages that have characterized all technology progress to date here on Earth.

And the Augustine report, which was accepted on a bipartisan basis as a blueprint for the future in space reads,

* * * the Committee holds the strong conviction that if the U.S. is to have any significant long-term manned space program, a space station is the next logical and essential element of that endeavor. The most significant unknowns remaining in manned exploration reside in the area of life sciences. A manned, near-Earth laboratory is, in our judgment, the sensible place to begin addressing these crucial questions which sooner or later must and will be resolved—by the U.S. or some other space faring nation.

Americans are not willing to let some other space faring nation lead this conquest of the next frontier.

Do we now erase the dream? Do we stop here and tell our children, it was a good idea but we are not going to conquer the next frontier? Do we tell them to be content to watch science fiction and count the satellites that are successfully launched?

Our children are falling behind most other countries in test scores in math and science. The Soviet Union is graduating five times as many engineers as the United States while Japan, with only half of our population now out produces the United States in many critical science education ideas.

It is time to recapture the challenge of the 1950's and 1960's. It is big science that inspires and sparks the imagination. It is the space station that will lead our country to preeminence in space.

Vice President QUAYLE said,

> The importance of the Space Station is not the size of its span nor the power of its circuits; it is the size of the dream and depth of the commitment it represents.

NASA and the administration are committed to a balanced plan for space exploration. Let this Congress keep the commitment as well. Let us continue to reach for the stars.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a great debate here on the future of space, and I commend our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], and our ranking member, but let me just say, "Let's vote for the Chapman-Lowery amendment, and let's keep reaching for the stars."

□ 1900

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] for his able assistance in helping to craft and present this amendment. I will not use all of my 3 minutes, but I will say that the debate tonight in my judgment is about who we are in America, what we believe in, and where we will go.

The manned space program, as has been described by speaker after speaker, is in jeopardy and its very existence is on the line tonight with this vote. With space station Freedom there can be no serious debate that we will make scientific discoveries. We will make medical breakthroughs, we will improve technologies, and we will by virtue of those discoveries and those advancements improve not only our country, our future, our youth, but yes, in fact all mankind. Tonight this vote is about who we are, what we believe in, and where we will go.

Mr. Chairman, let us support the investment of our funds in space station Freedom. Let us support the future of America and all mankind. I ask the Members to vote for the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] is recognized as the final speaker for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I most especially want to extend my deep gratitude and appreciation to the sponsors of the amendment, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] and to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for the high-level of debate which started sometime this morning. I want to say how proud I am of this body, irrespective of how this vote comes out. I have learned a lot, and I am sure that America has as well. I extend my gratitude for that.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell the Members what the amendment does in my judgment. I believe it restores much of the funding for station, and it offsets that increase for station by freezing NASA at the 1991 level in the science accounts and other accounts, and additionally it takes $217 million from the poorest of the poor of this Nation. For me, I am not only looking at this year's allocation but also next year's allocation. Our allocation at that time is not going to be sufficient to do all the things all the people want us to do. Even as we could not do them this year, I want to assure the members we will not be able to do them next year, especially with the station in and capturing so much of our resources.

Let me put this question to rest. The manned space flight program is not in jeopardy. Space station is in jeopardy with this amendment. As we talk here now, men and women are in space. Are the Members aware of that? We are going to be there. We have an excellent manned space program. The question is: Do we want a station that performs essentially two limited functions at a cost of over $40 billion? And that number will climb as we add the centrifuge and assured crew rescue vehicle. Both of those items will add billions.

So the question becomes in my judgment one of: What are your priorities? In my judgment, this means that the agency, NASA itself, could lose between a thousand and two thousand civil servants because of the cuts contained in this amendment. If you do not think that is real, when we come back from the Senate and we cut the money for NASA's science programs, Members will understand then what we have done. It means that the space science programs are virtually wiped out, and I support him. I do not like what we are doing. It means that EOS, the Earth Observation System, is gone. How are we going to know about our ozone layer problem and its effects on mankind and the habitability of this planet without EOS and the EOS-DIS? I do not know.

It means that the space shuttle program, the only manned program that we have in place, will be cut between $300 million and $500 million with this amendment. What this boils down to is that we are funding a station at the expense of every other NASA program. The Members have got to know that. If they love NASA, they have got to hate this amendment. In addition to that, we are attacking the weakest folks in America, the poor who live in public housing.

Many members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology have stood in this well year after year after year talking about science. I have listened to them, and they taught me well. I subscribed to what they said, that NASA science programs are critical and essential. I believed them, and we protected those programs fully in this bill. This amendment guts them. It goes in the face of everything anyone has done on the Science Committee in prior years. I am sorry to have to say that.

The decision to support this amendment is wrong. Why? Because when this bill goes to conference, the problems are only going to get worse. We are not going to cut medical care for veterans, because I will not, you will not, and certainly the Senate will not. The veterans have said that they do not like this amendment. We have all the letters before us in our office, and they are handing them out at the doors. They are troubled by this amendment. They know it is part of their lunch that is going to get eaten by station next year and the year after and the year after as the limitations on expenditures inescapably fall upon this House in the years to come.

I ask the Members to listen to this. This country has serious fiscal problems. They are serious, and we cannot do everything any more. This amendment doesn't recognize those limitations. It expands the scope of our fiscal obligations in the years to come when we are not going to be able to do everything. The choices we are making here are hard, difficult choices. We came back down on the side of basic research, on the side of science, on the side of EPA science research and investment, on VA medical program, which we support, and we came down and said, yes, we support housing for the poor. We are not going to cut Department of Veterans Affairs programs in conference. We are not going to cut the EPA, in my judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in closing that this is the wrong amendment, and this is the wrong approach for this Nation.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Chapman-Lowery amendment to the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill. This amendment, which would provide funding for NASA's space station Freedom, would require cuts in essential domestic programs.

I recognize the need for the United States to remain globally competitive through scientific research. In fact, I have been holding hearings on international competitiveness in the Ways and Means Committee this very week. I acknowledge that the Space Station Freedom is certainly a vehicle for the United States to retain its leadership in space exploration.

However, I am certain that every Member in this Chamber is aware of the severe constraints that have been placed on spending through last year's budget agreement. Because of these restrictions, we as legislators must make difficult decisions in domestic spending.

Mr. Chairman, the Chapman-Lowery amendment provides $1.9 billion for the space station by holding all NASA programs at last year's levels and by cutting $250 million from public housing operating subsidies. Next year the space station will need further funding. And it will need continued funding for an estimated 30 years.

Where will these funds come from?

Can we truly afford to pay for a laboratory in space at the expense of housing here on Earth?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in opposition to the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, it is important to look at the space station amendment and see who is effected by the offsets. We have already heard about space science, life science, other NASA programs and of course, every NASA contractor has faxed us an information package about housing programs. I'd like to focus on crime and drugs. Drug dealers are a big winner in this amendment and every law abiding citizen in public housing is a big loser. Let me explain how.

The Chapman-Lowery amendment cuts public housing operating subsidies by $250 million—that's over 10 percent. Operating subsidies cover costs for salaries of public housing employees, utility bills and small repairs of the facility. Salaries must be paid on time and so must utility bills meaning that inadequate funding—and this proposed amendment goes well beyond inadequate—will prevent small repairs from being made.

What kind of repairs are we talking about? The replacement of broken door and window locks, for example. The replacement of broken or burnt out light bulbs in common areas like courtyards and hallways; metal screens to prevent vandals from breaking lamppost bulbs; minor repairs of fences that are meant to keep unwanted visitors out of public housing; as well as the hiring of security officers to guard public housing units and the installation of drug prevention hotlines between police and residents of public housing.

In fact, there is no program of greater importance to the health and safety of public housing residents than operating subsidies. Even drug elimination grants, slated for $165 million, do not come close to providing the basic necessities for public housing safety that are funded out of operating subsidies.

Some have argued that the amendment only reduces funding to the President's request—so what is the problem? There is a game that is played out every year between the VA–HUD appropriations subcommittee and HUD. HUD comes in with a low-ball figure for public housing operating subsidies. During testimony Chairman TRAXLER asks Secretary Kemp if the figure put forth in the budget for operating subsidies is the Secretary's number or OMB's. The Secretary smiles, shifts in his chair and makes some sort of joke about OMB. All of the HUD bean counters in the room look at the ground, shrug their shoulders and sheepishly kick at the carpet looking like the cast in an "Our Gang" episode. The subcommittee, knowing that the survival of the units and the tenants depend on a reasonable allocation, increases the level and everyone is happy.

The President's request, which is the recommended level in Chapman-Lowery, is $19 million below the amount funded last year. And last year was a tight year for public housing. Chapman-Lowery would simply gut the program unless, by some miracle, utility prices plummet and the employees of public housing offer to return part of their salary.

If your office is like mine, then you have received faxed messages from NASA contractors concerning, believe it or not, HUD programs. Their information is way off the mark. They say that Chapman-Lowery will only delay the $250 million in HUD funding for 10 days. That 10 days puts us into fiscal year 1993, and we cannot appropriate for 1993 in the 1992 budget. Second, HUD needs to hold that $250 million until the last 10 days of the fiscal year because that is when the funding cycle begins for a sizable number of public housing authorities. If HUD does not hold the funds, they will be forced, once again, to ask for a supplemental appropriation.

Finally, I'd like to relay to you a quote from Secretary Kemp, who is greatly admired and supported in our subcommittee and this Chamber. I am quoting from April 24, 6 weeks ago before the VA–HUD subcommittee, and I hope to do justice to the Secretary's impassioned and eloquent delivery. Speaking to Chairman TRAXLER the Secretary quoted from a publication stating that, "by the time (public housing residents) are adolescents, they have contended with more terror than most of us confront in a lifetime." And then the Secretary said, "there are no children" in public housing. "They are 9 years old" but "they have seen too much."

Now we have an amendment in front of us that will guarantee that doors and windows that have been jimmied open by some crack-crazed assailant will not have their locks replaced; security officers will be terminated because no money is available for contracts. The equipment necessary to keep the criminal element at bay will become old, broken and useless. The drug dealer, the gang member, the vandal, the rapist, the killer wins. Everyone else loses.

It is amazing to me that we are debating the construction of a $40 billion station to be placed into space when we cannot change a light bulb in the public area of a public housing unit. I do not see the sense in that.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for this opportunity to speak in opposition to the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in reluctant opposition to the Chapman-Lowery amendment and the space station Freedom. This is a difficult decision for me to make as I have been a supporter of this mission since it's inception. However, the bold concept we began with has been carved up and reduced to a mission which shares little more than the name of the original idea.

Unfortunately, because of the budget caps set by last year's budget agreement, we don't have the money to continue this project and provide for other important space science projects. Ordinarily, a mission such as space station Freedom would yield many returns on our investment. However, because of rescoping and financial uncertainties, space station Freedom has been left without a true mission. Similarly NASA is off track. We must ensure that this agency is put back on course before we begin any new major endeavors. Once its mission is redefined and clarified and faith in this program is restored, space station Freedom should be wholeheartedly supported. I remain supportive of a manned space station. Indeed, such is station would be a very important part of our space program. However, until we are willing and able to fully commit to this mission, we should hold off on its funding. We can not continue to piecemeal the space station into space.

I have an additional concern with space station Freedom. Funding this mission would leave NASA in a position to do little more. It would mean our already suffering space science program would continue to be neglected. This comes at a time when space science was underlined as the most important part of our space program by the prestigious Augustine Report. Funding space station Freedom now would mean putting into a deep freeze the discoveries and innovations which beckon from outer space. We have heard about the economic and technological rewards in store for us if we fund space station Freedom. Even so, there will also be countless returns from the myriad of other space projects we will be able to fund if we do not fund station. Funding for space science will clearly be in jeopardy if we fund station. Science programs such as the Great Observatories, Mission to Planet Earth, Craf Cassini would not just be cut—they would be terminated. These programs have a defined and proven mission and deserve our continued support.

I realize the importance of a manned space mission. When we are able to fully support a refined manned mission, I will gladly support such a concept. As we enter the 21st century, we are in a good position to reevaluate and refocus the mission and future of NASA. I am excited about the opportunities available to us, and hope to be a part of this important process.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment to restore funding for the space station Freedom project.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of discussion about what this amendment does. Unfortunately, there has been a lot of misinformtion as well.

As the Members know full well, this House voted just over a month ago to fund the space station Freedom in the NASA authorization bill. The vote was 361 to 36.

Now today we're being asked to kill the program. Mr. Chairman, this is no way to run a railroad, and it's no way to run the Government space program.

Space station Freedom is a vital part of the U.S. space program for the next decade. Like other NASA programs, it will advance the state of science and technology, advance our medical knowledge of the human body, advance our knowledge of the ecology of our

planet, and provide untold scientific economic and other dividends.

It is an integral part of the two other major NASA missions slated for the 21st century: the Mission to Planet Earth and the Moon Mars Mission. Freedom will provide an unmatched platform for scientific observation of the Earth and its ecosystems—terrestrial, oceanic, and atmospheric.

It will provide the biological and technological foundation for lunar and planetary exploration.

Killing the space station is throwing away the opportunity to advance our knowledge of how the human body works and how the Earth itself works, along with the opportunity to learn how to cure the ailments of both.

There are those who say we can do all this with robots. I can guarantee you that those same people would not step onto an airliner piloted by a robot and fly coast to coast. We could probably program a robot to avoid thunderstorms and handle emergencies, but you won't get me on board.

Only a human being can make the untold calculations, adjustments and decisions to adapt to unforeseen situations or react to new information. That is the reason we have a manned space program.

Nor are the benefits entirely scientific. The space station project will advance our economy as well as our technology. The economy of the 21st century will rely upon technology, and the nation which leads in technology will be the leader in the world economy.

That is clearly why Canada, Japan, and the European Space Agency have signed on with the U.S. space station program. Canada created its space program specifically for the space station Freedom.

The space station project provides us with an unparalleled opportunity to develp an international cooperative agreement in space. Instead of competing, we will be working together for the advancement of scientific knowledge and for solutions to international dilemnas such as global warming, ozone layer depletion, deforestation and ocean pollution.

Mr. Chairman, as we come to a decision on whether to proceed with this program in 1992, I can't help but think back to a decision made 500 years ago, in 1492, when Christopher Columbus couldn't interest his own nation in funding a voyage of discovery to the New World.

He went to Spain instead, and the rest is history.

Let's not slip into the backwaters of scientific knowledge and exploration, the second rank of nations, the followers instead of the leaders in international cooperation. Vote for the space station Freedom—it will be the best investment we make in the next century.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, I will vote today to cut funding for the space station. I wish we had enough room in the Federal budget for all kinds of exotic investments, but today, the money just is not there.

Reaganomics and supply-side economics have left the American people with a $300 billion budget deficit, a $2.6 trillion national debt, and $198 billion in interest payments on the national debt annually. This means every American is paying an astounding $800 every year just to pay interest on the national debt. We have no choice but to cut corners.

We were originally told the space station would cost $8 billion and be ready in 1992. The General Accounting Office, Congress' investigative arm, now puts the price at $40 billion, saying the long-term cost will skyrocket to $118 billion. When it comes to the space station, the only thing that seems to get into orbit is the price tag.

The National Institutes of Health, the Federal agency trying to find cures for diseases like cancer and Alzheimer's, has only enough resources to fund 29 percent of the research projects approved by scientific panels for funding. With shortfalls like this, it is hard to keep pouring money into a project that even the prestigious National Academy of Sciences has concluded has little scientific use. For example, the space station was once justified as an outer space platform for monitoring large-scale changes on Earth, but today we have satellites that can do that. We have the space shuttle that can perform experiments on ultrapure drugs produced in zero gravity. Dr. James A. Van Allen, one of the world's preeminent space scientists puts it this way:

> My own aspiration for future space exploration is quite different [from the Reagan-Bush Administration's emphasis on manned flights]—namely, building on our experience and using the superb techniques of unmanned flight to pursue scientific investigations and applications having direct value to human welfare and to the future habitability of the Earth.

The Bush administration promotes the space station as a project that will maintain American prestige around the globe. I simply don't think it is worth that for $118 billion.

I am certainly not against scientific exploration. The bill before us continues funding for the other activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It provides funding for the National Science Foundation to help restore excellence in science and mathematics among our students. Nor am I not against scientific research.

But I have to question spending taxpayer money on projects of questionable scientific merit. Voting against this amendment today that restores space station funding is my way of saying, "No."

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, it's been interesting to listen to the debate on this amendment. I envy the many Members who have spoken and who are able to see support or opposition to the amendment as the clear and obvious choice. After studying the issue, after 4 years on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I am afraid I am genuinely conflicted about what is best.

Looking first at the international ramifications, I believe we do have to pay attention to the negative impact it will have on our space station partners if we kill the program. They have committed real money based on real agreements. We cannot be cavalier in dismissing that dimension of the decision before us. It will hurt us if we do not keep our agreements.

Although it is impossible to quantify or place a dollar value on considerations like U.S. leadership in space, that consideration is nonetheless significant. I do not want to see this country lose or compromise its aspirations to greatness or its status as the pre-eminent nation in space.

The question is what is best and right for America in the long term. This would all be so much easier were it not for the fiscal cul-de-sac we are in. Budget discipline, we are all finding out, involves real choices and real pain. No new starts in the Energy and Water appropriations. Zeroing out earmarked grants in the Treasury, Postal bill. Now this.

I have a hard time envisioning a space program for America 20 years hence that does not include a manned, orbiting facility of some kind. Does that mean we should stay the course with the current space station program? Or, does it make sense to put this troubled program aside for now, keep the manned program going with shuttle, and come back with a better, less-compromised approach, when the budget is in better shape, and, arguably, when intervening manned and unmanned activities will have enabled a better conceived and engineered station?

I am especially worried about the effects of this amendment on the space science and applications program at NASA. There is no way we can ignore the very severe impact of a half-billion-dollar reduction there in order to make room for station. Yet, the most recent and persuasive review of NASA priorities by the Augustine Commission recommends this as the area to get top priority.

Whether it is EOS, or AXAF, or any of several other projects, there is good evidence that we will be getting more and more significant and needed knowledge from this part of NASA's budget. It may even carry the same—or better—commercial spin-off potential as station. And the gnawing question remains as to how much of the science conducted on station could not be done safer and cheaper and even better via unmanned satellites and probes.

Looking further at the budgetary implications, the out-year predictions are uncertain. I would love to buy the proposition that, with the rescoped station, we have seen the end of the ramp-up, and the only increases that lie ahead are modest, annual inflation adjustments. It does stretch my faith, however, to make a decision today that depends to any great degree on that prediction coming true. And if it does not, as Chairman TRAXLER points out, things are only going to get worse next year and the year after.

I believe the United States should continue to have a manned space program. Space station would certainly be the most compelling and dramatic way for us to do so. My thinking on this amendment is colored, however, by the fact that the shuttle program should and will continue, even if station—in its present configuration—does not.

The decision on this amendment carries very direct consequences for my district in Colorado—a district that is home to world class scientists and engineers employed by universities, Federal research agencies, and many private firms, large and small. I have sought their advice on this. They, too, are divided. But the clear preponderance of informed, professional advice from my area is—if the choice between station and the rest of NASA's research and development budget

has to be made—to choose, with regret, to cut space station.

In an issue like this, institutional tactics should come last. No one knows what the Senate will do, or how to position the House to get the best outcome in conference. What we do know is that this vote today is not going to be the end of this issue. And so, I choose to weigh in at this time, and under the current circumstances, and with clear admission of my own uncertainty about this, on the side of retaining the Committee's numbers. I'll continue to study the question and will welcome all the advice and counsel I can get.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2519, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill and urge my colleagues to reject all amendments to reduce funding for the vitally needed. I would like to commend Chairman TRAXLER and the members of the subcommittee for their wisdom and their courage in addressing our urgent and pressing domestic problems. This bill is a fine example of realistically balancing an achievable vision of space science and the future with a humane understanding of the more earthly needs of our citizens today.

I oppose the Chapman-Lowery amendment and urge my colleagues to oppose it also. The Appropriations Committee has recommended a fair approach here. While trying to reduce the Federal deficit, we plainly and simply cannot afford to begin construction of the space station, a big-ticket item, which unfortunately must compete with housing, the environment, and veterans for funding.

The space station is a big, glossy, high-tech experiment. In the best of all possible fiscal worlds, we could afford to experiment. Unfortunately, we are not living in the best of all possible fiscal worlds. This amendment would make very deep cuts in the other NASA programs, cuts we cannot afford to make. I am concerned that these cuts to other NASA programs would then have to be restored by the other body. Funds to restore these programs will have to be found elsewhere, in HUD, EPA and the Veterans Administration. Thus, while the Chapman-Lowery amendment cuts only one vital housing program, I am concerned that its passage would result ultimately in deep cuts in other desperately needed domestic programs. If we choose to spend vast amounts of scarce resources on this particular experiment, we are choosing ultimately to once again ignore urgent domestic needs.

The bill before us has vision. It provides full funding for the National Science Foundation, and virtually full funding for NASA's budget request aside from the space station. H.R. 2519 is a commitment to the wholehearted pursuit of science in the public interest, science which is a keystone of our economic future.

How can you look at a homeless child, who is struggling to survive on a daily basis, and not understand that without adequate shelter, education, and health care, this child will not be part of a productive future. We are rich as a nation because of our people. We must work today to meet the basic needs of our people.

We have a stark choice before us. We must make the fiscally responsible choice and acknowledge that housing America is part of this Government's role and responsibility. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Chapman-Lowery amendment. As long as we have earthly needs, the heavens can wait.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

Some have cast this vote as choice among priorities—do we fund the space station or do we fund vital housing programs? Others have said that this vote is about fiscal responsibility.

I believe that this vote revolves around two different issues. The first goes to the heart of whether or not the United States will be technologically competitive in the 21st century.

The space station is the core of our science and technology efforts. To renege on our commitment to this program and to eliminate the funding would be shameful. To give up our leadership role among other nations in the effort to build the space station freedom would be senseless.

And to ignore the dreams of our children and other future Americans—to say "we can't do it, let the Japanese and the Europeans do it"—would be tragic.

We've lost our competitive lead in industries like rubber, steel, and autos. But what remains as America's hope for the future is our technological ingenuity.

Make no mistake about it: A space station will be built. We will decide today whether or not we lead the effort and reap the benefits.

The second issue before us—why are we even here today arguing between our country's scientific and technological needs and other vital domestic needs? Today's vote is the first and most graphic demonstration of the faulty foundation of last year's budget agreement.

The Congress is effectively boxed in by a false set of choices. We are forced to play off one vitally important domestic program against another:

Veterans' medical care versus environmental clean-up; education versus crime control; the space station versus housing subsidies.

We shouldn't have to choose between the space station and housing funds—both are necessities and both are priorities. We should be able to look at the entire trillion dollar budget and make room for these priorities.

We should be able to say "no" to one more B–2 bomber and "yes" to our scientific and technological security.

Thirty years ago, John Kennedy challenged this country to put a man on the moon by the end of the decade. An earlier generation of lawmakers rose to that challenge.

Today, we are challenged in exactly the same way. We risk losing much more than just a space station. We risk our kids' futures and their ability to compete in a high-technology society.

And above all, we abdicate the responsibility of teaching our children the most important lesson of all: That our thirst for knowledge, our curiosity about our world, has made the United States the world's technological leader.

Let's rise to this challenge. Let's pass the Chapman-Lowery amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to the Chapman-Lowery amendment and in strong support of the bill crafted by Chairman TRAXLER and his colleagues on the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies.

The United States must strive to develop a space program that offers the greatest possible benefits to the American taxpayer. NASA has had tremendous success with unmanned space flights—the *Voyager 2* being one of the most prominent recent examples. Programs such as *Voyager* help the United States to maintain its role as a leader in research and development of high technology.

It is not at all clear that the space station would contribute to America's efforts to lead the way in space sciences. The space station has been assigned two scientific purposes; microgravity research and life sciences research. In fact, the consensus in the scientific community appears to be that the space station is not needed for microgravity research, most of which can be carried out on unmanned vehicles, and that extensive life sciences research should be undertaken only if we are ready to commit to a Mars expedition—at a price that might well exceed $500 billion.

The National Research Council examined these objectives and stated: "Most of these goals could be achieved in both a more timely and more cost-effective manner by alternative means." The VA–HUD Subcommittee has wisely allocated funds to study alternatives to the station, a measure I strongly applaud.

The issue of cost is a critical one. Both GAO and the staff of the Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation, which I chair, have found that NASA has grossly and repeatedly understated the costs of the station. NASA has publicly estimated the cost of the station at $30 billion, but this figure accounts only for the costs to achieve permanent occupancy. However, NASA's estimate of $30 billion understates even the initial costs it is meant to cover. GAO estimates that it will cost $40 billion, not $30 billion, to achieve permanent occupancy. The subcommittee staff estimates that it will cost $51 billion.

Even for this first phase, NASA fails to include costs of the crew return vehicle, full cost of shuttle flights to build and service the station, and the costs of the scientific equipment that will be placed aboard the station. Over its 30-year life, the cost of the station is estimated by GAO to run up to $118 billion; the subcommittee places the cost at $180 billion. The only significant difference between the subcommittee's methodology and that applied by GAO is that the subcommittee accounts for the full cost of each shuttle flight while GAO accounted only for marginal costs.

In an era of burgeoning deficits, we must take great care not to embark on extravagant symbolic ventures. This is especially true when proven alternatives exist. Many of these alternatives would be slashed pursuant to this amendment.

One key program threatened by this amendment is the promising Mission to Planet Earth, which should greatly improve our ability to understand and interpret global climate change. This program could be a cornerstone in our efforts to study and cope with our changing environment. Unfortunately, the amendment would cut funding for this program by 16 percent.

America needs a vigorous and robust space program—a program that benefits American scientists, scholars, and consumers—a program that benefits those who swim in our oceans as well as those who scan the stars. A fundamental prerequisite for NASA projects should be solid science, not glamour. I believe that the bill as reported out of committee reflects the priorities of the American taxpayer and the American scientist, and I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time under the unanimous-consent agreement for debate on these amendments has expired.

The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 173, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—240

Allard
Anderson
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bryant
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell (CA)
Cardin
Chandler
Chapman
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Cooper
Cox (CA)
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLay
Dickinson
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kennelly
Klug
Kolter
Kopetski
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Marlenee
Matsui
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Myers
Neal (MA)
Nichols
Oakar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pease
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Quillen
Rahall
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wylie
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—173

Abercrombie
Alexander
Andrews (ME)
Anthony
Atkins
AuCoin
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bonior
Boxer
Bruce
Bunning
Camp
Carper
Carr
Clay
Clement
Coble
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dingell
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Engel
Espy
Evans
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Gilman
Gonzalez
Grandy
Gray
Green
Guarini
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Hoyer
Hughes
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lancaster
Leach
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moody
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Savage
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Sikorski
Skaggs
Skelton
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Synar
Towns
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman
Bilbray
Borski
Campbell (CO)
Dymally
Gallo
Huckaby
Kostmayer
Martin
Martinez
Miller (WA)
Mrazek
Shuster
Sisisky
Slaughter (NY)
Solomon
Vento
Williams

□ 1925

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dymally for, with Mr. Ackerman against.

Mr. Solomon for, with Mr. Vento against.

Messrs. WYDEN, PAXON, and McNULTY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. TORRES changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments en bloc, as modified, were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Chairman, today I voted against two amendments on the VA–HUD–Independent Agencies appropriation for 1992. I voted against the Traxler amendment to increase funding for VA medical care by $33 million because the increase in funding is financed by taking $20 million from the EPA's important Superfund Program. I also voted against the Chapman amendment which provides $1.9 billion in funding for the space station and $33 million for VA medical care by freezing spending on NASA programs and cutting $250 million from HUD public housing operating subsidies.

I have always been a strong advocate and supporter of veterans programs in our country. So it is with reluctance that I must vote against both these amendments. The 1990 budget agreement requires that increases in domestic spending be offset by other cuts in domestic spending. Given these rules, a compelling argument must be presented in order to increase funding for one worthy program at the expense of another worthy program. I could support these amendments if the cuts came from unworthy, wasteful Government projects or services. These amendments, however, would slash two particularly vital domestic programs.

As chairman of the Environment, Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee with direct oversight over the EPA's administration of the Superfund Program, I do not believe it is at all appropriate to reduce funding for the Superfund Program. The existing Superfund sites are among the worst hazardous waste sites in the country. The current program is already overburdened and underfunded. In addition, the Superfund Program is often the last resort for hazardous waste site cleanup because of funding shortfalls in RCRA and other clean up programs. Reducing funding for Superfund sends a disturbing signal about our Nation's commitment to hazardous waste clean up.

I opposed the Chapman amendment because I do not believe it is prudent to increase funding for the space station at the expense of vital NASA programs, Federal science projects, and public housing subsidies. While there is a need for space exploration, the recent design modifications aimed at cutting the cost of the space station have reduced the proposed station's capabilities, and several scientific review boards now are questioning the scientific justification for spending such large sums on such limited uses. In light of our country's severe budgetary constraints, I cannot support an amendment authorizing $1.9 billion for a project whose ultimate cost is estimated by the GAO to cost $118 billion

over the next 30 years and whose mission continues to narrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 73), to remain available until September 30, 1993, $226,795,000, plus reimbursements.

HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

For payment of health professional scholarship program grants, as authorized by law, to students who agree to a service obligation with the Department of Veterans Affairs at one of its medical facilities, $10,113,000.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law, $40,479,000, plus reimbursements.

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 632), for assisting in the replacement and upgrading of equipment and in rehabilitating the physical plant and facilities of the Veterans Memorial Medical Center, $500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of six passenger motor vehicles, for use in cemeterial operations, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail; $854,204,000, of which $42,000,000 for the acquisition of automated data processing equipment and services to support the modernization program in the Veterans Benefits Administration shall not become available for obligation until September 1, 1992, and shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That in addition to the foregoing amount made available under this head, $14,100,000 is appropriated for the unbudgeted fiscal year 1992 incremental costs associated with Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm and such funds are hereby designated to be "emergency requirements" for all purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the $616,658,000 appropriated for the Veterans Benefits Administration in the "General operating expenses" appropriation of Public Law 101-507, is reduced to $613,658,000, and the $3,000,000 shall be available for the National Cemetery System.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $28,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 230, 1004, 1006, 5002, 5003, 5006, 5008, 5009, 5010, and 5022 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is $3,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, $522,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That except for advance planning of projects funded through the advance planning fund and the design of projects funded through the design fund, none of these funds shall be used for any project which has not been considered and approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this appropriation for fiscal year 1992, for each approved project shall be obligated (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 1992, and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 1993: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall promptly report in writing to the Comptroller General and to the Committees on Appropriations any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above; and the Comptroller General shall review the report in accordance with the procedures established by section 1015 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (title X of Public Law 93-344): *Provided further*, That no funds from any other account except the "Parking garage revolving fund", may be obligated for constructing, altering, extending, or improving a project which was approved in the budget process and funded in this account until one year after substantial completion and beneficial occupancy by the Department of Veterans Affairs of the project or any part thereof with respect to that part only: *Provided further*, That prior to the issuance of a bidding document for any construction contract for a project approved under this heading (excluding completion items), the director of the affected Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility must certify that the design of such project is acceptable from a patient care standpoint.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 230, 1004, 1006, 5002, 5003, 5006, 5008, 5009, 5010, and 5022 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than $3,000,000, $189,701,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous "Construction, minor projects" appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is less than $3,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than $45,176,000 shall be available for expenses of the Office of Facilities, including research and development in building construction technology: *Provided further*, That funds in this account shall be available for (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe, and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

PARKING GARAGE REVOLVING FUND

For the parking garage revolving fund as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5009), $19,200,000, together with income from fees collected, to remain available until expended. Resources of this fund shall be available for all expenses authorized by 38 U.S.C. 5009 except operations and maintenance costs which will be funded from "Medical care": *Provided*, That from funds previously appropriated under this head, the Department of Veterans Affairs shall construct parking facilities with at least 1,500 spaces at the Detroit VA Medical Center.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist the several States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5031-5037), $85,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans cemeteries as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 1008), $5,104,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Any appropriation for 1992 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations.

Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for 1992 for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs (except the appropriations for "Construction, major projects", "Construction, minor projects" and the "Parking garage revolving fund") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to engage in a colloquy with the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], regarding the Environmental Protection Agency's Long Island Sound Office.

□ 1930

Mr. Chairman, EPA is in the process of establishing the Long Island Sound Office, authorized under the Long Island Sound Improvement Act, Public Law 101-508. Mr. Chairman, Public Law 101-508 authorizes EPA to expend such sums as are necessary to pay for administrative costs of the Long Island Sound Office. EPA is moving quickly to carry out this mandate. In fact, I understand that EPA will announce the siting of the Long Island Sound Office very soon.

Is it the committee's intent to include language in the statement of the managers' at conference directing EPA to give priority to this important endeavor?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her question. The committee recognizes the commitment of the Long Island Sound Office to cleaning up the sound and supports the efforts of EPA to establish the office on an expedited basis. The committee would be pleased to consider language at the time of conference urging EPA to continue its priority support for this important facility in fiscal year 1992.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. I thank the chairman for his consideration of my request.

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address language in the committee report on page 45 relating to data management. In reading this language, I couldn't help thinking how important it is for there to be coordination in the development of environmental data and geographic information systems. The appropriations report includes rather specific directives for EPA with respect to taking a leadership role in the integration of data from remote sensing systems and terrestrial sources and making this data available to policymakers and the public.

It occurs to me that EPA is not the only agency engaging in environmental and geographic data management system enhancements. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] is currently planning a major new program for archiving and accessing environmental data, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NSAS] is devising systems to manage its ever-increasing requirements for storing and retrieving satellite data.

In making their proposals to Congress, each of these agencies goes through a separate and distinct review process by congressional committees concerned with the effective management of each of their programs. While promotion of efficient data management systems is a laudatory goal for environmental and geographic data, coordination between the agencies during the development stages is crucial. I am all too familiar with the mistakes that can be made, resulting in significant ill-spent dollars when coordination does not take place between various agencies handling related data and serving similar users.

Recently, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee consulted with the General Accounting Office about its data management initiative for NOAA. We found overall that Federal agencies involved in environmental data collection and retention need to consult with each other and with Congress before initiatives for new systems moved forward.

There appears presently to be little coordination. With the advent of new systems and enhancements, the danger exists that opportunities to avoid duplication, to ensure compatibility of data retrieval, access, and exchange, and to spend Federal funds wisely could fall by the wayside. Instead, agencies could independently pursue data management systems that are costly, limited in use and scope, or are duplicative and incompatible with others.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that EPA consult with NOAA and NASA so that environmental data systems, such as remote sensing data systems, are developed and enhanced in a coordinated multiagency effort.

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

Mr. HERTEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your comments and understanding about the necessity for coordination between EPA, NOAA, and NASA regarding environmental data systems. You have made some worthwhile observations, and I would agree that your suggestions should be reflected as supported by the committee.

I might also tell the gentleman that there is an outstanding, nonprofit entity in Michigan which has contracts with NASA now to do many of the things the gentleman is talking about, and that entity is CIESIN, and I will be pleased to discuss that further matter with the gentleman.

Mr. HERTEL. We just want all the agencies to work together and not go their separate ways.

I thank the chairman for his consideration.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, H.R. 2519 appropriates several million dollars to the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out the administration's so-called coastal America initiative. My question is whether the committee intends that, of this amount, $750,000 shall be available to EPA solely to develop the guidance for control of nonpoint sources of coastal pollution as required by section 6217(g) of Public Law 101-508; $1.25 million shall be available for coastal America projects generally; and all the remaining funds shall be available solely to fund projects called for by the comprehensive conservation and management plans approved by the EPA under section 320 of the Clean Water Act?

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

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. The answer to the gentleman's question is yes, that that is what the committee's intent is, and I thank the gentleman for the colloquy and the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1992 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities", shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the aforementioned accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 1991.

Appropriations accounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1992 shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from title X of the Competitive Equality Banking Act, Public Law 100-86, 1987, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable from "Compensation and pensions".

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND OPPORTUNITY FOR PEOPLE EVERYWHERE GRANTS (HOPE GRANTS)

For the HOPE for Homeownership of Multifamily Units Program as authorized under title III of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and subtitle B of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), $100,000,000; for the HOPE for Homeownership of Single Family Homes Program as authorized under title III of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and subtitle C of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, $100,000,000; and for the HOPE for Elderly Independence demonstration program as authorized under section 803(k) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, $10,000,000: *Provided*, That all amounts shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. KOLBE: Page 15, line 19, strike "For" and insert the following: "For the HOPE for Public and Indian Housing Homeownership Program as authorized under title III of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437aaa et seq.) and subtitle A of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), $150,000,000; for".

Page 25, line 16, strike "$203,413,000" and insert "$53,413,000".

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments en bloc be modified to reflect the precise figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendments en bloc offered by Mr. KOLBE: In the matter proposed to be inserted on page 15 by the amendment, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$151,000,000";

In the matter proposed to be inserted on page 25 by the amendment, strikeout "$53,413,000" and insert "$52,413,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendments en bloc, as modified is as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. KOLBE: Page 15, line 19, strike "For" and insert the following: "For the HOPE for Public and Indian Housing Homeownership Program as authorized under title III of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437aaa et seq.) and subtitle A of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), $151,000,000; for".

Page 25, line 16, strike "$203,413,000" and insert "$52,413,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] for 5 minutes to speak on behalf of his amendments en bloc.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the situation correctly, of course, this is an important amendment, and we have also had it on a previous occasion a few months ago.

Would the gentleman be willing to consider an hour's time limitation, one half-hour to the gentleman from Arizona and the other half-hour to be controlled by myself?

Mr. KOLBE. I would be quite happy to entertain such a unanimous-consent agreement. I think that we have certainly spent a great deal of time talking about one issue here today, and I think most of the Members of this body would probably like to see us get on as quickly as possible. I think a time limitation of an hour or something in that nature would certainly be satisfactory as far as I am concerned.

Mr. TRAXLER. I will give 15 of my minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 15 minutes of my time be given to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, under these conditions, that the time be limited to 1 hour, that the time be equally divided between myself and Mr. KOLBE, and that I be allowed to give 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, just to clarify it do I understand the agreement is for 1 hour of debate, 15 minutes controlled by the chairman, 15 minutes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], 15 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], and 15 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]?

Mr. TRAXLER. The gentleman is correct. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

□ 1940

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise today to offer this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] and myself. It is an amendment which should be familiar to Members of this body because we have seen this issue before on the supplemental appropriations bill we considered in March of this year.

I want to leave time for other Members to talk, so let me make my points as briefly and quickly as possible, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Let me talk about what this amendment is. Simply, it is an amendment to find a program that this body spoke on very strongly last year in authorizing the Affordable Housing Act. It would take $150 million, money that is over, over the authorized level. It would take that money from the Flexible Subsidy Program, a program that goes to developers, private developers to rehabilitate housing projects, and put that into the hands of poor people to allow them to own their own homes in public housing projects. It is as simple as that.

It is budget neutral. It takes money from an authorization only to the extent this appropriation exceeds the authorization. It is an irony today that I stand here as a member of the Committee on Appropriations defending the position of the authorizing committee. The $150 million that was put in by the chairman, by the subcommittee and the full committee is for a program called Project Repair. This is a program for which there have been no hearings in the Authorizing Committee and for which there has been no discussion. So, the program is not authorized. Let me make it clear that the dollars that are going into this program from the Flexible Subsidy, the $150 million going into this program, does not affect the authorized amount. Indeed, the $52 million that is authorized and appropriated for, if this amendment is passed, is 13 times higher than any amount put in the Flexible Subsidy Program since 1982.

So no Member can suggest we are short-changing the Flexible Subsidy Program. Rather, we are putting this unauthorized amount into a program that this Congress authorized and spoke on last year, when we adopted the HOPE program.

What is HOPE? It is very simple. It says that people who are less fortunate ought to have a chance to own their own home. It says that home ownership should not only be the dream of middle America, upper class America, but ought to be a dream that can be realized by people that live in public housing projects. They too, should have their opportunity to own a home.

It would get this program started, with a very modest $150 million, well below the amount that this body authorized last year, but an opportunity to at least get HOPE I started. We authorized three HOPE programs: One for public housing, one for multifamily housing, one for single-family housing. This one is for the public housing. It would get that program started.

It does not, let me say once again, does not cut into a program that currently exists. It does not take any money out of Section 8 vouchers. It does not cut into support for public housing. At the very least, if every bit of these dollars are spent, we are talking about less than one-half of 1 percent of all public housing units that might be sold to poor people who could occupy and own those homes. We are not talking about depleting the public housing stock.

This is a program that Congress spoke to last year. It is a program the authorizing committee said we ought to implement. I would remind Members that in the debate we had on the supplemental appropriations bill, the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking member, and those who spoke against funding HOPE in a supplemental, said every effort would be made to give funding for these programs this year. I appreciate the difficulties that they find themselves under. However, the time has come for members to say that we ought to provide home ownership for the poor. We ought to give the same hope for people who are less well-off than we are. We ought to give them the opportunity to own their own home. We ought to give them an opportunity to participate in the American dream.

Therefore, I hope this body will support this amendment, a very modest attempt to get the HOPE I program started.

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

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], the chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to start off by complimenting the gentleman on the very capable manner

in which has handled these very difficult areas.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is, again, a robbing-Peter-to-pay-Paul type of situation. It is an attractive, but illusory amendment.

What it does on one hand will be minimal, and the defect and impediments that it will provide for the existing housing programs that are shaped, and the only ones existing, the only ones our country has ever shaped up for the poor, very poor, will suffer as a consequence. I hope it will be voted down.

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

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to shift a relatively small amount of money into a program which I believe really has huge possibilities. We all have heard the saying, Mr. Chairman: Give a man a fish, he eats for a day; if we teach him how to fish, he eats for a lifetime. However, in this amendment, we are not talking about just giving or just teaching, but in fact we are talking about acquiring, acquiring the fisher. If we can do that, that in turn lays the basis; if we can convert folks from tenants into homeowners, that converts them and moves them into the mainstream. That is what this is all about.

This amendment would fund the HOPE I program at $151 million, less than half the authorized level of $380 million. It would affect less than one-half of 1 percent of HUD's total budget and affect even less of the total stock of public housing. However, it would help 6,500 families in public housing achieve homeownership. It would help another 23,250 families in 233 projects begin planning for home ownership conversions. The amendment would provide $20 million in planning grants and $131 million for implementation grants, most of which would be used for rehabilitation of public housing and public assistance.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would transfer funds from the flexible subsidy account, bringing that account down from $203 million to its authorized level of $52.8 million. Even with this deduction, $75 million from excess rental payments would still be available from the balance of that program. So we clearly are not talking about a radical change in public housing policy, but in fact we are talking about an important change in our approach toward those who live in public housing.

Mr. Chairman, there is a book on the New York Times best seller list that chronicles the movement of African-American people from the South in the 1940's and in the 1950's. These people began to move off the plantation into other areas across this country. Experience taught them that the person who controls your home controls your life. They knew that new hardships would come with leaving the plantation, but the hardships for staying were worse. I believe today many of the low-income Americans live in public housing, which is a lot worse off than living in some of those plantations of old, and so we are trying to change that. They are effectively trapped into transitional housing which in many cases is not fit for human beings to live in, but most of all, Mr. Chairman, they are trapped in a cycle of poverty, with no way to accumulate the skills or the assets that they need to move ahead. Without accumulating assets, the poor are destined to remain poor. Assets, Mr. Chairman, not necessarily income, is what separates the haves from the have-nots. The richest 5 percent of Americans receive the same amount of income as the bottom 40 percent, but the richest 1 percent of Americans own more assets than the bottom 80 percent combined.

This year, Mr. Chairman, we will provide $60 billion in tax deductions to homeowners, middle-income and upper-income homeowners. I support that. I will always support that. That will help them continue to build assets. However, that is more than twice this entire HUD budget combined. I think that we ought to be willing to spend a fraction of that to help those residents of public housing who have a desire to develop some assets of their own. Homeownership, in my opinion, is the best way to do that, and the quickest way to accumulate those levels of assets.

The HOPE program that we are seeking to fund today will not turn public housing residents into condominium owners. It will not solve all their problems. In fact, this program is not for every tenant in public housing projects. It is definitely not for every public housing project. There are some projects that tenants would not even want to own, where the only reasonable goal is to escape as soon as possible.

□ 1950

There are some projects that are albatrosses that no reasonable person would suggest hanging around the necks of any tenant.

But there are some other tenants in other public housing projects who, with the proper planning and assistance, would welcome the chance to own their own home. That is in fact what HOPE offers. The Committee on Appropriations has provided $100 million each for HOPE II and HOPE III. I thank Chairman TRAXLER for doing that. It funds the acquisition of multifamily housing and single-family units.

The committee report, when you read it, reaffirms the belief that low-income residents deserve a chance to become homeowners.

I say we should extend that reaffirmation by funding HOPE I with additional dollars.

I have talked to my colleagues in my efforts as whip on this bill that there are some legitimate concerns that I would like to address briefly. There is a legitimate concern that the total stock of public housing would decrease if tenants purchased public housing units. There is a legitimate concern that public housing tenants will be saddled with unprofitable projects and left holding the bag after Uncle Sam has gone. There is a legitimate concern, which I think is legitimate, that with the large number of families already waiting for housing assistance, it is unwise to reduce the stock of public housing.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this program has been structured to help address those concerns, at least some of them.

Very briefly, we are not talking about just dumping the worst public housing stock onto public housing tenants and saying, "You're on your own." Hope I funds would be used for planning assistance, for economic development assistance, for rehabilitation assistance, and for implementation. Tenant prticipation would be voluntary.

Planning assistance will be used to help organize tenants and tenant associations, to help teach them the responsibilities of home ownership so they can decide whether or not this is something they want to do. This is entirely voluntary.

Implementing grants will be available to help tenants learn how they can budget and how they can maintain their units. More importantly, implementation grants will be available to help rehabilitate the units before they are sold.

Operating assistance will be available for 5 years and, in some cases, for 10 years.

An adjustable post-sale subsidy will be available so that martgages are no more than 30 percent of a family's income. Those projects which cannot realistically be expected to become self-sufficient at the end of the subsidy period will not be approved, period.

The last concern, Mr. Chairman, the concern about the reduction of our low-income housing stock, is legitimate. However, for every unit sold to one low-income family, funds will be made available to assist another through vouchers, rehabilitated vacant public housing units or State or locally developed housing units. The total number of families receiving assistance will increase because the law now declares a 1-for-1 replacement. But the foundation would be laid so that more families can start accumulating the training, the experience and, most of all, the assets they need to escape public housing altogether.

I think we ought to learn from our failures and improve upon our successes.

The goal of this program is not simply to reduce the public housing stock. It is, rather, to take an affirmative step toward helping reduce the number of people who have no alternative other than public housing in the first place.

This program is not a panacea, that is for sure. It is not intended to replace other HUD housing programs to assist the first-time home buyers, but which are beyond the reach of most public housing tenants. We will have to monitor those very carefully and work with HUD, we will have to work with other tenant groups and we most certainly will have to follow the progress of the projects. We will have to learn from the sucesses and from the failures, and there will be some of both.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, let me say that we must emphasize that this program is not for every tenant in public housing, and it is definitely not for every public housing project. But for those who are willing to risk becoming homeowners, I believe HOPE I will at least offer them a hand. There are risks, but it seems to me the potential greatly outweights those risks. I think simply it is worth a try.

Again, my colleagues, we are only talking about less than 1 percent of the HUD budget. That is a small amount of money to spend to give public housing tenants a chance at owning their own piece of the pie, toward giving them a chance to move from dependence to independence.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I should like to explain what the committee actually did in terms of funding the new programs. The fact of the matter is we funded the HOME program and we funded two of the three parts of the HOPE program, the part dealing with multifamily home ownership and single-family home ownership, and that funding was roughly in the ratio of the authorizations in the housing bill of last year.

Given the fact that the housing bill authorized $4 billion more in appropriations that the then-current appropriations level, there was no way we were going to be able to fund everything to the full level authorized in the housing bill.

I am sure members of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and its Subcommittee on housing understand that and understood that, but those unrealistic funding levels are what they had to do to arrive at the compromise which got us the bill last year.

I do not criticize them for doing it.

As I mentioned, we had funded the HOPE for a single-family home ownership and the HOPE for multifamily home ownership. What we did not fund through the HOPE vehicle was the program for the sale of public housing to its tenants,

I want to compliment the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] for his statement because I think he recognizes the experimental nature of this program and the fact that it has some high degree of risk in it. Just to give one example, in HUD's testimony before us they indicated that in order to make the economics of the program work, tenant incomes would have to increase at 5 percent above inflation each year in order for tenants ultimately to be able to afford to keep up this housing without subsidy.

Now, that is a fairly daunting economic assumption. Because of the risks inherent in this program, several years ago, back in 1984, HUD, in fact, initiated a demonstration program for the sale of public housing to tenants. After some discussions with our subcommittee, we finally told them, "Go, ahead and do it at a 2,000-unit level." They have, as of a couple of weeks ago, sold 343 of those 2,000 units to their tenants. So, obviously, this has not been a fast-developing program.

I think that raises some real issues as to how much money we want to tie up in it, given the delivery rate thus far.

However, I was persuaded that HUD had in our hearings come up with a very good explanation of why the sales rate had been so slow. It was the fact that in our committee report, I guess it was back around 1985, we had included a requirement that they replace on a 1-for-1 basis any of the units that were sold.

I agree with them, that is a fairly stiff requirement and plainly it has slowed them down. As a result, our subcommittee, in response to that explanation by HUD as to why it had not been able to make better progress, removed that requirement for a 1-for-1 replacement. There is bill language in the bill which will remove that for the remaining 1,650-plus units that remain available for sale under the demonstration.

Now, HUD is currently experiencing a cost of about $30,000 per unit to fix up these units so that they are in a shape to sell to tenants. I think that tells us how badly we have underfunded the public housing operating program and the modernization program over the years as reflected in this enormous deficit in maintenance that has to be made up before anyone would think of selling these units to the tenants.

In any event, if one multiplies that $30,000 which HUD has been getting from modernization money, or some communities have been getting from Community Development Block Grant funds, if one multiplies that $30,000 by the 1,650-plus units that remain in the demonstration, one will see that in fact we have not blanked out the ability of HUD to engage in the sale of public housing to its tenants but in fact have relaxed the rules under which they can go ahead with a $49.5 million program.

□ 2000

Given the very slow pace of the sales until now with that restriction on, I think it makes sense to see if they can move the program more rapidly now that that restriction is off, and I think it will also give us more time to see whether some of these very extreme assumptions as to the growth in tenant incomes will really be there when all is said and done.

So, I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] that this is an experiment, and probably we are going to have success and failures along the way. I guess where I disagree with him is that we already have a demonstration in place at HUD to test the program, and to see what its strengths and weaknesses are. I think that elimination of the 1-for-1 requirement, will enable HUD to prove whether this program can move along more rapidly or not, and whether the pitfalls that some say are there are there or not. It would seem, to me we ought to proceed on that basis rather than accelerating the programs even more.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly concerned, of course, that the funding for this is coming from the flexible subsidy program, and I say that because we tried to respond in the increased flexible funding to a request by the administration for a new project repair program which will use the flexible subsidy fund as a financing conduit. The program is part of the administration's effort to deal with distressed housing and with the growing backlog of multifamily projects which are either financially or physically troubled or have the potential to become so in the near future.

These are all subsidized, and either FHA-insured projects or direct loan projects, such as those under the section 202 program. If we do not do the necessary repairs, if we do not keep these projects up, if we allow them to slip away, as we have allowed public housing to slip to the point where it is taking $30,000 a unit to bring it up to snuff, these projects are all going to be in default, and we are going to have very substantial losses either to the FHA insurance fund or, in the case of the direct loans, defaults directly to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a real stitch in time saves nine kind of case, and it is really unwise to tap the flexible subsidy fund in order to accelerate the HOPE I Program beyond what the demonstration will provide. For that reason I would ask my colleagues to support the committee and reject the amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to one point that was made by the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] when he spoke about the fact that these funds were requested by the administration. I point out the page from the budget request. It says the Project Repair Program will replace the flexible subsidy program in 1992. That is what the $200 million was requested for, for Project Repair. But Project Repair has not been authorized, let me repeat, has not been authorized, so we have $150 million in there for a program that does not exist. We are suggesting using this money for, this particular program, HOPE I.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must disagree with my distinguished chairman, but I do so respectfully.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYLIE. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of a district that has 70,000 residents in public housing, I enter into the RECORD my statement and do so in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I support the Kolbe-Espy amendment because I feel it is essential to provide funding for the HOPE I Program which was authorized in last year's National Affordable Act, and I emphasize "authorized" in the Housing Act of last year. I feel that it is of vital importance to provide an appropriation for HOPE I, for public housing, home ownership. The HOPE Program was the keystone of Secretary of HUD Jack Kemp's effort during the debate of the National Affordable Housing Act last year, and I believe that he and the deserving people in public housing ought to have an opportunity to see if the program works.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] are proposing to translate $151 million from the Federal flexible subsidy program. The gentleman from Arizona has made the point that this money was not authorized and also the point that the flexible subsidy program was designed to reduce claims on HUD's mortgage insurance funds by redirecting excess funds, and I emphasize "excess funds" from healthy projects to financially distressed projects. Even without an appropriation, flexible subsidy will receive approximately $87.1 million. The self-funding aspect of flexible subsidy is reflected in the fact that Congress has not found it necessary to appropriate moneys for this program since 1982. The $151 million has not been authorized, no hearings have been held. We have done a comprehensive reform of the FHA Program, and I think it is in a pretty healthy state. I urge adoption of the Kolbe-Espy amendment.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], that he has given the best description, and I mean this quite seriously, of the home ownership program I have seen. I hope he will tutor the Secretary in the sophisticated version that he has given, and I will say to him publicly, as I said to him privately, that, if he gets the Secretary fully to subscribe to that and persuades of it, he will have a much easier sell.

My problem is not just with that, however, now, but with taking it from flexible subsidies, and people say in the handouts flexible subsidy goes to the developers. That is true, and, when we build weapons, it goes to the companies. We live in a private-sector society, and, when we do things and we spend Government money, the Government money goes to private individuals.

I am surprised to hear from my friends on the other side, in particular, the invocation of private companies as if this was a terrible thing. If private companies get money to do things which have a public purpose, that is a good thing in our society, and flexible subsidy is very much in that vein. If we reduce flexible subsidy, and I have to say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, given what we just did, a number of my colleagues say, "Well, we don't want to take this from public housing, but we're forced to because this is the budget structure. We want to preserve the space station."

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] correctly stated to his credit, "Renter will remain the mode of life for most poor people. We will try to help some become owners. It's expensive, and it's difficult, but we're going to try to do it."

But most poor people most of the time will rent housing.

Now the House has already reduced one pot of money that goes to maintain rental housing. Some Members did that reluctantly because of the space station, and I understand that. If we follow this now, by reducing flexible subsidies by this very large amount, if we cut it to about a quarter of what we are talking about, we will further reduce our ability to keep a stock of habitable rental housing because what flexible subsidy does is go to those private developers who build housing for low- and moderate-income people under Government rules, under programs known as 221(d)(3), 236 and help them keep it habitable, or when one owner defaults or allows this to walk away, we can provide some replacement. The flexible subsidy is a subsidy that allows the housing to be rented at less than market rates. That is where the subsidy word is. It is a subsidy so that people can live in this at less than market rates.

We have a lot of housing that was built under various programs over the years. This housing sometimes deteriorates or threatens to deteriorate or the owners run into trouble. It was a nonprofit group that meant well and could not run it. It was a profit-making person who could not be trusted. Flexible subsidy is what we used for the troubled projects.

There are Members here who will have in their districts projects in trouble, 221(d)(3), 236. They will come to help them working it out. This is it. Do not take it away.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

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

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather awkward situation. I am in a little puzzle tonight. Yesterday I sided with my colleagues primarily on this side of the aisle about the civil rights bill, and now I find myself in a rather distressing situation, seeing them opposing what I see is a fundamental civil rights reform in the HOPE and home ownership package suggested by the administration and supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]. We have a fight in America today about civil rights, but it is not only a fight about legal rights. It is also a fight about economic rights, and the entire concept of this proposal is to allow poor people to break the cycle and have the opportunity to have a home of their own.

□ 2010

This is kind of a crude analogy. We all know what a hotel room looks like when we leave it. Towels are scattered in one corner, sheets are ripped off the bed. My kids leave a hotel room in a mess. Somebody else is going to clean it up because it is not yours. But if it is yours, it is an entirely different matter. It is a place of pride, and it is a place of economic grounding, a place where you can plant flowers, a place you can paint, a place that is not only your house but also your home.

If we vote against this amendment, what I think we are telling people is that "we can't allow you to be trusted with your own future." As the gentleman from Mississippi said, there is a risk in voting for this project a risk

that HOPE and HOME may fail, but I think there is a greater risk that if we do not take this opportunity and adopt this idea, we will allow people to be trapped in a cycle of poverty and trapped in large public housing projects for decades in years to come.

Pride of home ownership, as the Soviet Union is beginning to realize, is the key to perestroika in that country, and it is just possible that pride of ownership could be the beginning of restructuring in our own American cities.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make two quick points after listening to the gentleman from Massachusetts. First of all, no, we have no problem with private responsibility or private ownership and private developers. They support this amendment. I have a letter here from the National Association of Home Builders in support of it, and also I have one from the Public Housing Authority Directors' Association.

I also find it ironic that the gentleman from Massachusetts is on the authorizing committee and is here today speaking for $150 million for a program his committee has never authorized but he is against putting money into a program that his committee has authorized.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Back in 1968, after the devastating riots in many cities of our country, everyone recalls that the Kerner Commission was created, and it restated in vital terms something that every American has always known, that every single American, virtually all Americans, wants to see the day come when they will own their own homes. In fact, the entire Commission report was based on that flowery, wonderful language:

> The American people's dream to own one's own home is shared by virtually all Americans, and we believe it is in the interest of the Nation to permit all who share such a goal to realize it.

That is what this is all about. If we give one family, one neighborhood, one community, the opportunity, the hope to gear their subsidies and all the other kinds of benefits that they now use ineffectively into home ownership, we will have succeeded magnanimously with one little program. That is what this is all about, to give people the opportunity for home ownership.

From the Kerner Commission we come to the Kemp commitment. This is Jack Kemp, who is no big spender, who is no liberal profligate, who wants to see moneys in the sums that have been stated here diverted into a program that will put people into home ownership and to use tax moneys for tax users who will become taxpayers. That is a wonderful blend of economic enterprise, of freedom of enterprise, of the ability to own a home, of breaking the cycle of poverty, of giving every single American that grand opportunity to be a homeowner. From the Kerner Commission to the Kemp commitment, we have an opportunity to stand up to all Americans here tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to pass the Kolbe-Espy amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would transfer desperately needed funds from other public housing programs. The amendment is based on an ill-conceived, politically driven plot devised to relieve the Federal Government of its responsibility to provide decent, low-income housing for the poor. It is a cruel scheme backed by those promoting the discredited notion of supply-side economics. The unsuspecting public housing tenants who desire home ownership are merely pawns in this political chess game. There is no hope for them at the end of Secretary Kemp's HOPE I rainbow because the rain will not stop falling.

Mr. Chairman, the HOPE I Program defies both common sense and common decency. For supporters of this amendment to suggest that the poorest element in our society—those who subsist primarily on welfare, food stamps, old-age assistance—who can barely afford clothing, medical care, transportation, and other basic necessities—to suggest that this Government will make home ownership for them a reality is a farce. It's unadulterated hypocrisy.

A recent report issued by the Budget Committee of this House indicates that the average income of public housing residents is less than $600 a month and the monthly operating costs of home ownership would exceed $300 a month. What family planner or economist envisions poor people spending 50 percent of their meager incomes for a mortgage and at the same time breaking the cycle of poverty? What banker would consider financing a house where the purchaser's monthly note in a slum neighborhood would equal 50 percent of his monthly income?

I am afraid that Mr. Kemp's HOPE Program offers only false hope.

Mr. Chairman, I am sick and tired of hearing about the wonderful accomplishments achieved at the Kenilworth project here in Washington, DC. Kenilworth is HUD's first effort under the Public Housing Sale Program. Hitler's Minister of Propaganda would be proud of the campaign of distortion and deceit used in describing Kenilworth. He said, tell a lie, tell it big enough, tell if often enough and it will become the truth. Well, the lies about success at the Kenilworth project are big enough and told often enough, but should not become the truth to intelligent, discerning persons. Kenilworth is a colossal failure. It is a tribute to Government's propensity for waste and abuse. So far HUD and the District of Columbia have spent in excess of $35 million to repair the 464 apartments. In addition another $10 million have been doled out in rent subsidies. The projected figures for the cost of improvements is $130,000 per unit. And these figures do not reflect the millions of dollars from other Federal and local tax-funded programs which provide support services ranging from day-care to van pooling to job training. Yet less than half of the units have been occupied since 1987. All of this assistance mind you is being provided to Kenilworth residents in a lopsided effort to make Kenilworth appear to be a successful program. The truth is, thousands of other poor people in public housing in this town who don't live at Kenilworth are being denied equal access to these social service programs.

Mr. Chairman, in St. Louis, HUD has been encouraging the sale of Carr Square Village, a public housing entity. The latest projected renovation and replacement costs at the project are $80,000 per unit or nearly $40 million for the entire project. Some 4,500 families in my congressional district are on a waiting list to get into public housing while thousands of structurally sound units remain boarded up because HUD claims not to have funds to make minor plumbing and electrical repairs. But to squander $40 million on this Alice-in-Wonderland make-believe dream consumes a major portion of Secretary Kemp's agenda.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Kemp, I am sure, is sincere in pushing this program. But his efforts, in my opinion, are misdirected. This administration should stop fighting to reduce funding for public housing and discard this pie-in-the-sky notion that home ownership is the key to overcoming poverty. Hope of home ownership without adequate income, access to good health care, possibility of decent education—is a dream that will quickly dry up "like a raisin in the Sun." I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kolbe-Espy amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the American dream is home ownership. This amendment is the only way that dream can be achieved by those in public housing projects. Project HOPE will offer the opportunity—on a voluntary basis—for 30,000 low-income families to own their own home.

So many times we have heard, in response to the drug abuse problem, the crime problem, gang violence, broken homes and poor education—that the answer is to break the cycle of poverty, get people out of situations of dispair, including housing projects which don't offer opportunity.

The point has already been made tonight that when you own something, you're more likely to care for it, regardless of your income. That applies most of all to your own home.

So I can think of no better way to give families the opportunity to improve the environment in which they live than to empower them to own their our home. That's what Project HOPE does. That's what the Kolbe-Espy amendment does. That's what we should support tonight.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kolbe-Espy amendment, and I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for being so gracious and for yielding this time to me.

Very simply, as was mentioned earlier, I had two friends who were pulling out of an airport in a rental car, the traffic was very close, and it looked like there might be an opening. One of them turned to the other one and said, "Go for it. It's a rental."

Very simply, we know that when you do not own something, you are not as concerned and committed, and if you are locked into poverty and locked into public housing and you do not have the hope of owning that property, you know that everyone who roams the halls has the capacity to spray paint the walls and knock down the doors and knock holes in the walls and rip down the storm windows, and they do it because the government is going to repair it, because somehow the housing authority will take care of it. That is true throughout the history of these programs. We can speak of the experience in London, we can speak of the privatization program in Europe that is now taking place in Eastern Europe, and where home ownership takes place, lo and behold there doe not need to be the repair of storm windows and screen doors. Flower boxes appear in the windows, and the spray paint disappears from the hallways as people own their own homes.

Some people think it is cruel to give this opportunity to those who are trapped in poverty.

We believe under this amendment that has been authorized that it would work. It has been approved. This was all debated for 2 years, and it has already been approved by the House whereby Secretary Kemp would be given the opportunity to give those people a chance to own their property, recycle that property into home ownership, take those dollars for new and better subsidized housing, and get them out of this trap that they are in and allow them to move forward.

□ 2020

That is what this is about. This legislation before us is authorization on an appropriations bill. This program has been authorized, and this is an effort by the Committee on Appropriations to circumvent the authorization, to rewrite the law to say that you cannot do what has already been authorized by the Congress.

I believe it is wrong, Mr. Chairman, and I recommend that this amendment be passed. As was mentioned earlier, the reason we are using these funds is because the committee has not cooperated, and I support the amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kolbe-Espy amendment in order to give public housing residents an opportunity to participate in the American dream of owning their own home.

Permit me to remind my colleagues that the Home Ownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere Program was overwhelmingly approved last year by Members on both sides of the aisle as part of the National Affordable Housing Act. Yet, this year, the Appropriations Committee provided zero funding for HOPE I, that part of the program that would give public housing residents an opportunity to break the cycle of dependency. This amendment's funding of $151 million for HOPE I would help nearly 6,500 public housing families, 65 projects, achieve home ownership and help another 23,250 families, 233 projects, begin planning for their homeownership conversions.

In addition, this amendment provides $20 million in planning and grants and $131 million for implementation grants, the bulk of which would be used for rehabilitation of public housing and operating assistance.

This amendment would fund HOPE I at approximately one-half of the authorized level of $380 million and does not change the authorization for HOPE II or HOPE III. Furthermore, even after this amendment, the three HOPE grant programs together would be funded at less than one-half of the authorized level.

Mr. Chairman, support for the Kolbe/Espy amendment is the least we can do to furnish HUD the opportunity to end the dispair suffered by low-income families as they are forced to live a life of dependency. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the Kolbe/Espy amendment in order to make home ownership available for all Americans.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kolbe-Espy amendment. This amendment would reallocate housing funds for HOPE, home ownership grants for public housing tenants. It will take away some funding from the costly and ineffective housing construction programs that have been tried in the past.

Project HOPE will allow low-income families to take greater control of their lives with an approach that is basic to our common values.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members to reassess funding for this program, and think about the following questions: do you want to reach out to low-income families eager to depart from the deprivation of poverty and government dependency? Do you want to offer people a hand up the economic ladder? Do you want to provide low-income families with the responsibility and endless potential of home ownership? Do you want to say as a Congressman that we are ready to make a fresh start on a problem which continues to trap people in subsidized housing?

Mr. Chairman, if you said yes to these questions, there can be no doubt that you can support funding for the HOPE I Program. We should not allow petty politics to sidetrack us from providing this opportunity to the families that would truly like to realize a part of the American dream, home ownership.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage Members to support the Kolbe-Espy amendment.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Kolbe-Espy amendment. I rise in opposition to this amendment, because it is more than ridiculous. I am sick and tired of hearing the theoreticians, political pundits, and would-be politicians talking about what is good for people who live in housing projects. I am sick and tired of them talking about what they are going to do once they are able to own a unit in Kabrina Greens or in Carr Square Village or in Nickerson Gardens in Watts.

They do not know what they are talking about. They have never lived there, for the most part, and they do not visit these housing projects.

I have six of them in my district. I am working with young men and women every day who are standing on the corners of those housing projects in a state of hopelessness. They want jobs, they want to be employed, they need child care. They need assistance in getting into the mainstream.

If you want to empower these people, let us talk about jobs, let us talk about job training, let us talk about edu-

cation. Let us not talk about a silly idea of owning a unit that nobody wants to live in.

If you want to do something for these housing projects, put some money into repair and rehabilitation. Put some swings on the grounds for children to play on. Put some sandboxes there so mothers will have some place for their children to play. Fix up the windows, put some new cabinets in, paint the units, and do something about making them just a little bit better for these people to live in.

People do want to own their homes, but they want to live in homes like you live in and like I live in. If they can get a job, they can be empowered. Let me tell you something, they will buy their home, and it will not be in a housing project; it will be in suburbia, or maybe nextdoor to you.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say I was very disappointed with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] who just spoke. She said nobody visits.

Jack Kemp today was in Chicago. He was visiting Henry Horner Homes, which is the site of this book, "There Are No Children Here."

Jack Kemp is desperately trying to move the Bush administration, the Congress, and the Nation, because he does care. He cares about these kids. He cares about children who live in violence, he cares about a welfare program that has failed, and he cares about public housing projects that have failed. It is truly tragic.

The introduction to this book has a poem by Langston Hughes:

What happens to a dream deferred?

Does it dry up
like a raisin in the sun?
Or fester like a sore—
And then run?
Does it stink like rotten meat?
Or crust and sugar over—
like a syrupy sweet?

Maybe it just sags
like a heavy load.

Or does it explode?

Mr. Chairman, there is one person in this Government who everybody I know knows is out trying every day to save human beings. It is Jack Kemp, Secretary of HUD. He is asking for a tiny opportunity, a tiny opportunity to try something new. Maybe it will not work, but we know what we have tried has failed.

Mr. Chairman, I would beg this House, give Secretary Kemp at least a tiny chance. Try something new, and maybe we will save some children.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, hearing the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] just infuriates something in me. We just received a letter from Jack Kemp on the last amendment urging that we cut $250 million of operating subsidies from those very same public housing project units and put it in a space station. And now we are being read poetry. What kind of baloney is that?

You cannot give people ownership in homes unless you have adequate money to do it. We do not have enough in operating subsidies, and Secretary Kemp, who is supposed to represent HUD, sends all of us a letter saying that we should cut $250 million from those desperately needed operating subsidies and build a space station. He is not the Secretary of Science or of Space; he is the Secretary of HUD. Therefore, I would say to Members that this HOPE Program is simply hype. We cannot give people homes in public housing. If you want to give people opportunity, then let them move out of public housing because they have the necessary resources and buy homes like the rest of America, so that more poor people can move into public housing.

□ 2030

What we are doing here is rearranging the deck chairs on the *Titanic*. We are taking a unit that is occupied by a poor family and changing its form of ownership and leaving hundreds of thousands, if not millions of families out in the cold. If my colleagues really want to help the people, do not fiddle around with this nice ideological, grandiose scheme but provide the dollars they need to live in a decent place once and for all.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has 2 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] has 1½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has 1 minute remaining; and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Cleveland, Ohio [Mr. STOKES], an important and ranking member of the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, on its face it appears that the authors of this amendment are really helping poor people. It sounds good. It sounds American to say that adoption of this amendment would enable poor people to do what other Americans do; that is, to be able to buy a home. If that were true, I would not be in this well opposing this amendment.

These people are not buying homes. They are buying the oldest housing stock in America, old, dilapidated, unrenovated public housing.

In Cleveland, free public housing was offered to the homeless in the King-Kennedy Estates and the homeless turned it down.

Mr. Chairman, I grew up in public housing. The people who live in public housing do not want to live there and certainly do not want to buy there. The people who live in public housing live there because they cannot afford to live anywhere else. They do not want to buy homes in crime infested, drug-ridden poverty hovels in ghettos. They are the poor people who live in public housing because they want the same thing that other Americans want.

They want homes in nice neighborhoods with nice green lawns, good schools for their children. They are trying to escape public housing, not perpetuate their existence in poverty and crime in a ghetto.

The only way this makes sense at all is that it does what both Ronald Reagan and George Bush have sought to do; that is, to get the Government out of the public housing business by selling it away.

I ask my colleagues, do they personally know of anyone who wants to buy a house known as public housing? No. And neither do I.

The people who the authors of this amendment want to help are good people, but they are poor people. In fact, they are the poorest of the poor.

It is a cruel hoax to offer them ownership by selling the public housing. If we really want to help these people, defeat this amendment and give these people a chance to do what other Americans do: That is, buy a decent home in a decent neighborhood as a result of earning decent wages on a decent job.

This is the case where the poor, whom the authors of this amendment would help would say, "Please, don't help us this way." This is why the government has only been able to sell 343 of these homes out of the 2,000 available.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] for yielding time to me. I am sorry we do not have a whole lot more time here so that I could recount some of the experiences that I have had in approaching this subject, together with the gentleman from Mississippi. He and I served in a joint leadership position on the Delta caucus, one of the poorest regions of the country.

It occurs to me that most of the speakers that I have heard this evening come from urban areas, and I will tell my colleagues that Project HOPE has a great deal of applicability to rural

America and it could do an awful lot of good.

I think that this is a very, very modest request for $151 million, a reallocation of money within the housing budget.

I rise today in support of the Kolbe-Espy amendment which would provide $151.0 million to fund the HOPE I—Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere—Program. The HOPE I Program was left out of appropriations altogether. Yes, altogether. $380.0 million was authorized for a very worthy program and the committee appropriated not one cent.

The Kolbe-Espy amendment provides—$151.0 million—less than half of what was authorized—and which would affect less than one half of 1 percent of HUD's total budget. This modest amount would come from HUD's flexible subsidy account, bringing the account down from $203 million to its authorized level of $52.8 million. It would not take moneys from new or existing programs.

We all know from experience that programs like HOPE work. From cochairing the Delta caucus, together with my friend and colleague MIKE ESPY, I know that areas like the poverty-ridden Delta need the helping hand that the Federal Government can provide through programs such as this. In communities across the country, local home ownership programs are helping low-income families pull themselves out of poverty and break the dependency cycle. HOPE I is the first stage of a new and successful war against poverty and $151.0 million is a small amount to invest in the destiny of so many Americans. HOPE I would help 6,500 public housing families achieve home ownership and would help another 23,250 families begin planning for home ownership conversions. That is a lot of families.

To authorize HOPE I without appropriating funding would undermine the efforts of millions of residents living in public and assisted housing communities who seek increased opportunities through urban homesteading, resident management and economic development. Let us in Congress not deny them this much needed vehicle.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Kolbe-Espy amendment.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As one who lived in rental housing until he was 39 and who has 75 percent of his constituents living in rental housing, I take a certain umbrage at the comments that have been made this evening about the conduct of those who live in rental housing. I have no reason to believe that most people who live in rental housing abuse their housing and are not just as concerned as those who live in their own homes to live in a decent environment.

Let me simply say that we have provided in this bill for the sale of public housing demonstration to go forward. We have removed the one stumbling block that the department told us was the reason it has not been going faster, why they have been able to sell only 343 units in 6 years.

If they really can move the program faster with the impediment removed, they have the opportunity to do it for another 1,657 units.

Jack Kemp, go to it. Meanwhile, let us not take this other money that is needed to fix up some badly deteriorated housing. Please stick with the committee and defeat the amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

I rise in opposition to the amendment before us. Certainly in an ideal world we would like to have home ownership for people who live in public housing. I do not think anybody would disagree with that, but let us be honest about it. The few that would have access to anything like that are very few and far between. And I think it would be very, very unfortunate to take this money away from a program that really protects programs like FHA, programs for the elderly, programs for women who are head of the household, who need to depend on subsidized housing.

So while I feel ideally it would be wonderful to fund at least on an experimental basis a program of this nature, I really do not think it is appropriate in this bill because of the shortcomings and the budget crunches we have.

It seems to me that when we are talking about a program of transferring money from a program that protects individuals who may have problems keeping up with their FHA loan, people who indeed are older, who really need the resources to live in rental housing, I do not think we should take it away from them. So I oppose the amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER].

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, a recent speaker on the other side of this issue referred to the public housing programs in this country as "the *Titanic*," a sinking ship.

Mr. Chairman, we agree with that. We have got problems with our public housing program. This Congress has agreed with that. This Congress agreed with that by authorizing a new approach.

We said in addition to the existing programs, which no one is trying to gut, which no one is disparaging, we want to try something different. We want to try an approach that puts assets in the hands of poor people, an approach that extends private ownership to poor people.

This Congress has supported and will continue to support a multitude of programs to subsidize home ownership by middle-class people and rich people, FHA programs, VA programs, farmers' home program and the deductibility of mortgage interest which even the richest people can utilize to help them own their own homes.

What we are saying with the Kolbe-Espy amendment is, let us try a little bit to help a few very poor people who cannot access these programs for rich and middle-class people that we all support to try to get into the ownership of assets which arguably has done more to create the middle class in this country than anything else.

The opponents of this program are saying simply no. We cannot do it. When they said no last time, it was on a narrow basis. Cannot do it right now, regulations are not promulgated. We are not ready to implement the program.

We are at the crossroads tonight because the arguments used against funding this amendment will come back to us next year, and the year after and the year after that. The opponents are not saying no tonight. They are saying no, never. Tonight is the opportunity for the Congress to put its appropriated money where its authorizing mouth was.

Keep HOPE alive. Support the Kolbe-Espy amendment.

□ 2040

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, the remainder of my time, just to say that there are a number of organizations that support this amendment, the Public Housing Authorities Directors Association, the Conference of Black Mayors, the Council for a Black Economic Agenda, the National Association of Housing Cooperatives, the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprises, the National Cooperative Business Association, the American Legislative Exchange Council, and the National Association of Neighborhoods.

Mr. Chairman, in the remaining milliseconds that I have, let me just say that this is not just an amendment that benefits urban America. There are all kinds of housing projects that exist in rural America. I have 22 in my district, and I have visited them.

They tell me, "Mr. Congressman, if this project was rehabilitated, if it could be sold to the tenant association and I know that my mortgage would be capped at 30 percent of family income, I would like to own the place where I live to leave for my children and for the next succeeding generation." That is why I am doing this.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kolbe-Espy amendment. The people in my district, 66-percent minority, do favor the HOPE Program.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, the remainder of my time. Let me make these points.

This is money for a program that is not authorized. This is not a cut. This is not a reduction in the flexible subsidy program.

Indeed, it is 13 times higher in this appropriation bill than the last time it was ever appropriated for in 1982, 13 times higher than it was then.

This is for a program that has been authorized, has strong bipartisan support, and the money that we are taking this from is for a program that the authorizing committee has never had hearings on, never authorized. It stinks.

Why should we not give people who are less fortunate an opportunity to own their own home? Vote for the Kolbe-Espy amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes, the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Arizona.

Let me tick off a couple of the many, many agencies and organizations opposing the amendment: the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Catholic Conference, the Union of Hebrew Congregations, Partnership for the Homeless, the Consumers Union, American Baptist Churches of America, ACORN, Association of Community Organizations, American Planning Association, Center for Community Change, Child Welfare, the AFL–CIO.

Look, there is an existing pilot program for HOPE I. It is not working very well. It is very expensive.

It started at 2,000 units. We are even helping the Secretary with some bill language where he does not have to replace those units one for one. But we would appreciate it very much if the Members would reject this amendment, allow—and there are probably 1,500 units left there, or 1,400, and we get different answers from HUD every time we call, but whatever is left—them to do them. They are terribly expensive to do. We are giving away public housing in this situation. These are family jewels. It is the crown jewels they are giving away after they have been renovated at extremely high costs.

So what I would say to the Members is run the pilot program on HOPE I. We are starting HOPE II and III, and we will have our opportunity to see who is right on this issue. Do not start a massive selloff of public housing.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona, [Mr. KOLBE].

The gentleman's amendment shifts funds within the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide initial funding for the President's HOPE I Program. This program would assist persons residing in public housing to purchase such units.

The HOPE program—which stands for Home ownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere—was first proposed by the President and then authorized by Congress in the National Affordable Housing Act last year.

The HOPE Program is a radical departure from the traditional thinking on providing public housing for those in need.

We determined last year that conventional public housing may not be the only solution available to us. With over 100,000 units boarded up and vacant—in a state of decay—it was certainly time to look for new answers.

No one disputes that home ownership is a basic tenet of the American dream. And no segment of the American people should be excluded from this dream.

As stated by Housing and Urban Development Secretary Kemp in a recent Washington Post editorial "Acquiring assets powerfully affects the way people think, promoting achievement, inspiring confidence and encouraging planning for the future."

Persons living in public housing should be afforded the opportunity to join in the dream of home ownership. They should be encouraged to build a better life for themselves.

Therefore, it is crucial that funding be initiated for the HOPE I Program. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Kolbe amendment.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have just passed an amendment to cut $250 million from public housing operating subsidies. As we already know, salary and utility costs are more or less fixed, so the cuts come from garbage collection; by eliminating security guards and police hotlines in the projects; by slashing funds for window and door lock replacement, fixing elevators, broken lights, cleaning public areas and a host of other things that make public housing barely livable.

Now, after letting down the poorest of the poor, the Kolbe-Espy amendment is saying to public housing residents "boy have I got a deal for you!" Mr. Chairman, caveat emptor.

Everyone in this Chamber supports home ownership, and there is currently $200 million dollars in the VA–HUD budget for HOPE II and HOPE III—two home ownership programs that make sense. There is also $27 million in the budget for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, an excellent home ownership program which is administered far better than anything HUD could possibly accomplish.

But HOPE I has serious problems. One look at the Kenilworth project and its $130,000 per unit price tag and every Member should be alarmed. In April, the National Journal wrote that "The Federal and district governments have poured more than $35 million into fixing up the 464 apartments at the (Kenilworth) project. That doesn't count the $10 million in rental subsidies for Kenilworth tenants over the next 5 years."

That's a $45 million allocation for 464 apartments, and we just cut $250 million to help keep public housing operational for the other 1.3 million residents. It seems unfair to me that we drastically cut funds for the vast majority of public housing residents and then vote to create an oasis for the select few.

I strongly support resident-management programs and I have seen them work in my district. I agree with Secretary Kemp and everyone in this body who believes that it is a must for low-income families to have control over their own lives. Home ownership is an important element for economic empowerment, as are tenant-management programs. But HOPE I is a dump public housing at all costs program and it will not deliver economic empowerment to residents.

Every Member and everyone watching C–SPAN at home should apply the HOPE I test to their own life. Here's the first quiz question: Go home tomorrow night and bust a window. Scrawl graffiti on your door and in the hallway. Dump garbage out the window, break the elevator and then smash the light bulbs in the stairwell. Let the grass grow 2-feet high on your lawn and don't forget to spread broken glass on the grounds. Jimmy the lock on the front door so everyone in the neighborhood can come in whenever they want. Relocate a major interstate highway within a stone's throw of your door. And finally, put it up for sale.

You couldn't give the property away. But that is exactly what HOPE I sets out to do. The Federal Government has fallen down on its responsibility to make these projects livable. Today we slashed the operating budget to make conditions in the worst place a family in America could possibly live even worse. Then we say to tenants, "It's yours. We'll generously provide you with modernizing funds and 5 years of operating subsidies and your on your own." Unless, of course, Congress agrees to spend $130,000 per unit to turn one of these projects into a shiny trophy in a trophy case.

Today, Secretary Kemp drafted a letter which was used in the previous debate which said in essence, "HUD does not need $250 million to make repairs on public housing." Can anyone who has ever seen a public housing project really believe that there are no needs for additional funds for security and repairs?

Now the Secretary wants to take us to Camelot on the HOPE I chariot. But HOPE I is poorly designed and will only falsely raise hope for the poorest in the Nation. It will not deliver and it will cost a bundle. I urge all Members to reject the rhetoric and oppose the Kolbe-Espy amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Kolbe-Espy amendment, which would shift millions of dollars away from rental public housing and into the HOPE I Program to allow the Federal Government to sell off public housing. While assisting a few individuals, this amendment would contribute to the rapidly growing shortage of available affordable housing. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I support the goals of empowerment as a way for individuals to break the chains of poverty. Home ownership may, for some, be the key to empowerment. However, there will always be those among us who either choose to rent or need to rent and we cannot allow our meager stock of affordable public housing to be depleted. HOPE I is not cost effective and unfortunately this amendment by taking funds away from the Flexible Subsidy Program, will benefit the few at the expense of the many.

Once again, I find myself on the floor of this body saying that in the best of all fiscal worlds, we could afford to fund this experiment in home ownership. Once again, I must remind my colleagues that we are not living in the best of all fiscal worlds and we must

choose. The choice here is fairly simple. We can choose to rehabilitate and improve the existing housing stock and ensure that it stays affordable by supporting the committee. Or, we can choose to not only sell our public housing, but also set back efforts to improve and rehabilitate the existing stock.

I believe that the committee position is the fiscally responsible choice to make. Kenilworth-Parkside, the most highly publicized example of HUD's public housing sale program, has already cost the Government the exorbitant sum of $130,000 for the sale of each unit. Brand new units of affordable housing are being built by groups like the Enterprise Foundation for less than $70,000 per unit. Existing units of housing can be rehabilitated for an average cost of $20,000 per unit. Many units of affordable housing could be rehabilitated, improved, and maintained as part of the affordable housing stock if we oppose the Kolbe-Espy amendment and preserve the Flexible Subsidy Program.

Passage of this amendment would benefit a handful of public housing developments while depriving thousands of others. In these times of fiscal constraint, this is not a choice we can afford to make. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Kolbe-Espy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement agreed to earlier, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 183, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

AYES—216

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Brewster
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Carper
Chandler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Davis
DeFazio
DeLay
Dickinson
Donnelly
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Espy
Fawell
Feighan
Fields
Ford (TN)
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lowery (CA)
Luken
Machtley
Marlenee
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morrison
Myers
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Pursell
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roth
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Staggers
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Weber
Weldon
Wilson
Wolf
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—183

Abercrombie
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Annunzio
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bonior
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Erdreich
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Guarini
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Horn
Hoyer
Hughes
Jacobs
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
LaFalce
LaRocco
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Markey
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHugh
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Roe
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schumer
Serrano
Sikorski
Skaggs
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NOT VOTING—32

Ackerman
Anthony
Bilbray
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Dymally
Gallo
Gray
Hastert
Jenkins
Kostmayer
Lehman (FL)
Livingston
Manton
Martin
Martinez
McCurdy
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mrazek
Pelosi
Quillen
Ridge
Rose
Shuster
Sisisky
Slaughter (NY)
Vento
Williams

□ 2102

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Dymally against.

Mr. GAYDOS and Mr. GUARINI changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendments en bloc, as modified, were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), $500,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That after setting aside amounts for reservation in accordance with section 217(a)(2), and prior to applying the allocation provisions of section 217(a)(1) of such Act, $25,000,000 of the foregoing $500,000,000 shall be available for grants to States and units of general local government for a program of lead-based paint abatement in privately-owned housing, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall specify: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of the foregoing $500,000,000, such Act shall be construed as providing the following: in section 216(3)(A), "$750,000" both places it appears shall be "$375,000"; in section 217(b)(2)(A), "$3,000,000" both places it appears shall be "$750,000"; in section 217(b)(2)(B), "$500,000" both places it appears shall be "$125,000"; and in section 217(b)(3), "$500,000" shall be "$250,000".

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended ("the Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 1437), not otherwise provided for, $9,985,790,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the new budget authority provided herein, along with $216,200,000 of budget authority previously made available for vouchers and certificates under section 8(o) and section 8(b) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437(o)) which remains unreserved at the end of fiscal year 1991, $157,800,000 shall be for the development or acquisition cost of public housing for Indian families, including amounts for housing under the mutual help homeownership opportunity program under section 202 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1737bb); $574,500,000 shall be for the development or acquisition cost of public housing, including $143,625,000 for major reconstruction of obsolete public housing projects, other than for Indian families; $2,500,000,000 shall be for modernization of existing public

housing projects pursuant to section 14 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437l), including funds for the comprehensive testing, abatement, and risk assessment of lead, of which $25,000,000 shall be for the risk assessment of lead and $5,000,000 shall be for technical assistance and training under section 20 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437r); $1,106,550,000 shall be for the section 8 existing housing certificate program (42 U.S.C. 1437f) (of which $35,000,000 shall be for Foster Child Care); $818,975,000 shall be for the housing voucher program under section 8(o) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437(o)); $2,555,141,000 shall be for amendments to section 8 contracts other than contracts for projects developed under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, including $70,000,000 which shall be for rental adjustments resulting from the application of an annual adjustment factor in accordance with section 801 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-235); $718,462,000 shall be for assistance for State or local, tenant and nonprofit organizations to purchase projects where owners have indicated an intent to prepay mortgages and for assistance to be used as an incentive to prevent prepayment or for vouchers to aid eligible tenants adversely affected by mortgage prepayment, as authorized in the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625); $348,750,000 shall be for loan management, provided that any amounts of budget authority provided herein that are used for loan management activities under section 8(b)(1)(42 U.S.C. 1437f(b)(1)) shall not be obligated for a contract term that is less than five years; $266,682,000 shall be for section 8 assistance for property disposition; and $41,000,000 shall be for the conversion of rent supplement and rental assistance program units and projects to section 8 project-based assistance: *Provided further*, That those portions of the fees for the costs incurred in administering incremental units assisted in the certificate and housing voucher programs under sections 8(b) and 8(o), respectively, shall be established or increased in accordance with the authorization for such fees in section 8(q) of the Act: *Provided further*, That up to $227,000,000 of amounts of budget authority (and contract authority) reserved or obligated for the development or acquisition costs of public housing (including public housing for Indian families), for modernization of existing public housing projects (including such projects for Indian families), and, except as hereinafter provided, for programs under section 8 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f), which are recaptured during fiscal year 1992, shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That 50 per centum of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 per centum of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-628, 102 Stat. 3224, 3268) shall not be rescinded, or in the case of cash, shall not be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash shall be used by State housing finance agencies in accordance with such section: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 20 percent limitation under section 5(j)(2) of the Act, 25 percent of the new budget authority for the development or acquisition costs of public housing other than for Indian families shall be used for major reconstruction of obsolete public housing projects other than for Indian families: *Provided further*, That of the $9,985,790,000 provided herein, $50,000,000 shall be for housing opportunities for persons with AIDS under title VIII, subtitle D of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625); and $4,200,000 shall be for the housing demonstration under section 304(e)(1) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625): *Provided further*, That sales of housing units by a public housing agency, as authorized by section 5(h) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, which occur under the Department of Housing and Urban Development's "Public Housing Homeownership Demonstration" (as described in 49 FR 43028 of October 25, 1984), shall not be subject to section 304(g) of such Act: *Provided further*, That of the $54,250,000 earmarked in Public Law 101-507 for special purpose grants (104 Stat. 1351, 1357), $667,000 made available for the city of Chicago to assist the Ashland II Redevelopment Project shall instead be made available for the city of Chicago to assist the Marshway Project.

Of the $9,985,790,000 provided under this head, $343,920,000 shall be for capital advances for housing for the elderly as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625); $380,950,000 shall be for project rental assistance for supportive housing for the elderly under such section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959, of which up to $92,950,000 may be for amendments for section 8 contracts for projects for the elderly that receive capital advances, including projects previously reserved under section 202 as it existed before enactment of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, including $16,250,000 for service coordinators pursuant to section 202(g) of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625).

Of the $9,985,790,000 provided under this head, $83,400,000 shall be for capital advances for housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625); $104,510,000 shall be for project rental assistance for persons with disabilities under section 811(b)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, of which up to $23,300,000 may be for amendments for contracts for projects for the handicapped that receive capital advances, including projects previously reserved under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 as it existed before enactment of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act.

Any amounts heretofore provided under this head for assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 1437) for rental assistance in projects developed for the elderly or handicapped under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q) (before revision in section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act) for such projects for the handicapped, may be used by the Secretary for project rental assistance under section 202(c)(2) of such Act (after revision by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act).

ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 SUBSIDY CONTRACTS

For assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437) not otherwise provided for, for use in connection with expiring section 8 subsidy contracts, $7,024,589,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided under this paragraph may not be obligated for a contract term that is less than five years: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may maintain consolidated accounting data for funds disbursed at the Public Housing Agency or Indian Housing Authority or project level for subsidy assistance regardless of the source of the disbursement so as to minimize the administrative burden of multiple accounts.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE
(RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) is reduced in fiscal year 1992 by not more than $2,393,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGAM
(RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s), is reduced in fiscal year 1992 by not more than $2,448,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I do so for the purpose of engaging the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] in a short colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Congressman MRAZEK and myself, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] for his excellent work on the Appropriations Committee. I know that his subcommittee had to make difficult choices in light of severe budget constraints.

His subcommittee has been very supportive of the National Estuary Program and specifically the Long Island Sound study. The study is in its final year, but considerable research and evaluation need to be completed on toxic contamination, pathogens, and living marine resources. In addition, NOAA is completing water quality and circulation models that are critical to understanding the problems with nutrients and low-dissolved oxygen in the sound.

Mr. Chairman, we have learned that the EPA is planning to significantly cut the amount of funding the Long Island Sound study will receive this year. In fiscal year 1991, EPA and NOAA received approximately $2 million.

If EPA does not allocate at least $1 million, the research and evaluation cannot be properly completed. This is the most critical time for the modeling work and it would be very detrimental to slash funding for the study after this 5-year effort.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of our constituents and the congressional Long Island Sound caucus, it is our hope that the subcommittee will consider Long Island Sound funding a priority as the bill makes its way through the

legislative process and in its conference deliberations with the Senate.

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

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. TRAXLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am in complete agreement with the statement. I understand the concerns of the gentleman. You can be sure we will work on this as a priority to see that the Long Island Sound study receives adequate funding in conference committee.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 80, line 6, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the balance of the bill through page 80, line 6, is as follows:

CONGREGATE SERVICES

For contracts with and payments to public housing agencies and non-profit corporations for congregate services programs in accordance with the provisions of the Congregate Housing Services Act of 1978, as amended, $9,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

PAYMENTS FOR OPERATION OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

For payments to public housing agencies and Indian housing authorities for operating subsidies for low-income housing projects as authorized by section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g), $2,405,844,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $250,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 20, 1992.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners—both current and prospective—with respect to property maintenance, financial management, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions and meeting the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership, including provisions for training and for support of voluntary agencies and services as authorized by section 106(a)(1)(iii), section 106(a)(2), section 106(c), and section 106(d) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, $8,350,000, of which $350,000 shall be available for the prepurchase and foreclosure-prevention counseling demonstration program.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

For assistance to owners of eligible multifamily housing projects insured, or formerly insured, and under the National Housing Act, as amended, or which are otherwise eligible for assistance under section 201(c) of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1a), in the program of assistance for troubled multifamily housing projects under the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended, $203,413,000, and all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 1991, and any collections and other amounts in the fund authorized under section 201(j) of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended, during fiscal year 1992, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That assistance to an owner of a multifamily housing project assisted, but not insured, under the National Housing Act may be made if the project owner and the mortgagee have provided or agreed to provide assistance to the project in a manner as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

FHA—MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 1992, commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of $60,000,000,000.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed loan program, $255,645,000, to be derived from the FHA-Mutual Mortgage Insurance Guaranteed Loans Receipt account, of which not to exceed $250,100,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for salaries and expenses; and of which not to exceed $5,545,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the Office of Inspector General.

FHA—GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of guaranteed loans under such funds authorized by the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3(b) and 1735c(f)), $54,911,000: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the total loan principal any part of which is to be guaranteed of not to exceed $8,651,901,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed loan programs, $189,000,000, of which $184,900,000 shall be transferred and merged with the appropriations for salaries and expenses; and of which $4,100,000 shall be transferred and merged with the appropriation for the Office of Inspector General.

FHA—GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK INSURANCE FUNDS

On October 1, 1991, each outstanding obligation issued by the Secretary of Housing Urban Development to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 520(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, together with any promise to repay the principal and interest which has accrued on each obligation, and any other term or condition specified by each such obligation, is canceled.

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

For grants to public housing agencies for use in eliminating drug-related crime in public housing projects authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11901-11908, and for drug information clearinghouse services authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11921-11925, $165,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $5,700,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for grants, contracts, or other assistance for technical assistance and training for or on behalf of public housing agencies and resident organizations (including the costs of necessary travel for participants in such training): *Provided further*, That $10,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be made available for grants for federally assisted, low-income housing.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDES TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 1992, new commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721g), shall not exceed $74,769,293,000. For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed mortgage-backed securities program, $6,595,000, to be derived from the GNMA—Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account, of which not to exceed $6,595,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for salaries and expenses.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM

For the emergency shelter grants program, as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, $71,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TRANSITIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the transitional and supportive housing demonstration program, as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the foregoing amount, $5,000,000 shall be available for a homeless demonstration project at Luther Place Church in Washington, DC and $4,200,000 shall be available for the New England Shelter for Homeless Veterans in Boston, Massachusetts.

The unexpended balances of the "Transitional housing demonstration program", available from the appropriations enacted in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, and the unexpended balances of the "Supportive housing demonstration program", available from the appropriation enacted in Public Law 101-71, shall be added to and merged with amounts available under this heading.

SUPPLEMENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR FACILITIES TO ASSIST THE HOMELESS

For grants for supplemental assistance for facilities to assist the homeless as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, $57,000,000, notwithstanding section 837(c) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), to remain available until expended.

SECTION 8 MODERATE REHABILITATION SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY

For assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437f), for the section 8 moderate rehabilitation program, to be used to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), $55,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SHELTER PLUS CARE: SECTION 8 MODERATE REHABILITATION, SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY

For the Shelter Plus Care: Section 8 moderate rehabilitation, single room occupancy program, as authorized under subtitle F, part III, of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SHELTER PLUS CARE: SECTION 202 RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For the Shelter Plus Care: Section 202 rental assistance program, as authorized under subtitle F, part IV, of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, $37,200,000, to remain available until expended.

SHELTER PLUS CARE: HOMELESS RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

For the Shelter Plus Care: Homeless rental housing assistance program, as authorized under subtitle F, part II, of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, $116,000,000, to remain available until expended.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For grants to States and units of general local government and for related expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out a community development grants program as authorized by title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), $3,265,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994: *Provided*, That $32,600,000 shall be available for grants to Indian tribes pursuant to section 106(a)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), $14,500,000 shall be available for "special purpose grants" pursuant to section 107 of such Act, and $500,000 shall be available for a grant to demonstrate the feasibility of developing an integrated database system and computer mapping tool for compliance, programming, and evaluation of community development block grants pursuant to section 901 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 20 per centum of any grant made with funds appropriated herein (other than a grant using funds under section 107(b)(3) of such Act or funds set aside in the following proviso) shall be expanded for "Planning and Management Development" and "Administration" as defined in regulations promulgated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That $5,000,000 shall be made available from the foregoing $3,265,000,000 to carry out an early childhood development program under section 222 of the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z-6 note): *Provided further*, That after September 30, 1991, notwithstanding section 909 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), no funds provided or heretofore provided in this or any other appropriations Act shall be used to establish or supplement a revolving fund under section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

During fiscal year 1992, total commitments to guarantee loans, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), shall not exceed $140,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal.

REHABILITATION LOAN FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Notwithstanding section 289(c) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), the assets and liabilities of the revolving fund established by section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452b), and any collections, including repayments or recaptured amounts, of such fund shall be transferred to and merged with the Revolving Fund (liquidating programs), established pursuant to title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701g-5), effective October 1, 1991.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, $29,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That $1,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for innovative building technologies research with the Research Center of the National Association of Home Builders.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, $13,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That not less than $8,000,000 shall be available to carry out activities pursuant to section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and nonadministrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $7,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $750,078,000, of which $394,609,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration.

PERSONAL SERVICES AND TRAVEL, OFFICE OF HOUSING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For personnel compensation and benefits for the headquarters Office of Housing, $55,580,000, of which $37,637,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,276,000 of the $55,580,000 herein provided shall be available for travel expenses of the Office of Housing: *Provided further*, That the amounts herein shall not be consolidated into a single administrative expenses fund account, notwithstanding section 502(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1948.

PERSONAL SERVICES AND TRAVEL, OFFICE OF PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

For personnel compensation and benefits for the headquarters Office of Public and Indian Housing, $10,424,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $491,000 of the $10,424,000 herein provided shall be available for travel expenses of the Office of Public and Indian Housing: *Provided further*, That the amounts herein shall not be consolidated into a single administrative expenses fund account, notwithstanding section 502(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1948.

PERSONAL SERVICES AND TRAVEL, OFFICE OF COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

For personnel compensation and benefits for the headquarters Office of Community Planning and Development, $17,872,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $439,000 of the $17,872,000 herein provided shall be available for travel expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development: *Provided further*, That the amounts herein shall not be consolidated into a single administrative expenses fund account, notwithstanding section 502(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1948.

PERSONAL SERVICES AND TRAVEL, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For personnel compensation and benefits for the headquarters Office of Policy Development and Research, $10,705,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $141,000 of the $10,705,000 herein provided shall be available for travel expenses of the Office of Policy Development and Research: *Provided further*, That the amounts herein shall not be consolidated into a single administrative expenses fund account, notwithstanding section 502(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1948.

PERSONAL SERVICES AND TRAVEL, OFFICE OF FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

For personnel compensation and benefits for the headquarters Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, $10,516,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $377,000 of the $10,516,000 herein provided shall be available for travel expenses of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity: *Provided further*, That the amounts herein shall not be consolidated into a single administrative expenses fund account, notwithstanding section 502(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1948.

PERSONAL SERVICES AND TRAVEL, DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For personnel compensation and benefits for the headquarters budget activity of Departmental Management, $9,293,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $673,000 of the $9,293,000 herein provided shall be available for travel expenses of the Departmental Management activity: *Provided further*, That the amounts herein shall not be consolidated into a single administrative expenses fund account, notwithstanding section 502(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1948.

PERSONAL SERVICES AND TRAVEL, OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For personnel compensation and benefits for the headquarters Office of General Counsel, $14,985,000, of which $2,754,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration: *Provided*, That not to exceed $259,000 of the $14,985,000 herein provided shall be available for travel expenses of the Office of General Counsel: *Provided further*, That the amounts herein shall not be consolidated into a single administrative expenses fund account, notwithstanding section 502(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1948.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $43,645,000, of which $9,645,000, shall be transferred from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the city of Vallejo, California, is authorized to retain any land disposition proceeds or urban renewal grant funds that remain after the financial closeout of the Marina Vista Urban Renewal Project, and to use such funds in accordance with the requirements of the community development block grant program specified in

title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The city of Vallejo shall retain such funds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use, in accordance with this paragraph, all past and future earnings from such funds, including any interest.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the city of New London, Connecticut, is authorized to retain any land disposition proceeds or urban renewal grant funds that remain after the financial closeout of the Shaw's Cove Urban Renewal Project (No. Conn. R-126), and to use such funds in accordance with the requirements of the community development block grant program specified in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The city of New London shall retain such funds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use, in accordance with this paragraph, all past and future earnings from such funds, including any interest.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the cities of Newburyport and Malden, in Massachusetts, are authorized to retain any categorical settlement grant funds or urban renewal grant funds that remain after the financial closeout of the Central Business Urban Renewal Project (No. MASS-R-80) in the city of Newburyport and the Civic Center Urban Renewal Project (No. MASS-R-118) in the city of Malden, respectively, and to use such funds in accordance with the requirements of the community development block grant program specified in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The cities of Newburyport and Malden shall retain such funds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use, in accordance with this paragraph, all past and future earnings from such funds, including any interest.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the Housing Authority of the city of Jefferson, in the State of Missouri, is authorized to retain any land disposition proceeds from the financially closed-out Capitol West Urban Renewal Project (Mo. R-45), pursuant to the agreement which permitted the retention of certain proceeds, which agreement was dated August 27, 1982, and to use such proceeds in accordance with the requirements of the community development block grant program specified in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The Housing Authority of the city of Jefferson City shall retain such funds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use, in accordance with this paragraph, all past and future earnings from such proceeds, including any interest.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall cancel the indebtedness of the town of Calhoun Falls, South Carolina, relating to the public facilities loan (Project No. SC-16-PFL0061). The town of Calhoun Falls, South Carolina, is relieved of all liability to the Government for the outstanding principal balance on such loan, for the amount of accrued interest on such loan, and for any other fees and charges payable in connection with such loan.

During fiscal year 1992, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the number of individuals employed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in other than "career appointee" positions in the Senior Executive Service shall not exceed 15.

Section 8(c)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting after "New York." the following new sentences: "The Secretary shall also establish separate fair market rentals under this paragraph for Monroe County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In establishing fair market rentals for the remaining portion of the market area in which Monroe County is located, the Secretary shall establish the fair market rentals as if such portion included Monroe County.".

Section 801(a) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act is amended in the last sentence of subsection (g)(2) of the amendment to be made (by such section 801(a)) to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 by striking "in housing principally serving frail elderly persons".

The last sentence of section 202(g)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q(g)(2)) is amended by striking "or a project where the tenants are not principally frail elderly".

Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(p) With respect to amounts available for obligation on or after October 1, 1991, the criteria established under section 213(d)(5)(B) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 for any competition for assistance for new construction, acquisition, or acquisition and rehabilitation of public housing shall give preference to applications for housing to be located in a local market area that has an inadequate supply of housing available for use by very low-income families. The Secretary shall establish criteria for determining that the housing supply of a local market area is inadequate, which shall require—

"(1)(A) information regarding housing market conditions showing that the supply of rental housing affordable by very low-income families is inadequate, taking into account vacancy rates in such housing and other market indicators; and

"(B) evidence that significant numbers of families in the local market area holding certificates and vouchers under section 8 are experiencing significant difficulty in leasing housing meeting program and family-size requirements; or

"(2) evidence that the proposed development would provide increased housing opportunities for minorities or address special housing needs.".

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries; $18,440,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That where station allowance has been authorized by the Department of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be authorized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Commission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces serving as members or as Secretary of the Commission may be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members of the Commission: *Provided further*, That the Commission shall reimburse other Government agencies, including the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of personnel assigned to it: *Provided further*, That section 509 of the general provisions carried in title V of this Act shall not apply to the funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That not more than $125,000 of the private contributions to the Korean War Memorial Fund may be used for administrative support of the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board including travel by members of the board authorized by the Commission, travel allowances to conform to those provided by Federal Travel regulations.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, $40,200,000: *Provided*, That not more than $395,000 of these funds shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits for the Commissioners of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Veterans Appeals as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 4051-4091, $9,133,000: *Provided*, That such sum shall be available without regard to section 509 of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; $12,587,000, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; and not to exceed $6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; $1,090,000,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be expended for purposes of Resource Conservation and Recov-

ery Panels established under section 2003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6913): *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, $4,951,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes for which that fund is established.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $39,661,000, of which $14,954,000 shall be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund trust fund and $623,000 shall be derived from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For research and development activities, including procurement of laboratory equipment, supplies, and other operating expenses in support of research and development, $333,875,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That not more than $42,000,000 of these funds shall be available for procurement of laboratory equipment, supplies, and other operating expenses in support of research and development: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, $2,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes for which that fund is established.

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For abatement, control, and compliance activities, $1,133,625,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That up to $2,800,000 shall be available for grants and cooperative agreements to develop and implement asbestos training and accreditation programs: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, $10,982,800 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes for which that fund is established: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from funds appropriated under this heading, the Administrator is authorized to make grants to "Federally recognized Indian tribes" on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate for the development of multimedia environmental programs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this head shall be available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration pursuant to section 118(h)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be expended for purposes of Resource Conservation and Recovery Panels established under section 2003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6913), or for support to State, regional, local, and interstate agencies in accordance with subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, other than section 4008(a)(2) or 4009 (42 U.S.C. 6948, 6949).

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment for facilities of, or use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, $39,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $6,700,000 of the foregoing amount shall be made available as a grant for a center for neural science to be constructed and owned by New York University: *Provided further*, That none of the funds previously appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for activities pertaining to the proposed Environmental Technology and Engineering Center in Edison, New Jersey shall be expended, except for those funds necessary to investigate alternative laboratory sites.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111 (c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), $1,650,000,000, to be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund, plus sums recovered on behalf of the Hazardous Substance Superfund in excess of $200,000,000 during fiscal year 1992, with all of such funds to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 111(m) of CERCLA or any other provision of law, not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to carry out activities described in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of CERCLA and section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 1992: *Provided further*, That no more than $260,000,000 of these funds shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, from funds appropriated under this heading, obligate up to $213,000 for a new pumping station in St. Anthony, Minnesota: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, from funds previously appropriated under this heading in Public Law 101-507, obligate up to $5,000,000 for Koppers Texarkana Superfund site relocation.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, $85,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than $6,400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Water Quality Act of 1987, $2,195,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,783,500,000 shall be for title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; $16,500,000 shall be for making grants authorized under section 104(b)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; $49,000,000 shall be for section 510 of the Water Quality Act of 1987; $300,000,000 shall be for making grants under title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to the appropriate instrumentality for the purpose of constructing secondary sewage treatment facilities to serve the following localities, and in the amounts indicated: Boston, Massachusetts, $100,000,000; New York, New York, $70,000,000; Los Angeles, California, $55,000,000; San Diego, California, $40,000,000; and Seattle, Washington, $35,000,000; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, $46,000,000 shall be available for Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration Project grants to be awarded by the Administrator, who is authorized to make such grants to Wayne County, Michigan, such grants to be for the construction of sanitary sewers and retention basins, for the repair and maintenance of wastewater treatment plants and collection systems, and for the investigation of commercial and industrial facilities and storm sewer connections to implement the Rouge River National Demonstration Project for Wet Weather Flows: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law or any regulatory requirements, the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority may utilize facilities inside or outside the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to meet any technology or marketing backup requirements imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or any judicial decree for residuals management. The Massachusetts Water Resources Authority shall not be required to own such management facilities to meet such backup requirements as long as such facilities are under the control of the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority pursuant to a binding enforceable lease, contract, or other legal instrument for the period of time required under the approved residuals management program. Nothing in this paragraph shall relieve the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority of its obligation, pursuant to a preexisting court order, to maintain its ownership and control of a site within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for potential use as a backup residuals management facility, except that the development of such land for a backup facility is not required prior to selection of a final site for such a facility by the Landfill Siting Commission appointed by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or January 1, 1992, whichever first occurs. Any facility used by the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority for residuals management shall meet all applicable Federal and State environmental requirements.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

During fiscal year 1992, notwithstanding any other provision of law, average employment in the headquarter's offices of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not exceed: (1) 46 workyears for the Immediate Office of the Administrator, (2) 50 workyears for the Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs, (3) 77 workyears for the Office of Communications and Public Affairs, (4) 187 workyears for the Office of General Counsel, (5) 61 workyears for the Office of International Activities, (6) 32 workyears for the Office of Federal Activities, (7) 285 workyears for the Office of Policy, Planning, and Evaluation, and (8) 1,386 workyears for the Office of Administration and Resources Management.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality, in carrying out their functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-224), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, including not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $2,560,000.

NATIONAL SPACE COUNCIL

For necessary expenses of the National Space Council, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $1,491,000, of which not to exceed $1,000 may be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That the National Space Council shall reimburse other agencies for not less than one-half of the personnel compensation costs of individuals detailed to it.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $3,880,000: *Provided*, That the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall reimburse other agencies for not less than one-half of the personnel compensation costs of individuals detailed to it.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DISASTER RELIEF

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), $185,000,000, of which not to exceed $541,000 may be transferred to the disaster assistance direct loan program account for subsidies for direct loans provided under section 319 of such Act, to remain available until expended.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Funds provided to this account are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $6,000,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire and purchase of motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343); uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency preparedness; transportation in connection with the continuity of Government programs to the same extent and in the same manner as permitted the Secretary of a Military Department under 10 U.S.C. 2632; and not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; $165,113,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $3,600,000.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as amended (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), section 103 of the National Security Act (50 U.S.C. 404), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, $277,827,000.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

There is hereby appropriated $134,000,000 to the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out an emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of Public Law 100-77, as amended: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed three and one-half per centum of the total appropriation.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

(TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Of the funds available from the National Flood Insurance Fund for activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, $12,874,000 shall, upon enactment of this Act, be transferred to the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for administrative costs of the insurance and flood plain management programs and $45,023,000 shall, upon enactment of the Act, be transferred to the "Emergency management planning and assistance" appropriation for flood plain management activities, including $4,720,000 for expenses under section 1362 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4103, 4127), which amount shall be available until September 30, 1993. In fiscal year 1992, no funds in excess of (1) $32,000,000 for operating expenses, (2) $208,276,000 for agents' commissions and taxes, and (3) $3,500,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations.

NATIONAL INSURANCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

Notwithstanding section 520(b) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1735d(b)), effective October 1, 1991, any indebtedness of the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency resulting from the Director or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development borrowing sums under such section before the date of the enactment of this Act to carry out title XII of the National Housing Act shall be canceled, the Director shall not be obligated to repay such sums or any interest thereon, and no further interest shall accrue on such sums.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Information Center, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $1,944,000, to be deposited into the Consumer Information Center Fund: *Provided*, That the appropriations, revenues and collections deposited into the fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Consumer Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of $5,500,000. Administrative expenses of the Consumer Information Center in fiscal year 1992 shall not exceed $2,285,000. Appropriations, revenues, and collections accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1992 in excess of $5,500,000 shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Consumer Affairs, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,103,000.

INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON THE HOMELESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Interagency Council on the Homeless, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title II of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11311-11319), as amended, $1,083,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Council shall carry out its duties in the 10 standard Federal regions under section 203(a)(4) of such Act only through detail, on a non-reimbursable basis, of employees of the departments and agencies represented on the Council pursuant to section 202(a) of such Act.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation and modification of real and personal property; purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than administrative aircraft, necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; $5,194,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in support of space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including operations, production, services, minor construction, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and modification of real and personal property; tracking and data relay satellite services as authorized by law; purchase, hire, maintenance and operation of other than administrative aircraft; $5,650,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993, of which $32,674,796 shall be used only for the purpose of payment, to the Federal Financing Bank, for the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite System (TDRSS) loan: *Provided*, That such payment shall constitute settlement of all amounts owed on said loan.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For construction, repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and for facility planning and design not otherwise provided, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, $398,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated under this heading by this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations therefor, the amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended, except that this provision shall not apply to the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization for repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and facility planning and design: *Provided further*, That no amount appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be used for the lease or construction of a new contractor-funded facility for exclusive use in support of a contract or contracts with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under which the Administration would be required to substan-

tially amortize through payment or reimbursement such contractor investment, unless an appropriations Act specifies the lease or contract pursuant to which such facilities are to be constructed or leased or such facility is otherwise identified in such Act: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may authorize such facility lease or construction, if he determines, in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next appropriations Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of research in Government laboratories, management of programs and other activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); awards, lease, hire, maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase (not to exceed thirty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and maintenance and repair of real and personal property, and not in excess of $200,000 per project for construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, repairs, and rehabilitation and modification of facilities; $2,427,300,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $35,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for scientific consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $12,952,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

No amount appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this or any other Act may be used to fund grants, contracts or other agreements with an expected duration of more than one year, when a primary effect of the grant, contract, or agreement is to provide a guaranteed customer base for or establish an anchor tenancy in new commercial space hardware or services unless an appropriations Act specifies the new commercial space hardware or services to be developed or used, or the grant, contract, or agreement is otherwise identified in such Act: *Provided*, That the Administrator may authorize such a grant, contract, or agreement if he determines, in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, that deferral of such action until enactment of the next appropriations Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation.

Income derived from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Endeavor Teacher Fellowship Trust Fund may be used to award fellowships to selected United States nationals who are undergraduate students pursuing a course of study leading to certified teaching degrees in elementary education or in secondary education in mathematics, science or technology disciplines.

None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may be used to administer, execute, or implement the provision 48 CFR 52.246-8 (f) and (j) of the standard Federal procurement contract language.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

During fiscal year 1992, gross obligations of the Central Liquidity Facility for the principal amount of new direct loans to member credit unions as authorized by the National Credit Union Central Liquidity Facility Act (12 U.S.C. 1795) shall not exceed $600,000,000: *Provided*, That administrative expenses of the Central Liquidity Facility in fiscal year 1992 shall not exceed $964,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

PAYMENT TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

For payment to the National Institute of Building Sciences, $250,000.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880–1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; $1,960,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the amount appropriated is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

ACADEMIC RESEARCH FACILITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out an academic research facilities program pursuant to the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the research and operational support for the United States Antarctic Program pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875); maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research and operations support; improvement of environmental practices and enhancements of safety; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of research ships and charter or lease of ships for research and operations support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; $118,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That receipts for support services and materials provided for non-Federal activities may be credited to this appropriation.

UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC LOGISTICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in reimbursing Federal agencies for logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic Program pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875); maintenance, and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research and operations support; improvement of environmental practices and enhancements of safety; maintenance and operation of research ships and charter or lease of ships for research and operations support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That receipts for support services and materials provided for non-Federal activities may be credited to this appropriation.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education and human resources programs and activities pursuant to the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $435,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That to the extent that the amount of this appropriation is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary salaries and expenses in carrying out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880–1881); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $110,000,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under salaries and expenses in fiscal year 1992 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $3,300,000.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), $26,900,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 4101–4118) for civilian employees; and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; $27,480,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into

the Armed Forces of the United States: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of 50 U.S.C. App. 460(g), none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated in connection with the preparation of more than one report each year to the Congress covering the operation of the Selective Service System.

TITLE IV

CORPORATIONS

Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 1992 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

FSLIC RESOLUTION FUND

For payment of expenditures, in fiscal year 1992, of the FSLIC Resolution Fund, for which other funds available to the FSLIC Resolution Fund as authorized by Public Law 101-73 are insufficient, $15,899,000,000.

RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $30,328,000.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 501. Where appropriations in titles I, II, and III of this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System; to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to travel performed in connection with major disasters or emergencies declared or determined by the President under the provisions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to site-related travel performed in connection with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; to site-related travel under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended; to travel performed by the Offices of Inspector General in connection with audits and investigations; or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules: *Provided further*, That if appropriations in titles I, II, and III exceed the amounts set forth in budget estimates initially submitted for such appropriations, the expenditures for travel may correspondingly exceed the amounts therefor set forth in the estimates in the same proportion.

SEC. 502. Appropriations and funds available for the administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Selective Service System shall be available in the current fiscal year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 503. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Resolution Trust Corporation, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 505. No funds appropriated by this Act may be expended—

(1) pursuant to a certification of an officer or employee of the United States unless—

(A) such certification is accompanied by, or is part of, a voucher or abstract which describes the payee or payees and the items or services for which such expenditure is being made, or

(B) the expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law; and

(2) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office or is specifically exempt by law from such audit.

SEC. 506. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between his domicile and his place of employment, with the exception of any officer or employee authorized such transportation under title 31, United States Code, section 1344.

SEC. 507. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for payment, through grants or contracts, to recipients that do not share in the cost of conducting research resulting from proposals not specifically solicited by the Government: *Provided*, That the extent of cost sharing by the recipient shall reflect the mutuality of interest of the grantee or contractor and the Government in the research.

SEC. 508. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used, directly or through grants, to pay or to provide reimbursement for payment of the salary of a consultant (whether retained by the Federal Government or a grantee) at more than the daily equivalent of the maximum rate paid for GS-18, unless specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 509. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for personnel compensation and benefits shall be available for other object classifications set forth in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any part of the appropriations contained in this Act for Offices of Inspector General personnel compensation and benefits.

SEC. 510. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Nothing herein affects the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission pursuant to section 7 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 et seq.).

SEC. 511. Except as otherwise provided under existing law or under an existing Executive order issued pursuant to an existing law, the obligation or expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for contracts for any consulting service shall be limited to contracts which are (1) a matter of public record and available for public inspection, and (2) thereafter included in a publicly available list of all contracts entered into within twenty-four months prior to the date on which the list is made available to the public and of all contracts on which performance has not been completed by such date. The list required by the preceding sentence shall be updated quarterly and shall include a narrative description of the work to be performed under each such contract.

SEC. 512. Except as otherwise provided by law, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be obligated or expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) for a contract for services unless such executive agency (1) has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder, and (2) requires any report prepared pursuant to such contract, including plans, evaluations, studies, analyses and manuals, and any report prepared by the agency which is substantially derived from or substantially includes any report prepared pursuant to such contract, to contain information concerning (A) the contract pursuant to which the report was prepared, and (B) the contractor who prepared the report pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 513. Except as otherwise provided in section 506, none of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency.

SEC. 514. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in 15 U.S.C. 2001 with an EPA estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon.

SEC. 515. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1992 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 516. None of the funds appropriated in title II of this Act, or otherwise available to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be used for first class travel of any Department official or employee unless required by medical necessity or on airplane flights longer than seven hours.

SEC. 517. None of the funds appropriated in title I of this Act shall be used to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental is more than $300,000, unless the Secretary submits, in writing, a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress and a period of 30 days has expired following the date on which the report is received by the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 518. (a) The Resolution Trust Corporation ("Corporation") shall report to the Con-

gress at least once a month on the status of the review required by section 21A(b)(11)(B) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the actions taken with respect to the agreements described in such section. The report shall describe, for each such agreement, the review that has been conducted and the action that has been taken, if any, to rescind or to restructure, modify, or renegotiate the agreement. In describing the action taken, the Corporation is not required to provide detailed information regarding an ongoing investigation or negotiation. The Corporation shall exercise any and all legal rights to restructure, modify, renegotiate or rescind such agreement, notwithstanding any other provision of law, where the savings would be realized.

(b) To expend any appropriated funds for the purpose of restructuring, modifying, or renegotiating the agreements described in subsection (a), the Corporation shall certify to the Congress, for each such agreement, the following:

(1) the Corporation has completed its review of the agreement, as required by section 21A(b)(11)(B) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act;

(2)(A) at the time of certification, in the opinion of the Corporation and based upon the information available to it, there is insufficient evidence or other indication of fraud, misrepresentation, failure to disclose a material fact, failure to perform under the terms of the agreement, improprieties in the bidding process, failure to comply with any law, rule or regulation regarding the validity of the agreement, or any other legal basis sufficient for the rescission of the agreement; or

(B) at the time of certification, the Corporation finds that there may be sufficient evidence to provide a legal basis for the rescission of the assistance agreement, but the Corporation determines that it may be in the best interest of the Government to restructure, modify or renegotiate the assistance agreement; and

(3) the Corporation has or will promptly exercise any and all legal rights to modify, renegotiate, or restructure the agreement where savings would be realized by such actions.

SEC. 519. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to implement the provisions of Public Law 101-576.

SEC. 520. (a) Section 622A(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "September 30, 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1992".

(b) Section 8013(e) of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508) is amended by striking out "September 30, 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1992".

(c) The amount provided in this Act for "Medical care" for the Department of Veterans Affairs is hereby increased by $90,000,000, to be available only for procurement of medical equipment.

(d) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall not take effect if the amount provided in this Act for "Medical care" for the Department of Veterans Affairs is less than $13,462,000,000, plus reimbursements.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the remainder of the bill?

If not, are there any amendments to the remainder of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN: Page 64, strike lines 5 through 9.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, On page 64 of the bill, the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to rewrite the regulations by which NASA awards contracts for the development of high-risk, state-of-the-art equipment—regulations which, by the way, have evolved through painful experience over a long period of years. The purpose of my amendment is to strike this provision, which, if enacted, would create chaos in all current and future NASA procurement activities.

Last year, in mandating that NASA redesign the space station according to its specifications, the Appropriations Committee went right to the edge of what is permissible under House rules in terms of legislating in an appropriations bill. This year, in rewriting the way in which the Federal acquisition regulation [FAR] applies to NASA, it has again walked right up to that line. The committee has been very clever about this. Had they gone over that line, we certainly would have asked the Rules Committee to strike this provision on a point of order. But even if we concede the right of the Appropriations Committee to push into all sorts of quasi-legislative activities involving agencies under its jurisdiction, we cannot permit them to do so in the harmful and sloppy manner that they have in this case.

The fact of the matter is that the committee is effectively legislating on tens of billions of dollars of NASA contracts without the benefit of a single hearing on this provision, or of a record of any kind. All the experts that we have consulted conclude that this is a very poorly crafted provision. In fact, we have been unable to elicit any sort of agreement from the experts on what this provision would mean in practice. NASA is on record as opposing the provision strongly. Contract experts at the General Accounting Office have told us that the provision would create chaos and that its likely effect will be the exact opposite of the intent of the provision as laid out in the committee's legislative report accompanying the bill.

To cite but one example of questionable impact of this provision, experts at GAO conclude that the effect of the amendment would actually be to reduce, rather than strengthen, the ability of the Government to compel contractors to correct defective products.

Mr. Chairman, we on the Science Committee certainly agree that reforms are needed in the Federal procurement system. The taxpayer is not well served when NASA pays for and accepts defective products such as the Hubble space telescope. But one of the problems with this provision is that, even if it had been in place, it would not have had the slightest effect on the government's ability to fix the problems of the Hubble telescope. The solution to procurement problems will be neither simple nor obvious, as the House has learned over the past several years in its attempts to reform the procurement process in the Department of Defense.

For NASA, the process of procurement reform has already begun. Last month, I introduced legislation—H.R. 2162—which provides a starting point for a series of hearings that our committee intends to convene later this year on the issue of liability in NASA contracting. The Appropriations Committee is aware of our activities and intentions in this area, and of the legitimate interests of the Government Operations Committee. Given the complexities of these issues, the House should let the normal legislative process operate to produce a thoughtful and comprehensive solution to the problem. The public would not be served by the adoption of a provision as confusing and poorly understood as this one.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell the membership what this is all about. All I need is 2 minutes of your time. It has been a long day, but I would not want anybody to walk out of here tonight without understanding the problem that the chairman is committed to fixing.

Let me tell you what it is. When Hubble went kerplunk and developed its inability to see, we asked, as the subcommittee that funds NASA and as the subcommittee like each and every one of you that is worried about taxpayer dollars, whether we could find out what the situation was on the contractor liability.

□ 2110

We asked NASA to send the contracts over. We talked with NASA. The fact of the matter is that there is a longstanding practice within NASA and the contracting industry to provide for waivers on ordinary negligence on behalf of the contractor.

Now get this one. I ask my colleagues, "Would you enter into this kind of contract if you were a business person buying something from another business?"

Here is how it reads:

Except as provided in this clause, and the exception is fraud, lack of good faith or willful misconduct, except as provided in this clause and as may be provided in the schedule, the contractor shall have no obligation or liability to correct or replace articles which at the time of delivery are defective in material, or workmanship or for any other

reason not in conformity with the requirements of this contract.

In other words, the contractor can deliver shoddy goods, and they cannot be sued. In short, they are paid. That is what we are doing on Hubble, and that is what the language in this bill is designed to correct. The gentleman has assured me that this issue has top priority in this committee, and all we want is a fix so that the taxpayer gets a fair, fair delivery of goods for the dollars he is paying.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], let me make it clear that, while this was a NASA problem, the regulations involved are governmentwide, and the legislation falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, and the distinguished chairman of that committee is anxious, as I am, to see that some remedy is achieved.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], my friend, for yielding in this repentant mode that we are in after the deed has been done. I say to the gentleman, "I support the concept that you're working toward. I share your concern. But, as you know, the Federal acquisition regulation falls within our committee. We would appreciate, even if we're not violating the law of rule XXI, clause 2, that we are certainly violating the spirit to do it this way. We would appreciate working with you on these matters. I support the intent. Please don't let it happen too much more in the future."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is addressing me or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER]. The bill that I referred to has been referred to his committee, and it cannot be reported unless he acts on it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlman will yield, I thank the gentlman, but this is all after the fact. I say to the gentleman, "I'm glad you're giving it to me now."

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I feel like I just fell in the crack. All I want and all the American taxpayer wants is to get what he is paying for, and I leave it to the gentleman to figure it out. But I promise one thing if it is not figured out and fixed next year, my colleagues are going to be staring at this language again, and we will have a vote on it.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for being so willing to write all the authorization legislation required by the Congress, and I know he will continue to do a good job.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. I appreciate the efforts he has made on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations. He has been pretty successful today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise for purposes of engaging in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, the coastal America initiative is premised on the idea that interagency coordination of various Federal coastal programs makes sense both from a resource protection standpoint and from an administrative and funding standpoint. To the extent that the coastal America initiative does not get all of its earmarked funding or to the extent that it's earmarked for the National Estuary Program as Mr. STUDDS has suggested, there's nothing contained in this bill or current law which prevents EPA from coordinating its coastal resource efforts with other Federal agencies which have coastal resource responsibilities. Is that correct?

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

Mr. BATEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] is absolutely correct.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARPER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARPER: Page 79, strike lines 12 through 14.

Page 79, line 15, strike "SEC. 520." and insert "SEC. 519.".

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in conjunction with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON]. The language that we would strike with our amendment is a very brief section, section 519. I will read those words to our colleagues. The language we strike reads as follows:

SEC. 519. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to implement the provisions of Public Law 101-576.

I might ask, "What is Public Law 101-576?" It is legislation that the 101st Congress enacted entitled A Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990.

Each week during the year 1989 seemed to bring with it fresh revelations of gross mismanagement of HUD. The extent of the waste, and the fraud and the corruption first brought our dismay, then our embarrassment, and, when we became aware of the extent of it, it brought forth our anger and our outrage. As a result of the kind of mismanagement that we learned about 2 years ago, the Committee on Government Operations prepared and offered to the full House legislation creating the chief financial officer in 22 departments and agencies within the Federal Government.

This particular proposal represents, I believe, the best single financial management reform for the Federal Government for the executive branch of our Government in the time that I have been in the Congress. This recommendation is strongly endorsed by GAO, strongly endorsed by the Comptroller General, endorsed during hearings by the Committee on Government Operations, by Members of this body, by the executive branch, by GAO, by CPA's from around the country.

We voted on this legislation last year. We adopted it without a dissenting vote. The Senate adopted this legislation also, I believe, without a dissenting vote. They were signed into law last year by the President, and now we find in one appropriation bill after the other that language like the language I read earlier which prohibits the use of any funds for the purpose of hiring or enabling chief financial officers in each of our departments and agencies to do the job that the legislation of last year intended for them to do.

I sat here last week when we debated the energy and water bill and said nothing. I sat here last week when we debated the military construction and appropriation bill and said nothing.

□ 2120

Mr. Chairman, I sat here earlier this week when we debated the legislative branch appropriations bill, and I said nothing. But today, when we debate funds for HUD, which represents the worse example of mismanagement, lack of financial systems, lack of accounting, and lack of cash management systems, to say nothing, I cannot do that.

This is a program that deserves to be funded, and I ask my colleagues today to consider this issue. A number of us have had an opportunity earlier today with the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations to meet with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and express to him our personal concern over the failure of funding for these particular financial offi-

cers. We need this kind of reform. My hope is that if we do not act on this amendment today, certainly by the time we take up the Treasury appropriation bill, that some resolution of whatever is keeping us apart here may be reached and we may complete this report that we began last year.

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

Mr. CARPER. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and may I say that I can agree with him as to the objective. But I say to my colleagues here that the housing situation is not from the action of the Congress. We do not administer these programs. Everything the gentleman mentioned that is bad is handled by the executive department. We write the laws and appropriate the money, and after that it is out of our hands.

I agree with how bad some of these things are, and I agree with the purpose the gentleman has, but I differ with the gentleman about the cure he has offered. I will not state how many folks heard it, but as the gentleman says, there was not a dissenting vote on this bill. There was not a record vote either. I knew nothing about it until about a month ago. So what we have done on our committee is point out that the end result may be worse than what we have if we follow this course.

May I say again that housing, the savings and loan, and all that is administered by the executive branch, not by the Congress.

Our Committee on Appropriations has held the line. We had sequestration imposed by the Office of Management and Budget after the recent supplemental appropriations. They had sequestration of 13 ten-thousandths of 1 percent and, according to the press that means a dime apiece for each of our employees each month.

So I object to turning over the operations of the legislative branch to a representative of an executive department. That comes from many years of experience. But I agree with the objectives the gentleman has.

May I say that in the meeting we had today, we agreed we would have the staffs of the two committees work together to bring about the best results we can, and we would have it ready by the time the Treasury bill comes before the House. So I hope that will satisfy the gentleman, because my intentions are just as good as his. And as to my record and our record, I am proud to say to all the Members, that the Appropriations Committee since 1945 has held the total of appropriation bills $180.8 billion below the recommendations of the President. But you are about to squeeze us where we cannot look after the country. So, I hope we can postpone this and let the staffs work together and see what we can do to bring about the results we both seek.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Delaware yield?

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman, before I yield, let me say that I have no quarrel with the record of the Appropriations Committee. It is the record of the management or mismanagement, the financial mismanagement that occurred and is occurring in other agencies. We want it to stop.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, and it does not need to be done at the expense of the Appropriations Committee to do it because we are not the cause of mismanagement. Let me say again that it is not the gentleman's fault. He did it in public, and the CFO bill passed the House. But I do not know how many folks heard the debate. I did not know anything about it until a few weeks ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CARPER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Delware a question.

It is my understanding, after reading the language in the bill last year, that the legislative branch of government is not conceding any authority to the executive branch. What we are doing is setting up a mechanism where there will be accounting that will be consistent throughout the Government so that the various agencies of Government will know what is going on. Right now, as I understand it, it is a real mishmash and nobody can figure out what the problems are in the various agencies of Government and where the waste is. So there needs to be consistency and there needs to be sound accounting procedures. Is that correct?

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has stated it very well.

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

Mr. Chairman, what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stated earlier is accurate, that we did meet this afternoon with him about this subject and he did indicate that our staffs would try to work something out on this subject, but in the meantime we thought that we ought to inform the Congress exactly what it is we are talking about here.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has too few chances in the course of its business to really do something to cut down on Government waste and make this huge Federal Government a more streamlined and efficient operation. The Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, which was enacted last November and is now being threatened in this and other appropriations bills, is one such opportunity.

Congress passed the CFO's Act unanimously last October in response to the HUD scandal, the savings and loan crisis, and the many other Federal Government management "high-risk areas" identified by the General Accounting Office and others. The act requires the installation of chief financial officers in the 16 Cabinet departments and the 7 largest agencies, and outlines goals for restructuring internal financial management. It also makes the Office of Management and Budget more responsive to Congress by creating a new OMB Deputy Director for Management, and requires certain financial statements and audits in each of the 23 covered agencies.

The act was supported by a broad, nonpartisan coalition of legislators, Government officials, and private sector groups. It did not come out of nowhere—Congress had been considering such legislation for over 5 years.

It is essential for the cause of good government—which I believe every Member of this body supports—that Congress fund the implementation of this act, both in the VA/HUD/Independent Agencies appropriations bill that we are currently considering and in every other appropriations bill. Governmentwide, the administration is asking for a little more than $104 million to fund the implementation of the CFO's Act. My 29 years in Congress, all of them serving on the Government Operations Committee, have shown me that the investment up front in intelligent management reform programs—like the one required in the CFO's Act—will yield in savings many times the amount invested. This act, if funded and implemented, will prevent untold amounts of fraud, waste, and abuse from occurring in the months and years down the road.

I have heard the concerns of some that the CFO's Act will decrease the power of Congress relative to the executive branch. This will not be the result of this act. The legislation seeks only to streamline internal executive branch management, not tinker with the substance of programs, or the relations between Congress and the administration. The act will simply create benign, nonpartisan improvements in a Federal management structure riddled with weak internal controls and poor information.

The act would help eliminate such inefficient and wasteful practices as the operation of over 450 different and incompatible Government accounting systems. The management of the executive branch is often quite poor. There are long lists of agencies that the GAO

and others have identified as time bombs of management scandal. The CFO's Act seeks nothing more and nothing less than to inject accurate information and discipline into the management of the multi-billion dollar enterprise of Government. And past legislative efforts, such as the Inspectors General Act of 1978, indicate that intelligent management reform can be quite effective.

The Members should also know that the act will not make OMB more powerful than it is now. Both new OMB positions are subject to Senate confirmation, and OMB will be required to report to Congress on all of its major steps, both in the implementation process and from year to year. If the act is properly implemented, OMB will actually lose the power to guide the basic decision of what the actual numbers are in the management cycle of the agencies, since the system will be generating precise, accurate information that will be outside of the influence of OMB.

Mr. Chairman, it is very important that the implementation of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 be fully funded in all of the covered departments and agencies, including the VA, HUD, NASA, EPA, and the National Science Foundation, all of which are affected by todays bill and all of which will benefit greatly from continued management reform. Chairman CONYERS and I, and the other drafters and supporters of the bill, strongly believe that the only thing in our Government that this bill would threaten, if implemented properly, is the continued existence of waste, fraud, and abuse. It will change only those things that need to be changed.

□ 2130

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

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the ranking member of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], is exactly correct. the Chief Financial Officers Act has hung around the Congress for many years, and it deals only with the fiscal management of the departments and agencies, some 22, that are so unauditable that we cannot begin to keep track of the savings and loans and the HUD scandals.

Mr. Chairman, we have some 78 programs that are on the shaky list, that are going to come up on the screen. This is to help Congress make the assessment about what we are to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] is expired.

(At the request of Mr. CONYERS and by unanimous consent, Mr. HORTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, this in no way cuts into the jurisdiction of the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I want to praise the gentleman for the meetings that we have had, as existential as they might have been. I think we are on the right track. We are moving toward closure on this matter, and I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations begins to see that we are in no way trying to curtail the jurisdiction of the Congress in this matter. It is only to give us more control over the fiscal reports.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to concur with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] in the progress of our meetings.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to strike a limitation on funding the Chief Financial Officers Act. May I say that in this bill there is no money to carry this out anyway. We put the provision in here so that at some time no one could use available balances to do this. There is no money in this bill for this purpose.

I agree with the purpose that our good friends have in mind. I agree that if either one of them were running it, it would be all right. But the person put in charge is the Office of Budget and Management. Here is their record.

The Office of Management and Budget has already required sequestration to reduce funds by 13 ten thousandths of 1 percent. The cost of making this reduction across the whole Government cost many thousands of dollars. That was the executive branch.

These problems that we read about are not made by the Congress. We do not run these programs. We provide the money and the law. The executive branch implements it. So that is where the problem is.

Now, the annual cost of $100 million to finance the Chief Financial Officers Act would come at the expense of present programs.

In addition, this act will create one more impediment to the operations of our Committee on Appropriations and the Congress and in effect surrender to a branch of the executive branch increased control.

The major jusitification given for this act was that it will stop the scandals like those during the past decade in HUD. Those happened because of actions taken by high level executive branch employees. There was ample authority to investigate and stop these problems if that level of scrutiny was desired.

Sections 4(a) and 5(d) of the Inspector General Act, which has been in place since October 1978, read as follows:

> It shall be the duty and responsibility of each Inspector General * * * to provide policy direction for and to conduct, supervise, and coordinate audits and investigations. * * *
>
> Each Inspector General shall report immediately to the head of the establishment involved whenever the Inspector General becomes aware of particularly serious or flagrant problems, abuses, or deficiencies relating to the administration of programs and operations of such establishment. The head of the establishment shall transmit any such report to the appropriate committees or subcommittees of Congress within seven calendar days, together with a report by the head of the establishment containing any comments such head deems appropriate.

In the highly publicized scandal that occurred at HUD, such a report was not issued by an IG though it was required to do so. I don't see how having another person for the IG to report to will help control waste and fraud. Adding new legislation to control fraud won't stop the problem if the executive branch will not use what they already have in place.

I would say let us get together and see if we can work out something to carry out your objective, and, at the same time, not risk what has happened on sequestration.

We need sound financial management and appropriate audit controls. Legislation already exists to require this. The Chief Financial Officers Act merely adds a new position with a fancy title for each agency whose responsibility would be to comply with policy and guidance from the Director of OMB. Instead of that layering, we need to more effectively implement sections 1112, 3511, 3512, and 3513 of title 31, United States Code, our basic financial management authorities. More intensive implementation of these basic authorities is the right approach, not layering agencies with fronts for OMB.

If financial management procedures or controls need to be strengthened, then the parts that are ineffective should be improved. Administration and management need to be improved.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the author of this amendment to consider withdrawing it, in light of the progress that we have been making.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think I have a record, and I know the gentleman from Michigan does, of wanting to do the right thing if we can find out what it is. But let us not turn it over to a partnership in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I will say this: If the OMB in any way intrudes upon any of the jurisdiction of any committee in this Congress, I will be leading the

fight for zero funding in the next Congress.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, may I say, they had the jurisdiction to cause us the sequestration of 13 ten-thousandths of 1 percent. It cost you a dime, but it cost the Government several hundred thousand dollars to run it through the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can postpone this and see if we can work it out.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo the words in support of this amendment by my good friend, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER], and echo the comments made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. Chairman, we are all against fraud and abuse, and we are all for better accounting, period. We are all for better efficiencies in this program as well.

Last year the chief financial officers bill passed this House without a dissenting vote. In fact, I complained to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], earlier this afternoon, why did we not have a recorded vote, so it could have shown it would have been 435 to nothing, or maybe 434 to 1, based on the comments this evening. In fact, that would have helped us in our preparation for offering and passing this amendment this evening.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], for meeting with us this afternoon, and I hope that in the next 7 to 10 days we can in fact work out a compromise that will allow for the funding of the chief financial officers bill, so that we can see real accounting, we can go after fraud and abuse in the program, and we can do something to help solve this deficit in this country.

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

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, just simply to reaffirm the comments made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] and others, we did have a meeting with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] this afternoon. We are going to be meeting with the gentleman throughout the next week.

I would like to come to some agreement on this, and, if we do, there will not be a need to bring this amendment up on future appropriation bills. On the other hand, if we do not, it might come back later.

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

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that meeting. Nothing has been said about how many folks were on the floor when that legislation passed. I did not know about it.

But be that as it may, we want to solve the problem here. We have suggested that we get together and do it.

Mr. Chairman, may I say again, there is no money in this bill for this purpose at this time, whether we keep the amendment or not.

Not only that, but I am glad to have a chance to tell Members all they have been reading about has come from the executive branch, not the Congress.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman, I do not plan to ask for a vote tonight, given the assurances of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and given the negotiations that are occurring with the Committee on Government Operations. I think it is important and appropriate that those negotiations go forward.

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

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it was a public statement when I made it this afternoon, and I am glad to make it before my colleagues again this evening.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman, having said that, this is an important issue. It certainly is an important issue to those on the Committee on Government Operations, and it is an important issue to those who serve on the Subcommittee on Housing. It is an issue that is not going away, and it must be addressed.

Mr. Chairman, given those assurances, I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn. Are there further amendments to the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992".

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEILENSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 363, nays 39, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—363

Abercrombie	Brown	DeFazio
Alexander	Bruce	DeLauro
Allard	Bryant	DeLay
Anderson	Burton	Dellums
Andrews (ME)	Bustamante	Derrick
Andrews (NJ)	Byron	Dickinson
Andrews (TX)	Callahan	Dicks
Anthony	Camp	Dingell
Applegate	Cardin	Dixon
Archer	Carper	Dooley
Aspin	Carr	Doolittle
Atkins	Chandler	Dorgan (ND)
AuCoin	Chapman	Dornan (CA)
Bacchus	Clay	Downey
Baker	Clement	Durbin
Ballenger	Clinger	Dwyer
Barnard	Coble	Eckart
Barrett	Coleman (MO)	Edwards (CA)
Barton	Coleman (TX)	Edwards (OK)
Bateman	Collins (IL)	Edwards (TX)
Bennett	Collins (MI)	Emerson
Bentley	Combest	Engel
Bereuter	Condit	English
Berman	Conyers	Erdreich
Bevill	Cooper	Espy
Bilirakis	Costello	Evans
Bliley	Coughlin	Fascell
Boehlert	Cox (IL)	Fazio
Boehner	Coyne	Feighan
Bonior	Cramer	Fields
Brewster	Cunningham	Fish
Brooks	Darden	Flake
Broomfield	Davis	Foglietta
Browder	de la Garza	Ford (MI)

Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Gray
Green
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schulze
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Sikorski
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—39

Annunzio
Armey
Bellenson
Bunning
Cox (CA)
Crane
Dannemeyer
Donnelly
Dreier
Duncan
Early
Fawell
Guarini
Hancock
Henry
Hubbard
Hughes
Jacobs
Kaptur
McEwen
Moody
Moorhead
Nagle
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Orton
Pallone
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Roemer
Russo
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Stark
Stump
Weiss

NOT VOTING—29

Ackerman
Bilbray
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Dymally
Gallo
Hastert
Kostmayer
Lehman (FL)
Martin
Martinez
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mrazek
Pelosi
Quillen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Shuster
Sisisky
Slaughter (NY)
Swett
Towns
Vento
Williams
Yates

□ 2156

Mr. HUBBARD and Mr. DONNELLY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcalls 141, 142, and 143. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcalls 141 and 142 and "yea" on rollcall 143.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear at the appropriate place in the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, on final passage of H.R. 2519, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriation, I mistakenly recorded my vote in the negative when I intended to vote in the positive. I was not aware that I had in fact cast an inappropriate vote, and, while the vote cannot be changed, I want the RECORD to show that, had I not cast the inappropriate vote, I would have voted in the positive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD include my statement of explanation.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, congressional business in Montana required that I leave Washington, thus I was unable to be present for the votes on the bill H.R. 2519, VA-HUD appropriations.

Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on final passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a personal explanation of my absence from the vote on rollcall 140, the Smith amendment to the Chapman-Lowery amendment to H.R. 2519, the VA–HUD appropriations bill. I was unavoidably delayed due to a meeting in my office. Had I been here to vote, I would have voted "aye.'

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a personal explanation of my absence from votes. I was unable to vote because I was en route to my district. Had I been here to vote, I would have voted the following way:

On rollcall 142, the Kolbe amendment to H.R. 2519, the VA–HUD appropriations bill, "No."

On rollcall 143, final passage of H.R. 2519, "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be here. Had I been here, I would have cast the following votes:

"Yes" on rollcall No. 141—Chapman amendment on the space station to the Veterans Affairs, HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill.

"Yes" on rollcall No. 142—Kolbe amendment on the HOPE I Program to the Veterans Affairs, HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill.

"Yes" on rollcall No. 143—The vote on the Veterans Affairs, HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill.

□ 2200

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2038, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102–100) on the resolution (H. Res. 169) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2038) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1992 for intelligence activities of the U.S. Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2508 FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS, AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102–101) on the resolution (H. Res. 170) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2508) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to

rewrite the authorities of the act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and to redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the special orders granted for today to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] be switched.

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

There was no objection.

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER AND REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 60-minute special order granted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] for today be vacated, and that he be granted a 5-minute special order today instead.

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

There was no objection.

THOUGHTS ON BOOKS: THE BEAUTY OF THE WRITTEN WORD AND THE PRINTED PAGE

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, next month, July, the White House Conference on Library and Information Services will take place and I thought it was appropriate that this morning in the Washington Post there is a column by the columnist George Will dealing with books and the beauty of the written word and the printed page.

In this column Mr. Will describes the usual travails about American students watching too much television, and reading too little. He expresses, as I feel, a certain concern about what might be called a transition from the printed page to the electronic medium for assembling and conveying information.

A few words of his are worth repeating from his article. He says, "Electronic pictures, unlike words, are ill-suited to communicate irony, ambivalence and other elements of adult wisdom. Television * * * is less suited than printed words are for required and developing intellectual maturity," which he describes as "the complexity needed for governance of the self and for self-government in society."

So there is a civic interest served by our promoting the written word and by our promoting libraries, which are the repositories for the Nation's and the world's learning.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1991]

TEMPTING READERS

(By George F. Will)

Reading the torrent of essays about the end of reading, and the glut of books about the death of the book, leaves little time for savoring the significance of Borders bookstores, which are flourishing.

There are 14 of them so far. The first was in Ann Arbor, Mich. The one here in Rockville is typical. It has more than 100,000 titles, 1.3 million volumes and a staff who when asked "Where is 'Billy Budd'?" will not reply, "He doesn't work here."

No one works here who cannot pass a quiz featuring questions like, "In what subject areas would you look for books by or about Jean Piaget, Gustav Klimt, Dorothy Sayers, Karen Horney, Ludwig Wittgenstein"? "Who wrote 'Tin Drum'? 'Native Son'? 'Where the Wild Things Are'?" Non-readers need not apply at Borders, which unlike lots of supposed bookstores sells neither games nor globes nor garden hoses.

The number of bookstores increased 76 percent in the 1980s. Only fast-food restaurants multiplied faster. Unfortunately, some of the bookstores resemble those restaurants, serving up a high volume of unnourishing stuff in an ungracious ambience. They make much of their money off bestsellers. They have transitory inventories: If a book is not moving fast, yank if off the shelf, fast.

A better way of doing business in books began 20 years ago with the Border brothers, University of Michigan graduate students, Tom, an English major, and Lewis, a computer wiz. Their idea was to use modern information systems to make possible, meaning profitable, small-volume purchases of many titles rather than large-volume purchases of titles that will sell at a high velocity.

The bulk of Borders' stock consists of just one or two copies of particular titles. A book selling eight to 10 copies a week is a strong seller. But, then, people do not come here for Danielle Steel.

Borders believes that the secret of a seductive store—selling books should involve enticement—is not just selecting stock with interesting eclecticism from the 55,000 new titles each year. It also involves offering selections from publishers' backlists.

Both the Walden and B. Dalton-Barnes & Noble chains account for approximately 12 percent of U.S. retail book sales and up to 25 percent of many bestsellers. But chains are only 32 percent of all bookstores. Independents are thriving because of their independent judgments about book stocks.

If everyone who entered a supermarket bought only the food he or she had in mind when leaving home, the supermarkets would fail. Supermarkets depend on impulse purchases. So do bookstores like Borders.

Supermarkets depend on display and packaging to trigger purchases. Borders knows it is enough to get real readers into the store and confront them with variety in a "browser-friendly" ambience.

Great independent bookstores—Denver's Tattered Cover, St. Paul's The Hungry Mind, Square Books in Oxford, Miss.—are receiving from some chain stores the homage of emulation. The chains are installing stuffed chairs and wooden shelves.

There is a public interest at stake in the fate of bookstores that quicken the public's appetite for printed words.

Seventy-two percent of eighth-graders recently surveyed said they watch at least three hours of television a day; only 27 percent said they read for pleasure each day. The rising generation is characterized by "aliteracy": It can read but doesn't. It prefers less demanding, actually less active, activities—mere distractions, really.

At most 12 percent of the adult population sets a good example by reading serious literature. Small wonder that SAT scores measuring verbal skills of the college-bound cream of high school students have declined.

The success of stores like Borders encourages the hope that Alvin Kernan is wrong to say (in his book "The Death of Literature") that serious literature has "almost no presence outside university literature departments." But Kernan rightly worries about the "transition from a print to an electronic culture."

What is changing, he says, is not just the way we do something—communicate—but consciousness itself. In our electronic culture the mind is becoming a thinner, more watery, less interesting thing.

Reading is private, silent, inward, active, demanding. It is linear as a sentence, orderly as a paragraph, governed by a logic of coherence. Electronic ways of learning things, using pictures rather than words, are passive, noisy, chaotic, communicating surfaces and meanings that are immediately and easily accessible. Electronic pictures, unlike words, are ill-suited to communicate irony, ambivalence and other elements of adult wisdom.

Words are complex signs sending sometimes elusive signals. Television, particularly, is less suited than printed words are for requiring, and developing, intellectual maturity—the complexity needed for governance of the self, and for self-government in society. So there is a civic interest served by anything, be it a better school or a better bookstore, that stimulates the wholesome addiction to printed words.

FARMERS NEED RATIONAL "WETLANDS" POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to protect the ability of Arkansas and American farmers to respond to the Nation's need for food and natural fiber production.

My bill would exempt lands which have been and continue to be used for agriculture production purposes form regulation, under Sec. 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, of deposit of dredged and fill material.

What farmers need is fair play. The Agriculture Wetlands Exemption Act I am proposing would help insure that they get it on this issue. The text of my bill is included in this speech.

Wise wetlands management is of vital importance to the Nation and to the future of all Americans. Therefore, it is reasonable that all Americans, not just farmers, share the costs.

The bill which I am introducing would block the application of the Sec. 404 provisions relating to discharge of dredges or fill material to lands which:

Was used for agricultural production on any calendar date during the 24 months prior to its enactment; and,

Which were used for agricultural production for at least 1 year in the period between January 1, 1972, and the date the bill becomes law.

The problems facing farmers in connection with the implementation of Sec. 404 are not new. However, they have boiled to the surface of public awareness due to the uncertainties and perceived injustices resulting from conflicting, inconsistent, and illogical rulings by Federal agencies charged with administering Sec. 404.

It is true that during the last year and a half some changes have been made which are directed at applying Sec. 404 in a more rational and logical manner. However, implementation of the "normal farming" exemption contained in Sec. 404(f) of the law continues to be restricted. And, farmers are suffering the consequences.

Thus, it appears that only effective means of settling this matter is write into Sec. 404 a clear and unambigous provision which protects land that is being used for and continues to be used for farming purposes. My bill would accomplish that.

The following is the text of the bill which I am introducing:

HR. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Wetlands Exemption Act."

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT.

Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1344), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(u)(1) This section shall not apply to the discharge of dredged or fill material into any wetland:

"(A) which was used for agricultural production on any calendar date during the twenty-four months prior to the date of enactment of this subsection: and,

"(B) which was used for agricultural purposes for at least one year in the period between January 1, 1972 and the date of enactment of this subsection

so long as such land shall be used for agricultural production.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'agricultural production' shall include, but not be limited to, production of row crops; horticulture; vintniculture; silviculture; aquaculture; mariculture; grazing; haying; apiculture; hydroponics; production of tree fruits or nuts; raising of cattle, horses, poultry, swine, sheep, goats and other livestock; storage of surface water for agricultural production; distribution of water for agricultural production; conserving uses required as a condition of enrollment in an acreage reduction program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Agriculture Act of 1949 or any amendments thereto; all other activities identified in Sec. 404(f)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) as of July 31, 1989, and the construction, expansion, improvement, maintenance and operation of farm residences and facilities."

THE MEDICARE PREVENTIVE BENEFITS ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today H.R. 2565, the Medicare Preventive Benefits Act of 1991, along with 23 of my colleagues on the Committees on Ways and Means. This legislation would improve Medicare coverage of essential preventive health services. A companion bill is being introduced today in the Senate by the Honorable LLOYD M. BENTSEN, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

Health professionals have recognized the value of preventive services for many years. Some preventive services, such as vaccinations prevent the occurrence of diseases. Other preventive services such as mammography screening enacted last year allow for early detection through screening. Early detection and treatment are not just cost-effective. For diseases like cancer, early detection and treatment may offer the best chance for reducing mortality and duration of illness.

However, preventive services generally have not been reimbursed under Medicare. Only in the last 10 years has Congress begun a slow process of providing coverage for a limited number of preventive services. Services currently covered by Medicare include:

Pneumococcal vaccine, since 1980;

Hepatitis B vaccine for certain high-risk individuals, since 1984;

Pap smears to screen for cervical cancer, since 1990;

Mammography screening for breast cancer, since January of this year.

The Medicare Preventive Benefits Act of 1991 would further extend Medicare coverage to additional preventive services with proven and unquestioned value. The bill would also lead to the establishment of a routine process for accelerating coverage decisions relating to preventive services under Medicare.

First, H.R. 2565 would provide a Medicare benefit for colorectal cancer screening. In addition, the current policy of biannual mammography screening for elderly women would be amended to allow for annual screenings as recommended by the American Cancer Society.

Second, our bill would provide coverage for annual influenza vaccinations for the elderly and for tetanus vaccinations every 10 years.

Third, H.R. 2565 would provide coverage for well-baby and well-child care, including appropriate immunizations for the small number of children eligible for Medicare through the end-stage renal disease program. These services are appropriate for all small children, and should be available to Medicare beneficiaries.

Finally, our bill would authorize permanent demonstration projects relating to preventive services. In addition, the Office of Technology Assessment would conduct a study and recommend a process for determining when other preventive services should be covered under Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, consistent with the requirements of last year's budget agreement and with the committee's policy over the last 10 years, the Committee on Ways and Means is fully committed to pay-as-you-go financing for benefit expansions within its jurisdiction, such as those contained in this bill.

There are a variety of approaches that could be used to finance these benefits. One would be through an increase in Medicare's part B premium. Based on preliminary estimates, the cost of these benefits would be fully financed by an increase in the premium of $1.10 per month in 1992, increasing to $1.60 per month in 1996. Other approaches for financing these benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis could also be considered. I specifically solicit public comment on this proposed premium increase at the hearing by the Subcommittee on Health that will be held June 17, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Chairman BENTSEN for his support in developing this legislation, and my colleagues on the committee for their support of this important bill.

Preventive services not only offer the potential of saving money for the Federal Government, but also the lives and suffering of millions of our senior citizens. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

A section-by-section summary of the bill follows:

THE MEDICARE PREVENTIVE SERVICES BENEFITS ACT OF 1991

SECTION-BY-SECTION

Section 1. Title.

Section 2. Coverage of Colorectal Screening.—The bill would provide for coverage of fecal occult blood tests (FOBT) and screening sigmoidoscopies for the early detection of colorectal cancer. The FOBT would be covered on an annual basis; the screening sigmoidoscopies would be covered every 5 years. Payment for the FOBT would be under the laboratory fee schedule, subject to a $5 limit in 1992. The screening of sigmoidoscopies would be reimbursed under the RB RVS, without regard to the RB RVS transition provisions. That is, the sigmoidoscopies would be paid based fully on the RB RVS rate in 1992.

The Secretary would be permitted to modify the frequency criteria after 1994.

Section 3. Coverage of Certain Immunizations.—The bill would provide for coverage of annual influenza vaccinations, and for tetanus-diphtheria vaccinations every ten years.

Section 4. Coverage of Well-Child Care.—The bill would provide for coverage of pediatric well-child care, including appropriate immunizations for Medicare beneficiaries up through age six. In general, beneficiaries eligible for these benefits would be children entitled to Medicare benefits who have kidney failure as a result of end-stage renal disease.

Section 5. Annual Screening Mammography.—The bill provides for Medicare coverage of screening mammography on an annual basis for individuals over the age of 65 or older. Current law coverage provides for annual coverage for women ages 50 through 64, but only every two years for the older women.

Section 6. Demonstration Projects for Coverage of Other Preventive Services.—The bill would provide for the establishment of an ongoing series of demonstrations that would evaluate the appropriateness of coverage of additional services under Medicare.

Section 7. OTA Study of Process for Review of Medicare Coverage of Preventive Services.—The Office of Technology Assessment, subject to the approval of the Technology Assessment Board, would conduct a study and recommend a process for determining when other preventive services should be covered under Medicare.

Section 8. Effective Date.—The benefits would apply to services provided on or after January 1, 1992. All other provisions would be effective on enactment.

DOMESTIC DEFENDERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, 1991 is the 200th anniversary of the Bill of Rights of this Nation. In that regard, it is fitting and proper that this year Congress acknowledge a similar bill of rights for America's domestic defenders, the men and women who make up the emergency response network in this great Nation.

In that regard, 10 days ago I introduced H.R. 2448, the Benjamin Franklin Memorial Fire Service Bill of Rights. In just 20 short days this legislation has received the cosponsorship of 250 of my colleagues, and we expect to move this legislation quickly in the House; shortly, Senator BIDEN from Delaware will be introducing the exact same legislation in the Senate. We expect a similar response in that body.

This Bill of Rights on behalf of the Fire Service and the emergency responders of this country provides for 10 basic rights in recognition of the job that the domestic defenders of this country have done for the last 250 years. It does not grant them the entitlement to sue this Government, but simply acknowledges that we in this country have not been doing enough to support their efforts Nationwide.

In that regard, it calls for the minting of a special coin in 1993, as a matter of fact, 2 separate coins. 250,000 of a gold coin, and 4 million silver dollars to commemorate and honor Benjamin Franklin, our Nation's first fire fighter.

The proceeds of the sale of these coins will go to a series of programs that will benefit the 3 million men and women who make up the Nation's fire and emergency services network. The proceeds will be distributed equally among six nonprofit foundations, each of which is providing a level of service to the fire services of this Nation, including two scholarships for fire fighters and emergency response personnel who wish to go on to pursue advanced degrees.

Proceeds to establish promotion of volunteer health and safety programs for the 85 percent of the fire service who, in fact, are volunteers; 13 percent of the proceeds of the sale of these coins to go to the International Association of Fire Fighters Burn Foundation for research into burn injuries and better techniques and abilities to deal with burn injuries; 13 percent of the proceeds go to the National Association of State Fire Marshals to establish and maintain a special scholarship program named in honor of the late Senator John Heinz, who last year sponsored this bill in the Senate to provide educational scholarships for the children and spouses of fire fighters and emergency responders who were killed in the line of duty; an additional 13 percent of the proceeds will go to the National Fire Protection Association's Learn Not to Burn Foundation to provide local education programs and resources for low-income residents, in rural and urban communities throughout this Nation. Finally, 13 percent to the Institute of Life Safety Technology and Emergency Management Education and Emergency Response Disciplines.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does not cost the taxpayers of this country 1 dime. As a matter of fact, the bulk of the coins will be purchased by the fire fighters themselves throughout this country.

I ask my colleagues, tonight, to join with the 250 Members of this body who have already cosponsored this legislation so that we can move it quickly and allow this legislation to become reality.

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

Mr. WELDON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank personally my colleague from Pennsylvania. All Members who have come to this Congress have come from neighborhoods and communities where we have earned or we have given a great deal of respect to the fire fighters and other domestic helpers of our communities, but it took the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] to elevate their status to the highest it has ever been, and to help Members of Congress understand fully the place in society that the fire fighter takes.

For that reason, I am glad to be one of the 250 sponsors to whom the gentleman refers, and we will cooperate with the gentleman in whatever further ventures he may put before Members.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend and acknowledge the fact that he passed major legislation last year as part of the defense bill in regard to better protecting our fire fighters around the country.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has brought many Members together in the Fire Fighters Caucus, in the Congress, and given Members the opportunity to address many of the needs, to assist our many volunteers who are out there saving lives and property daily.

I am pleased to cosponsor the measure the gentleman is introducing, and I hope many more of our colleagues will join in that endeavor.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from New York, and I applaud him for his leadership in leading the way for legislation calling for smoke detectors in public buildings.

□ 2210

POLAND TALKING WITH FOREIGN BANKS ON DEBT SETTLEMENT

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, a delegation of Polish officials and creditor foreign banks are due to meet June 18 and 19 in Frankfurt, Germany to discuss compromises on a debt reduction package. I enthusiastically support this meeting because an agreement would be beneficial to both the Polish economy and the foreign banks.

The foreign debt hinders the Polish economy in its drive toward capitalism and free markets. Because of the difficulty the Polish Government has had in converting to a market economy, it has not been able to afford its debt payments since late 1989. An agreement would stimulate the Polish economy and allow the foreign banks to receive much of what is owed to them. An agreement would also be a very strong signal for potential investors in Poland.

With some $46 billion in total foreign debt, Poland owes $35 billion to foreign governments and some $11 billion to 500 foreign banks. About $3.5 billion of the total is owed to American banks. Poland recently won a landmark agreement from the Paris Club of government creditors to write off at least half of the $35 billion they are owed. Poland is seeking a similar agreement from the banks.

The problem is, in order for Poland to receive the 50-percent debt reduction from the foreign governments, it has to successfully negotiate a similar reduction with the foreign bank creditors.

In May, the banks offered debt forgiveness of 35 or 40 percent. The banks hesitate to accept the 50-percent offer because they believe that Warsaw must first address the question of overdue interest payments. Poland has offered to pay $100 million worth of overdue interest, and to deposit 20 percent of on-going interest payments with the Bank for International Settlements [BIS]. The deposits with the BIS

would be made unconditionally, but release of the deposits to the banks would depend on completion of a total debt package to be agreed with the banks.

Thus the discussions have been going back and forth. While simply talking is a good step toward an agreement, I fear that no agreement from the June 18 and June 19 meetings will cause the talks to collapse.

The talks must not collapse. These talks are of paramount importance if the Polish economic system is expected to make further progress on the road toward capitalism. Both sides must be further willing to compromise, but I urge the American banks among the foreign bank creditors to take a greater leadership role in moving to accept the 50-percent debt reduction proposal. The Polish progress toward democracy and privatization over the last couple of years must not be sacrificed.

THE PRESIDENT'S ANTICRIME BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, next Friday, a week from today, there will have expired the 100 days within which the President of the United States wanted very much to see action taken by this Congress on the comprehensive crime bill for which the American public is pining as a society to try to bring about a control of the crime wave that is hitting every community.

Sadly, that 100 days will elapse like the 100 months that have elapsed since former President Reagan first introduced his comprehensive crime package.

From the time 8, 10 years ago now that that President introduced a stern and firm comprehensive crime package, we have been able to get through the Congress perhaps one or two little legs of a series of things that have to be done in this titanic battle we are waging. And those were accomplished through parliamentary devices where we had to use legerdemain through the auspices and with the help of our minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, and with the grudging help of the then-Speaker of the House in maneuvers unbeheld previously in this Chamber.

But we did so because we knew if the House was given the opportunity, it would enact legislation to be tough on criminals. And because of this same kind of opposition that President Reagan had in everything he tried and now which President Bush is encountering, we have another titanic struggle ahead of us. We are going to keep trying.

What is it that the American people most become disgusted about in the whole system of justice that we have? I maintain it is the phenomenon of a criminal caught red-handed who then comes before the court and because of some technicality the judge is forced to free him, to allow him to leave the court laughing at the system for beating the rap because of some technicality, some missed comma in a search warrant, some oversight that has nothing to do with the commission of the crime.

No wonder then the American people have a distrust of the entire system. That would be cured if only we would be permitted to bring to the floor and follow to conclusion in conference and placed before the President a bill that would finally reform the exclusionary rule and end the practice of using technicalities to free known criminals from their just desserts.

We know the American people overwhelmingly support the death penalty in those heinous and serious, tragic cases that hit the headlines every day; not just those that are blatantly accomplished by paid killers and drug dealers, serious as they are, but the drive-by killers, the bank robbers, and all those bloody messes of murders that we see in our newspapers and televisions almost every day.

We want a comprehensive death penalty to be applied across the board for those who would dare to kill in our society, and many other portions of the comprehensive crime bill also.

But what we are really saying here tonight is we know what the American people want, we know they will support us and do support us in these efforts. We know that we have men and women of good will in the House of Representatives who will support these anticrime measures.

But the real complaint, and it is a justifiable complaint that we lodge here tonight, is that the leadership of the Committee on the Judiciary and the leadership of the opposition to the President would rather not let anything happen at all than to abide by a passage of bills that have the leadership stamp of President Bush placed right on them. That is the real issue here. They do not want to see the President succeed in a comprehensive crime initiative that he began almost 100 days ago.

Well, there are other speakers who I am sure will embellish on what we have begun to say here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the leader of the Republican portion of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania so well put it, the 100-day deadline is winding down. In less than 10 days, the President's simple request to the Congress that it pass an anticrime bill will go unanswered.

We use the word crime so often and so easily, we tend to forget the evil that it represents. Crime is not just another issue; crime is a personal thing. Crime is the knife at your throat on a darkened city street; crime is the fear that terrorizes the elderly who hide behind locked and bolted doors; crime is the greed and violence of the drug lords who rule parts of our city as if they were sinister royalty; crime is being mugged outside your home, as I have been; crime is the outward visible sign of a breakdown in values, of civility, discipline, of responsibility. And I guess we can talk about root causes all we want, but defining a root cause never put one thug behind bars.

Yes, let us search for the cause of the scourge, but while they are talking, let us do something useful.

You would think such a vital issue would be our No. 1 priority in this country.

I strongly believe it should be.

Those who engage in this special order feel likewise. But the likely scenario for crime legislation in this session will probably follow a familiar pattern; the majority may very well move a bill that will be so loaded down that it probably would be worse than no bill at all.

Republicans are going to be working to change this unacceptable routine. We will vote against any bill that will do nothing effective to fight crime in this country. We will urge the President to veto any weak crime bill that comes to his desk. We are going to fight for a crime bill that punishes the criminal and protects the victim. We want a tough crime bill, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has alluded to earlier. We are going to do everything in our power to see that effective and forceful anticrime legislation passes the House this session. An effective crime bill includes, as the gentleman said, habeas corpus reform that will stop the endless legal delays and redtape used by the guilty to avoid justice being done. It also includes a modified exclusionary rule to clarify those technicalities that criminals employ to have evidence at their trials suppressed.

Finally, it must include an expanded death penalty for those who deserve it.

The President's crime bill includes those provisions and others that will help in our Nation's struggle against criminals. It is politically difficult for Members to vote against the crime bill, even one that has no teeth; but it is politically irresponsible to tell the American people we have produced an anticrime bill when we have not.

The American people instinctively understand this basic truth. We must stand fast for a crime bill that fights crime and accept nothing less.

I will underscore, in conclusion, only again that in times past we have had to use every parliamentary device and ruse under the sun to really give this House an opportunity to vote on really

strong crime legislation. I am thinking back to several years ago when our good friend Dan Lungren, who was still a Member of Congress from California, took the motion to recommit that we at the time had caught our opponents unawares on that occasion, but that was a unique kind of situation. Then again, last year when we got so close through both Houses for all practical purposes and that had one of the good things that we had adopted and fought so hard for, gutted in the conference.

We do not intend to see that happen this year. We are going to hang in there tough. I just want to alert our Members on the other side that that is going to be our game plan for this session with respect to anticrime legislation. Hopefully, we will be successful this year.

I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me at this particular time.

□ 2220

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. Speaker, I always remember that conference that we had, I remind the gentleman from Illinois, with the then Speaker, Tip O'Neill, and all our leadership and all the little things we had to do to try to get a parliamentary party going on in the House here as we prolonged the debate on capital punishment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for a short message.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend the gentleman for arranging this time and commend our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], for his introduction and support of a Comprehensive Violent Crime Control Act of 1991.

Violent crime has become a disease afflicting and eroding our Nation. It is an epidemic spreading throughout urban, suburban, and rural areas where our citizenry are constantly concerned for their own safety. I ask, "Isn't it time that we alleviate the apprehensions of the people of our Nation who even fear walking the streets of their neighborhoods due to the incidence of violent crime?"

Drug trafficking and abuse is a major contributor to the crime problems in our Nation. Eighty-five percent of all those arrested today for violent crimes test positive for drugs. Drugs clearly walk hand in hand with violent crime. Although the recently adopted 7-day waiting period in the Brady bill will help reduce crime, we are going to have to take much more comprehensive action. We must strike fear into the hearts of all criminals, into the hearts of all drug dealers and drug abusers. If not, this deadly disease will continue to spread terror across our Nation, victimizing more and more innocent, law-abiding citizens.

To effectively combat crime we are going to have to attack it at its core. The Michel tough Comprehensive Violent Crime Control Act of 1991 would be a truly powerful weapon in combating crimes and drugs in our society. The people of our Nation are disgusted with the drugs being fed to our young people and the ever-increasing cases of violent crimes. To eliminate violent crime the American public needs our help and needs it now.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon this Congress to support this comprehensive violent crime control legislation in order to provide our law enforcement officials with a powerful tool to crack down on the drugs and crime dilemma confronting our society.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] who is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and was also the chairman of the Crime Task Force for the Republican Party in the Congress.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think in the area of addressing the enormous problem of violent crime we have terribly let down the American people. They expect us to take strong action to address the carnage that is going on in the streets today, in excess, I believe, of 20,000 homicides a year. And what have we done in the U.S. Congress in just this year, in almost half of the calendar year 1991?

Mr. Speaker, we passed H.R. 7, the Brady bill, in the House, and we have sent that over to the other body, and that is all we have done.

Now I must say personally I did not vote for the Brady bill, as a matter of fact, nor did I vote for the National Rifle Association's proposed substitute because I did not think either would be effective in fighting crime. I have yet to hear someone explain rationally how the Brady bill will stop crime or even affect crime.

In terms of law enforcement, the Brady bill says that law enforcement agencies may conduct a check, but do not have to conduct a check of those who are purchasing handguns, and, in terms of the waiting period supposedly addressing those who in a weak mental moment might commit a crime of passion, to the extent that really happens with store-bought weapons, which I would question, the Brady bill actually, as we passed it , took that provision out. I know that has not been expressed in the media reports. But there is a provision in H.R. 7, the Brady bill, that we passed that says that, if any State, such as Virginia today, has an instantaneous check system between a gun dealer and a law enforcement computer to determine immediately whether someone wishes to purchase a handgun is a convicted felon, then there is no 7-day waiting period, so what happened to this need for a cooling-off period so that everyone who buys a handgun has a chance to think about it so they will not commit a crime of passion? Under the Brady bill today there would be no cooling-off period in Virginia, nor any other State as they adopt the Virginia system, and most of them will.

Now that has been decided in this body for now. The House of Representatives passed the Brady bill. I must say it passed fair and square, and it is over in the other body for its action. The point is that even the most ardent supporter of the Brady bill does not claim that it will be very effective in fighting crime, since everyone concedes that most criminals do not get their firearms from stores. They get them from other means. Therefore, even assuming that the Brady bill will in fact have the impact against crime that is limited, but that its supporters claim, what else have we done?

Mr. Speaker, the answer is nothing. That is why we need to move on the President's crime package, and that is why we need to move on every other good idea that we can think of and that we should be considering on the House floor.

I have to conclude by observing that all of the action against violent crime will not be taken in the Congress of the United States. Many of the laws with which we are dealing are State and local laws, and they have to be addressed.

For example, the States control juvenile laws, and we have a tremendous problem with teenage gangs. We do not want to face that idea. We want to think that a juvenile criminal is a 12-year-old who shoplifts, and with a little kick on the behind and a pat on the back will go straight and will not cause any problems as an adult. Of course that is probably the truth. Of course. Nevertheless, there are also 16- and 17-year-olds who rob, who rape, and who kill. How do our laws address those?

In my State of New Mexico, very poorly. We recently had a case where a 17-year-old killed an innocent bystander in a drive-by gangland-style shooting, and what did the State of New Mexico do to this 17-year-old murderer? We sent him to reform school of course because he is 17 years old, and he will be out again inside of 2 years, if not 2 months. So, there are great areas of reform that have to be done in bodies other than the Congress of the United States.

I will take that one step further. Much of the solution against crime exists with our communities, with our families, with our schools, with our re-

ligious institutions, with our community institutions far beyond what any legislative or governmental body can do. But we in the Congress of the United States have our obligations, our responsibility, and that is to take all of the action we possibly can at the Federal level which will address and curb the rising tide of violent crime and which will assist State and local governments and communities in doing the likewise, and we have failed in that thus far, and that is why we should move, and the next move we should take is acting on the President's proposed anticrime bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this will be acted on in the Committee on the Judiciary as soon as possible and brought to the House floor for action, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] again for yielding.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] for his remarks.

I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a leader over the years in the attempts to pass a comprehensive crime package.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] for yielding on this special order time tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the comments that are being made are very significant because we are talking about being within 10 days of the challenge that the President gave of 100 days in which to come up with a crime bill. It seems to me that that is very significant in light of two things. One is the obvious that he made, and that is that we can have our troops in Desert Storm do what they did in 100 hours. Surely we can pass a comprehensive crime bill in a period of 100 days. But it is especially meaningful in the broader context of why he used the crime bill as one of two pieces of legislation that he suggested to us in that speech after Desert Storm that we should take very, very quick action on.

The reason that he used the crime bill in particular is because of what happened in the last Congress when we dilly-dallied around here and did not pass the major crime bill that we did pass and passed a pretty good one on the floor of the House. We did not do it until the very end of the session of the 2-year sessions of the Congress, and, as a result of that, the conferees between the House and Senate who got together to work out their differences had only about 3 days in which to work, and, as a practical matter, just a handful of very liberal Members of the other body, along with perhaps some sympathetic conferees from our side, could easily kill the crime bill that was passed out here on the floor. That crime bill of course was passed overwhelmingly out here, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well remembers, and that is what we do not want to see repeated.

We want to see a timely crime bill out of here now, this half of the Congress, before we get too far into all of this so that we can take that to conference and so that the Senators hopefully will be pressured to pass one as well, and that in this year, not at the end of a Congress, not at the end of a 2-year cycle, but during this very first year, we will have plenty of time in which to work the will of the Congress through a conference so there can be no excuses about that, we can bring something back in disagreement, we can have other votes on it.

□ 2230

We could put public pressure, rally people to write letters and so forth. I think that there is a reasonable chance that the Members on the other side of the aisle, their leadership will live up to some signals they are giving now that they will bring a bill out. I hope tonight will encourage them to make sure they do. There has been talk that we will have a bill through our House Judiciary Committee in July. I have not seen the movement yet on the subcommittees that would prove that, but there has been talk about that.

There has also been an indication here, by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], who is the leadership, of course, on the other side of the aisle, in response to some debate over one of our bills here a few days ago, indicated that there was going to be a bill by this fall, during this calendar year. And some others in their leadership have said they think there will be a bill out by September.

It seems to me there should have been action by now because there cannot be a bill out here on the floor, since there has been no committee action, within the next 10 days, within the President's 100-day challenge, but surely there can be a bill.

When there is a bill, there must be the provisions that we have heard our leader mention, and we have heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] mention out here. We must have the restoration of the procedures, that are necessary to put in place the death penalty, again in the Federal laws where it had been on the books for years but was taken off procedurally by decision of the Supreme Court in 1972. All the States, of course, that have had that decision rendered on them applicable to their procedures that had the death penalty have long ago reinstated the death penalty. We have not done that. That is to correct the constitutional infirmities.

The second thing going hand-in-hand with that, that is important, in addition to a few additional death penalty provisions the President wants, is particular emphasis on a new death penalty for drug kingpins where there is no actual provable death in the case but where there is trafficking in extremely high quantities of drugs, sufficient that that is what anybody would realize would be the appropriate deterrent for these huge drug kingpins. Then, of course, we have heard discussed the exclusionary rule, the so-called modified rule that deals with methods that would simply change the law to conform in the cases where there are no search warrants, the admissible standards when there is an otherwise legal search, not talking about violating the constitutional provisions against unlawful searches and seizures, where there is an otherwise lawful search. And there would be consent to go into somebody's home and make that search, if you have that.

The Supreme Court has said in the case that there is a warrant and one goes in and makes the search, then if there is a legitimate error, one that is technical in nature, that perhaps otherwise might be something they disapprove of, that at least the evidence could come in against the criminal in that case. We do not see why. I do not see why that should not be the same type of thing, same ruling applied where there is a lawful search in every other respect, just a technical flaw even though there is no warrant.

For example, a consent search situation where the police knock on the door and a person says, "Come on in." I do not have a problem with that.

The third or the fourth area really that was in that bill last year that we are readdressing in this Congress and needs to be out here in this 100-day limit time is the change in the law on habeas corpus. The Supreme Court ruled a few weeks ago on the subject but they did not go far enough or as far as we went last year. That is to change the rules so that in death penalty cases and in other cases where there has been an ability over the years for criminals to appeal endlessly to delay the carrying out of sentences, there can be some finalities. There can be, saying to the criminal, "You will have your one day to go into Federal court, if it is a State court conviction. After you have had all your appeals, regular appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States, you go back in one time but only one time and claim you don't have an attorney that was representing you properly or whatever other constitutional infirmity you want to claim. But you should not be able to come back again and again and delay and delay the carrying out of the sentences."

Those are very significant things, all in the President's crime bill, all of which were debated out here on the floor last Congress, all of which passed in some form this body and went to conference and then were defeated in the middle of the night because we did not have the bill out of this body in a

timely fashion, because we put it over there with only 3 days left.

In closing my portion of this special order, I would point out that there are several very significant additional things in the President's proposal. I am not going to list all of those, but one that comes to mind, because it is being discussed a great deal right now, concerns minimum mandatory sentences for those who commit violent crimes and drug-related crimes with guns.

One of the great tools that is out there right now for law enforcement in this country is a Federal law that says that if a person commits a crime of violence, a drug-related crime, either using a gun or having a gun in their possession, even if it is a State conviction, a State crime, then there is an additional Federal crime for the simple possession or use of the gun during that crime. And if the Federal Government prosecutes that person for that, and there is a new Attorney General ruling, Attorney General Thornburgh has out, asking the U.S. attorneys to make these prosecutions and cooperate with State courts and cooperate with States attorneys, for the States to bring those State criminals into the Federal system after they finish their prosecutions there. If they get that conviction, that second conviction in Federal court, regardless of what happens in the underlying case in the State court, they have the result being a minimum mandatory 5-year prison sentence.

The significance of that is that we have many felons, very violent criminals being released on our streets today in the United States who really should not be, because we have overcrowded State prisons. We have lots of room in our Federal prisons compared to the State prisons. We are building new prisons. We need to take the violent criminal who commits crimes with guns off the streets. We have the tools to do that with.

This bill the President has proposed offers enhancement of those. He would offer, for example, an enhanced penalty for someone who commits or carries with him during the commission of one of these violent crimes a semiautomatic weapon. That is real gun control.

If a person has a semiautomatic weapon and commits a crime, the President says that person ought to get a minimum mandatory sentence of 10 years in prison.

There are several other related enhancements that go with that. If we can get the criminal off the streets who is using the gun and he is a repeat offender and really lock him up with no chance of parole, the Federal law does not allow that in these situations, then we have begun to really do something to make the streets safer and to send a message, which is what criminal law is all about, to these thugs that are out there on the streets that there is swiftness and certainty back in our criminal laws and in our punishment system, and that we do mean business.

That is the only way we are going to get deterrence, so we get two things out of these things the President has proposed in his crime bill. The death penalty revision, exclusionary rule to get evidence in more easily to get convictions, particularly drug cases, the changing in the law to end the endless appeals in death row cases and in related other kinds of cases, and the cases with regard to these gun-toting felon violent criminal situations.

We have sent at least two messages. One is that we are going to mean it and they are really going to face the tough sentences and going to have to do time and a long period of time and not be able to delay the carrying out of their sentences if they commit this type of crime. And the second message to the American public that is equally important is that we are going to put people away for a long period of time. They are not going to keep getting released out on the streets and turned loose like we saw on television this evening on one of the network shows when they were talking about how judges are forced in State courts in many parts of the country to release people because of the overcrowding.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to extend some of what the gentleman has said today a little bit. Today our prisons are overcrowded. We cannot handle the people we have going in there. So how are we going to take care of this in the future?

When I was in the service, the day we pulled into Singapore on the Coral Sea, they hung in public a mother, a grandmother and a daughter. I am not proposing to do that, but we had a lot of trouble with our sailors going into different ports on drug usage. And when we pulled out of Singapore, the Captain's Mast line, we did not have a single sailor in the drug line. When we pulled into Africa, it was told to us that many of the prostitutes there had the HIV AIDS virus, and before the lines were extensive coming out of different ports. No one sailor, when we pulled out of Africa, was in the VD line.

□ 2240

In Singapore, they also have a penalty called the cane. In that penalty, if you commit a crime, say it is murder, you receive so many hits with this cane. It is very brutal, and I am not promoting it, but I am trying to make a point.

If you steal, then it is a different level of hits that you take. It is so bad that the cane cuts all the way to the bone. The doctor has to look at you after every time you are hit.

If you have, say, like 15 hits, and you can only take 3, what they do is take you back to the hospital and heal you up until you are able to come back and take the remaining ones. Singapore has a zero return rate in their prison system.

I am not promoting these, but what I am saying is if the penalty is severe enough, that you will not have the return to those jails and the recidivism that we have in our jail system today.

So what the President is trying to do is make criminals that commit the crime pay for what they do, and make it severe enough that they are not going to come back, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, in 2 months, or 6 months, and commit the same crime.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I agree. That is exactly right. The point of the gentleman is so well-made. We have lots of constitutional barriers, rightfully so, to some of those severe punishments other countries have. But those other countries do not have the crime problems we do.

We can have that deterrence, as the gentleman is pointing out. Maybe not quite the same absolute, but we can have a lot more, which we do not have in our law today, and that is the point of the gentleman. I agree with it.

If we just would do some of the things the President wants to do, and put that swiftness and certainly back in the system of punishment of our country for criminal laws.

I want to again thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], because he is doing a service to bring up this time tonight for us to discuss this. He has worked very, very hard, especially on the restoration of the death penalty over the years. It is absolutely a tragedy that we have not passed these laws and the death penalty restoration long before now. There is only a handful of Members in this body and in the other body who held this up, and thwarted the public will.

Maybe this throwing down of the gauntlet by the President, even though the 100 days may expire shortly, will prompt us to get that bill up.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for participating.

I yield whatever time he might consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] for his statement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman, even today as we went through several bills, my freshman class on both sides of the aisle sat down. We have only been here a short time, but we are in dismay for the politics that go on here on this House floor. The things that really pre-

vent us from helping people is the politics involved.

My friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], touched on it with the Committee on the Judiciary not releasing the President's crime bill. This is intolerable. It has been over 100 days. Today marks the 93d day since the President challenged Congress to pass this crime bill, and yet we have not seen it. We hear July, we hear August. Well, maybe next year.

This is ludicrous. They will not let it come up, and it is a crime in itself.

Crime is the No. 1 problem in the United States. Crime hits low-income and minorities the hardest. We just passed a civil rights bill on the House floor. People have a right to live.

Blacks are six times as likely to be murdered as whites. Half the murder victims in the United States are black. Blacks are more likely than whites to be victims of violent crime. Over 44 percent of blacks versus 34 percent of whites are involved in violent crime.

Hispanics are more likely than non-Hispanic to be the victims of violent crime. Persons with family income less than $7,500 are two and one-half times more likely to be the victims of crime.

People have a right to live. They have a civil right. We need to protect that.

Firearms were used in 11 percent of all violent crimes in the United States. According to the Justice Department, in 1989 there were over 21,000 murders in the United States.

I can remember thinking as a child that one murder, when I heard it, in the United States was unbelievable. We have 21,000.

In Los Angeles, in my home State, there are murders every day. Here on Capitol Hill is the same, and San Diego is no different.

There are over 135,000 rapes. Not 135, but 135,000 rapes.

About 5 percent of all households have been touched by violent crime. Not just break-ins, but violent crime. That means if we live 20 more years, every single one of us are going to be involved in violent crime.

The crime bill of the President will be a major step to getting the criminals off the street. The House just passed the Brady bill. My colleagues have mentioned it. Maybe they did not support the Brady bill. I did not support the Brady bill, and I probably should not have supported the Staggers bill, because neither one answered the question. Neither one answered the question of taking the weapons away from the criminals.

The President has vowed to veto the Brady bill. Mr. Speaker, we need some type of a system, and I would hope that the Senate can take the Brady bill and the Staggers bill and take the best portions out of them and combine it with a crime bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that over a period of time, a few years, we could have a system wherein if a criminal walks in and wants to purchase a weapon, or a criminal has a weapon, that some of the events that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] spoke about can be taken care of. I hope that that also passes.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] talked about the death penalty. This is one of the things that the President's bill will take care of. Not just for murder of Federal officials, but the penalty for drug kingpins, terrorists, the killing of hostages, and of murder for hire.

Equal protection. We need to ensure that justice is color-blind. Most of the people in our jails today are from ethnic minorities. Why? Maybe because we do not provide them with the jobs we need. Maybe they are not provided with the education that they need. Maybe they do not have the homes that they need.

This House tonight passed an appropriations bill with a HOPE Program which allows people to own their own homes. I think under that provision, that the first person that writes graffiti on that home, they are going to go away. The first drug kingpin that moves into those housing developments, it is the homeowner that will take care of it.

When you own your own home, that takes care of the value system in the homes themselves. I think when you have HOPE, you have a home, and you are going to eliminate some of the crime itself and put the value system back into it.

Reform of habeas corpus. That is the system that ties up our courts, that does not allow us to get due process.

Reform of the exclusionary rule. My friend from Florida covered that, and I am not going to expound on it.

We need to improve the firearm laws themselves and require a mandatory 10-year term for the use of semiautomatic weapons in drug trafficking offenses, rather than just a violent felony. If someone uses a weapon in a crime, we need to put the maximum pressure and penalty on them. We need to increase the penalties, which my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] also spoke about.

We need to protect the judicial system with witnesses, court officials, and jurors in Federal proceedings.

Gangs and juvenile offenders, my friend form Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] touched on this. I do not want San Diego to turn out to be another Los Angeles, or another Washington, DC, where crime is so rampant. We need to handle gangs.

One of the ways we need to do it is not just focusing on the negatives of our youth. There are so many positives that come out. We need to focus on some of the positives for the minorities, give them role models, and the only way to do that is through the educational process.

I believe that the President's crime bill will help us do all of these things and achieve all of those things.

One of the most terrible, heinous crimes, other than drug kingpins, other than murder for hire, for me, is child abuse and sex offenders. The bill will provide new penalties for child abuse.

Child abusers; to me, the Singapore system is in order. I am sorry, I do not really believe that, but something needs to be done for child offenders, for sex offenders, and make it easier to prosecute these offenders, and increase the penalties, as well as providing drugs to pregnant women and for sex offenders against children under 16 years of age.

□ 1050

The President's bill does this. Ladies and gentlemen, we need to pass the President's bill.

We have not talked about drug testing, but we have a war on drugs. When I was a commanding officer in the service, 99 percent of all of the problems that I had in the squadron were in relation to drugs, and I include alcohol within that division. We need to take a look at our borders. We need to take a look at more strenuous, tougher laws on parole.

My colleague from New York talked about 85 percent of all criminals testing positive for drugs, 85 percent. When we have a felon who is on parole, we need to test that individual.

Mr. Speaker, the President's bill takes care of all of these things, but yet the Judiciary Committee will not allow the President's bill to come out. Why? That is a crime in itself.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we force this bill to come out so that it is voted on in the House and so that we can also take it to the Senate and it can pass so that the American public will not only have civil rights, but they will have a right to life.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for participating in this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to another distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for all his leadership on this issue. The hour is late. I know that our dedicated employees around here are anxious to get home, but this is a very, very important subject made even more so because of the connection to the President's 100-day challenge.

I certainly appreciate the comments of all of my colleagues, particularly my cohort and colleague from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

I enjoy a rare distinction in this body of being one of a very few number of former police officers and those of us, if I can put that badge of honor on for just a moment, who have served, if you

will, in the front line in the fight against crime and can never move too far away from that battle. It is something that really carries with you always. It can, in fact, be a badge of honor. It is a very, very valuable experience and a frame of reference to have to use in whatever situation or experiences one may encounter later in life.

I was reminded of this just a week or so ago when the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families held a rather unique hearing on police job stress, and gave my better half, my wife Kathy, who I hope is back in California watching right now, the opportunity to testify before our panel from her perspective also as a former police officer, and the unique stresses that families involved in law enforcement occupations face. What came out clearly at that hearing from line officers in the law enforcement profession is that we are struggling, that we are struggling to cope, struggling to keep our heads above the surface, if you will, in the ongoing fight against crime, particularly in our inner cities in America. And they want our help back here in Washington, in the Congress of the United States, in taking back control of the streets and securing our neighborhoods.

But lest any of our colleagues who still might be with us tonight think that those of us who are gathered here in strong support of advancing this crime package through this Congress, against the determined opposition of our loyal foes on the other side of the aisle, think that we gather here just as a small group of right-wing bomb throwers, let me shift hats, take off the hat of the ex-policeman, the ex-cop, the ex-deputy sheriff, and put on the hat of the chairman of the Republican Task Force on Empowerment, and point out that the President's crime package, a well thought out, comprehensive approach to combating crime on the street level, on a national level in terms of drug trafficking and organized criminal dealings, and rings, and on an international level is but one part of a comprehensive package and empowerment strategy to try and improve the lives of Americans who might be most prone to victimization, victimization either by poverty circumstances and the background into which they were born, victimization at the hands of a fellow American in either a random street crime or a deliberate crime of malice aforethought. This package which was unveiled, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania certainly knows, back in February by the President was called the civil rights and opportunity package, and again I thought I would just stand up for a moment and point out that our crime bill is just one small part. I should not say a small one, but a very important part of that overall package.

What else is in the package? Educational choice, educational reform, educational flexibility. The President now has sent us his Educational Enhancement Act which contains strategic initiatives to improve the learning achievement of all Americans, to fundamentally reform and restructure our public educational system in America.

Enterprise zones. The Enterprise Zones and Jobs Creation Act of 1991 targets tax incentives and regulatory relief to some of our Nation's most economically depressed areas. The Opportunity Act of 1991 would enable communities to restructure Federal programs to provide services and benefits in the way a community deems best to meet the needs of its citizens and families served.

And last, but certainly not least, combating crime, freedom from crime being the most basic, the most basic of all civil rights. The administration has again proposed legislation to truly target and get tough on violent criminals, and criminals who are part of criminal syndicates, and I am talking about our inner city drug gangs as well. This is a comprehensive, and if I could go so far to say brilliant legislative agenda that deserves the serious consideration of both parties in this body.

Let me also point out if I might to my two colleagues remaining here that the President indicated with respect to handgun control measures, well in advance of this body acting on final passage of the handgun bill that he would, with distinct reservations, and perhaps having to hold his nose, he would support the incorporation or the merger of handgun control bill resembling the Brady bill into his crime package. He made that clearly known to the leadership of Congress; yet, our friends on the other side of the aisle were unwilling to meet him halfway. They were unwilling to entertain a bipartisan political compromise which might have allowed us to move this crime bill to the floor for debate, might have allowed us to send a signal to our fellow Americans that we in fact are serious about dealing with what are the principal concerns, and that is the problem of crime, spreading crime in America, particularly in our inner cities.

So where does that package stand today, if I might ask the rhetorical question? That package, as we discuss it tonight in this special order regarding President Bush's 100-day update, and specifically anti-crime bill, let me, if I might, with the indulgence of the gentlemen, explain where we are with the rest of that package, and particularly talk a little bit about the crime bill.

With respect to education flexibility, the President sent his education bill to the Congress at the end of May. Since then there has been no action in subcommittee, no action obviously in full committee.

On antidiscrimination laws, we had that debate over the last few days on the floor of the House. The President's bill, H.R. 1375, which I personally felt was the better, more balanced legislation, was defeated. But that is the one element of his package that has actually been acted on by this body. One time we have been able to break away from the bounds of political paralysis that seem to permeate this place and take actual action, affirmative action for our fellow Americans.

His community opportunities areas, enterprise zone concept, that bill, H.R. 23, was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], a very distinguished Member from New York who truly has concerns about inner-city crime problems at heart, given the nature of his district, which is Harlem on the island of Manhattan. He is chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. Since then where has that bill gone? He is a prominent Member of the majority party, but there has been no subcommittee action and no full committee action.

□ 2300

Homeownership: for low-income persons, well, we established tonight that, indeed, hope is alive, and we have taken the first steps toward funding the HOPE Program.

The anticrime bill: well, as we know, it languishes on a train going nowhere. For those of us who would like to see it pulling out of the station with a lot of our Democratic friends on board.

He also had one other element of that package, the Social Security earnings test.

There are a number of bills that seek to address that critical concern to repeal restrictive provisions in the Social Security laws with respect to earnings by older Americans. None of those bills has been heard in subcommittee. No action in the full committee.

Now, my colleagues from California and Florida have done a better job than probably this ex-cop can in describing the crime package, but there are certain elements about it that I just want to reinforce very, very quickly.

One, of course, is title IV, which would strengthen the Federal firearms laws by providing, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] explained, mandatory sentences, and in the case of prior convictions, enhancers. That is very, very important legislation. It is legislation that would send from this body a signal across the land that we are going to get tough on violent crimes, crimes that are committed with the use of a firearm, and you will get no dispute on this end, although I voted for the Brady bill and thought it was a reasonable, sane approach, common sense, if you will, to doing something about handgun proliferation.

I was very, very cognizant, and, I mean, I get calls from my ex-colleagues in law enforcement that it would not do much about fighting crimes committed with firearms. This bill would. I would also, as has been pointed out, address the problem of gangs and juvenile offenders and, frankly, again, in terms of the fight to take back our streets, that is a very, very important element, as to the city streets.

A subject very close to me, because my wife used to, as a police investigator, investigate these kinds of crimes, it would provide for Federal penalties in the area of sexual violence and child abuse. Let me tell you, you talk about dealing with crime, here is a whole area of crime that was relatively unknown just a few years ago, certainly underreported in America.

But with increased awareness and consciousness on the part of our fellow Americans and through active outreach areas by social agencies and law enforcement, the stigma of coming forward and reporting those crimes, the stigma of being a victim of that sort of degradation and abuse has been hopefully mitigated somewhat, and it is very, very important when we ultimately act on a crime bill that this element be in that bill.

Other provisions, drug testing; well, of course, drug testing for Federal offenders released on parole or probation only makes sense and, of course, if we were to survey our fellow Americans, that is exactly the kind of approach to crime that they would want to take.

We in our home State, as my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] knows, survey after survey has shown strong public support for the death penalty in certain situations. Yet, because of endless legal appeals, abuse of due process, we just simply do not seem to be able to, as a government, carry out that policy.

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

Mr. GEKAS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to point out to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], that since the Supreme Court in the 1972 decision of Furman versus Georgia, that 41 States have enacted laws to restore the death penalty, and since Gregg versus Georgia in 1976, it is clear that capital punishment can constitutionally be imposed under certain procedures.

I think that these procedures set forth in the President's crime bill protect an individual's rights, but those individuals that would seek to take lives of other Americans or anyone then could possibly forfeit their lives under certain circumstances, and the President's bill does this.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for yielding time.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman for his very cogent observation.

I would also point out, in case Americans are wondering what we are talking about, what kind of crimes do we want to apply a Federal death penalty to. Two that come out right away are mail-bombing. What an atrocious, cowardly act, death by mail-bombing; murder of Federal officials. And I for one will stand up, as I did on the campaign trail for one form of the death penalty that I think ought to be a Federal statute, and that is the murder of a peace officer in the performance of his or her duties. So it is high time that we reflected the will of the American people.

I happen to subscribe to that old adage when the people lead, hopefully, anyway, the leaders will follow.

It is very clear that they want us to act in this area. One of the key components, in fact the centerpiece, of a Federal anticrime package has to be the Federal death penalty in certain situations.

Legal reform is also very necesssary, but the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] did a wonderful job of pointing that out with respect to reform as to habeas corpus and the exclusionary rule, and the only thing I would add to his commentary was that the President's bill also contained a provision to sanction unwarranted and illegal fourth-amendment searches.

So it is a balanced package. That is a very key element that provides for administrative and legislative oversight and compensation, Federal compensation of victims, for unlawful searches an seizures. So here we are, and just if I might one more time emphasize that this is a comprehensive package, the crime bill being the most important, because unless people are fundamentally safe and secure in their natural environment as they go about their daily business, as they come home to their abode, whatever it might be, in the evening, and some of the other empowerment reforms that those of us who strongly support that agenda and want to advance it on this floor subscribe to cannot take place.

But it is a comprehensive package. The President, in his own statement, when he sent this package to Congress, said that everyone knows the best education takes place in a safe, drug-free environment. It is difficult for children to learn if there is violence in the classroom or crime in the schoolyard or drug pushers on the street corner, and older students and workers find it hard to attend night school or put in late hours at the office because of the danger that darkness brings, especially in crime-ridden neighborhoods.

As my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] pointed out, who is affected the most by runaway crime in America, of course, low-income Americans. Study after study has shown, talking about the civil rights debate over the last couple of days, that most crime is minority on minority, low-income American victimizing another low-income American, and that is a fundamental inequity in our society.

So low-income Americans are the ones most likely to be intimidated by crime and less likely to be able to take advantage of the opportuities I have been referring to, so it is in their name, our fellow Americans who come from disadvantaged and minority backgrounds, that this battle for the streets of our cities must be waged. The thugs and the gangs and the drug kingpins should be the casualties of this war, not their victims.

Our tactics, mandatory sentences for using firearms in a violent crime, strengthen prosecution, against sex crimes and child abuse, tough prosecutors, courts that deal out justice and, finally, our strategy must be an unequivocal commitment to empower our fellow Americans, particularly our young people.

I thank the gentleman for all the time this evening. I would point out, in closing, if I might just have a moment more, that in terms of meeting the President's 100-day challenge, I suppose in a sense it is very much a moot point.

I have here at least the tentative calendar for next week for the House, and that will take us through June 14. In fact, there is no legislative business on Friday, June 14. Perhaps that is an appropriate metaphor.

But nowhere on here will you see anything remotely relating to the crime bill or, for that matter, the empowerment package.

I thank the gentleman for all the time.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his participation and commend both him and his colleague from California for participation in the total value of this special order.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr Speaker, crime continues to tear at the social and economic fabric of our Nation. The statistics and anecdotal stories numb the mind.

Every 24 minutes an American is murdered; every 6 minutes a woman is raped; every minute, someone is robbed and every half minute, a person is assaulted.

Crime is no longer isolated in urban areas, where poverty and hopelessness run rampant. It touches suburbs, small cities, and little towns.

Throughout the debate over the Brady and the Staggers bills, both sides agreed crime is a menace which threatens every citizen, regardless of income, race, or age.

I supported the Staggers bill because it would have done what everyone concurs is the common goal, remove hand guns from criminals who use them through a mandatory criminal background check.

Whatever the fate of the Brady bill, there is one reality which remains about crime—there

are no easy answers, no quick fixes or magic tonics that will make crime go away.

So, it would appear to everyone that a thorough game plan is needed to punish criminals, stop the plague of drug abuse, educate and halt the abuse of women, the elderly, and children.

A plan does exist. Unfortunately, it has not been given a fair hearing by Congress.

President Bush has challenged the Congress to act and pass his plan to attack crime in all its forms—the Comprehensive Violent Crime Control Act of 1991. This sweeping blueprint for change would address many of the fundamental issues affecting crime.

Briefly, the plan would call for a mandatory 5-year sentence for anyone convicted of committing a crime with a handgun. No appeals, just straight time.

Drug dealers and kingpins who murder or order the killing of law enforcement personnel or witnesses would be eligible for the death penalty under the President's proposal. The aim of this provision is to insure the rights of the victims, not the hardened criminals who have caused misery and suffering.

An example of that suffering was heard this week. A father of a young woman, who was raped and murdered, told a Senate panel that her attacker had delayed his death sentence for 6 years. While the murderer bides his time through the courts, a family's anguish goes on.

The President's proposal would also change the exclusionary rule thereby allowing evidence retrieved during a search, to be used by prosecutors. While this has been termed controversial, it is essential our legal system does not allow criminals to be freed due to some minor technicality caused by an unintentional infraction by law enforcement officials.

During the debate over the Brady and Staggers bills, I supported a motion to have the Brady bill sent back to the committee process, with the hope of having it included in the debate on the President's plan. The Brady bill passed in the House and now heads to the U.S. Senate for action.

Unfortunately, this motion was ridiculed by some Members of the Congress and defeated. However, it is my hope the President's plan will eventually get a hearing, so the Congress can form a consensus that strikes at the heart of an issue which unites all law abiding people—the desire to live in safety.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, as of January there were approximately 2,412 death row inmates in the United States. Two thousand four hundred twelve people who have committed crimes so heinous that juries decided on the ultimate punishment. Assault, rape, theft, and homocide are household words in every community. Drugs are overruning our streets, and our court systems are so clogged with criminal cases that civil suits are denied due process. And yet this Congress has been sitting on our hands for 92 of the 100 days the President gave us to send him a meaningful anti-crime bill. In this Chamber we have debated everything from funding for the Lawrence Welk museum to nibbling at the edges of the crime issue through the Brady bill. But none of us can really look our constituents in the eyes and say we have confronted one of their top concerns head on. Violent crimes have increased at rapid speed leaving law abiding citizens victimized and frightened—even in their own homes. I am frustrated by this trend, and I am outraged. Members of this Congress have a responsibility to the people we serve. For each day that passes without action on measures we know will provide at least some remedy to this enormous problem—we allow ourselves to become accomplices. It is bad enough that the President had to issue a challenge and a deadline to get us moving on tough anti-crime legislation—you would think that our own consciences would have dictated swift and resolute action long before now.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, on March 6 in this very Chamber, we celebrated our victory in the Persian Gulf with the President of the United States. In his speech before Congress and the Nation, President Bush commended our troops on a job well done.

That day marked an important turning point for Congress: With the end of the war, the time to get to work on domestic issues had arrived.

Mr. Speaker, the President recognized this and put forth a reasonable challenge. He said that if our outstanding troops could win the ground war in 100 hours then surely Congress could enact a crime bill in 100 days.

Ninety-two days later, where do we stand? We have not moved forward a single inch. Just a few days after the President's challenge was issued, I was proud to join with many of my colleagues from this side of the aisle to introduce the President's comprehensive crime package, H.R. 1400. And yet, to this day, it has not been referred to a single subcommittee.

I sit on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime—the obvious starting point for many elements of the crime package. Clearly, this legislation should have been before that subcommittee back in March.

I want to commend my good friend from across the aisle, Mr. SCHUMER, the chairman of that subcommittee, for doing what he can to at least hold oversight hearings on the crime bill. But his hands are tied just like ours on the Republican side. Mr. Speaker, at this point, 3 months after the President's speech, we should be discussing the merits of the crime bill on the House floor. But the Democratic leadership on the Judiciary Committee does not want to even start the debate.

In the Senate, four hearings have been held to consider the President's crime package, as well as the Democratic alternative. There is no reason to justify the delay of this legislation in this House. Apparently the Democratic leadership on the Judiciary Committee does not recognize the urgent need to enact a good crime package.

The President's package is comprehensive and offers powerful solutions to make a serious dent in the crime epidemic. We need to enact this legislation, and the sooner we get on with the debate, the better.

We need to strengthen the Federal death penalty, extend it to drug kingpins, terrorists, and those who commit other heinous crimes. Mr. Speaker, for years we have had in the Federal statutes death-penalty provisions which are constitutionally invalid. This legislation will establish constitutionally sound procedures and adequate standards which will resurrect these dormant statutes.

Mr. Speaker, we need to impose mandatory sentences for gun-related crimes. Let us send out a message that is crystal-clear to all: If you use—or merely possess—a firearm when committing a violent crime or a serious drug offense, you are going to prison; if you choose to steal firearms, you are going to prison; and if you use a semiautomatic firearm, you will be in prison for the next 10 years. No exceptions!

We need reform of habeas corpus proceedings that have resulted in stays of executions averaging over 8 years. We need reform of the exclusionary rule which has kept necessary and probative evidence from juries, often allowing hardened criminals to go free. We need to protect witnesses, jurors, and court officers from violence by increasing penalties for such attacks. We need to increase the penalties for sexual assault and child molestation.

The President's comprehensive crime package addresses all these challenges, and does even more.

Mr. Speaker, at the very least, I call upon the Democratic leadership to refer H.R. 1400 to the relevant subcommittees within the 100-day challenge. That is one week from tomorrow, June 14. Then at least we can advance the debate. Every day of delay of this important crime legislation will be matched with further crime on the streets.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, violent crime and drugs continue to hold our communities hostage while Congress fails to come to America's rescue. On March 12, the President asked Congress to pass his tough but fair crime package within 100 days. We are closing in on the 100 days and still Congress has not passed the President's crime package.

Unfortunately, history seems to be repeating itself. Last year, Congress did manage to pass a crime bill only after eliminating some of the tougher provisions. As House Republicans it is our duty to respond to the President's goal of protecting law-abiding citizens.

The American people want the President's comprehensive Violent Crime Control Act of 1991 to pass in its entirety. Our constituents are sick and tired of hearing Congressmen talk tough on crime and drugs. Talking tough on crime did not prevent 20,000 Americans from being murdered in 1990. Talking tough on crime did not prevent too many criminals from going free because of legal technicalities. H.R. 1400 is a comprehensive bill containing provisions for sexual crimes, child abuse, gangs and juvenile offenders, firearms offenses, terrorism and drug testing. I am confident that with passage of the President's 1991 crime package, we will be helping to free America from the grip of violent crime and drugs.

As I stated earlier, the President's crime package is tough, but it is fair. As ranking Republican on the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I feel it is important to focus on the provisions in H.R. 1400 aimed at drug traffickers. The only thing that frustrates the American people more than crime is drugs. The President realized this and has rightfully included drug trafficking crimes in his package. A 10-year mandatory prison sentence for the use of a semiautomatic weapon

in a drug trafficking offense and new offenses for smuggling firearms in the furtherance of drug trafficking are called for in the President's crime package. It also authorizes the death penalty for drug kingpins.

The habeas corpus reform and exclusionary rule reform provisions are crime control measures aimed at removing many of the burdens that have plagued our criminal justice system by ensuring that sentences such as the death penalty are not delayed indefinitely by repetitive appeals. The Congress will be taking a significant step toward insuring swiftness and certainty of criminal punishments.

We have all heard of instances in which a violent criminal or drug trafficker gets out of jail free because a law enforcement officer—acting in good faith—made a mistake in seizing certain evidence. Exclusionary rule reform ensures that evidence, which is otherwise admissible, shall not be excluded if obtained in good faith.

House Republicans realize the time has come to give law enforcement personnel, judges, and juries the anticrime tools they need to make it harder for violent criminals to be released—due to legal technicalities—only to prey upon honest, hard-working, law-abiding citizens.

Drug testing in the criminal justice system is another important element of the President's crime bill. If a Federal offender is released on probation, parole, or a post-imprisonment supervised release and still uses drugs the chances of that individual committing a violent crime is increased. H.R. 1400 calls for drug testing of Federal offenders in such release programs. It also requires drug testing programs in State criminal justice systems as a condition of Federal justice assistance funding.

This provision allows the Federal Government to ensure that violent offenders are drug-free prior to the completion of their term of imprisonment.

I know I do not have to convince my Republican colleagues of the importance of H.R. 1400. With a person being murdered every 24 minutes in the United States, a woman being raped every 6 minutes, someone being robbed every 55 seconds and someone being assaulted every 33 seconds, I only hope that the distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee realize the urgent need for this legislation and commit themselves to taking swift action on H.R. 1400.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions contained in H.R. 1400 are overwhelmingly supported by the American people. If we can have a debate on these provisions in the House, I am confident we can enact them into law.

However, if a crime bill comes to the floor that is a hollow shell, I will urge my colleagues to vote against it. If such a crime bill should still pass, I will urge the President to veto it. I do not believe the 102d Congress should be allowed to go home without enacting tough anticrime legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to have faith in the Congress. I believe that both sides of the aisle can come together to enact real, meaningful anticrime legislation.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call upon the Congress to act now on the President's crime bill. Americans realize the need for a death penalty for drug kingpins and for certain heinous acts such as terrorists' murders. Americans realize the need to quickly bring criminals to justice instead of endless litigation. Americans realize the need to have a good faith exception to the search-and-seizure exclusionary rule. The President, in response to American concerns, has called on Congress to pass his crime package in 100 days. I agree with the President and want to see action now.

On March 6, 1991, in his gulf war victory speech to a joint session of Congress, President Bush called an Congress to act on a crime package in 100 days. On June 14, 1 week from today, the 100-day deadline will be here. What has Congress done? Nothing! In fact the President's crime bill has not even been referred to subcommittee. A first step in passing legislation.

I believe we need action on a crime bill this year. A crime bill which deals with the death penalty, habeous corpus, and the exclusionary rule. Congress should not be allowed to adjourn without action on a strong crime bill. We can do no less for American victims. If any other crime package comes to the floor, we should vote against it and the President should veto it.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the matter of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted:

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 60 minutes, on June 12.

Mr. SKELTON, for 60 minutes, on June 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GEKAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RINALDO.
Mr. CRANE.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO in two instances.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
Mr. RIGGS.
Mr. CAMP.
Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. WELDON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. TORRES.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. DARDEN.
Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.
Mr. SCHEUER.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. MATSUI.
Mr. TAUZIN.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. DE LUGO.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. REED.
Mr. TOWNS, in three instances.
Mr. BONIOR.
Mr. SOLARZ.
Mr. SHARP.
Mr. MAVROULES.
Mr. HUBBARD.
Mr. CARR.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. DOWNEY.
Mr. BUSTAMANTE.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. MFUME.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. CONDIT.
Ms. DELAURO.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 173. An act to permit the Bell Telephone Cos., to conduct research on, design, and manufacture telecommunications equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary;

S. 253. An act to provide for the establishment of an international criminal tribunal for the prosecution of Persian Gulf war criminals, to establish an office within the Department of State to implement the U.S. role with respect to the tribunal, and for other purposes; to the Committees on the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs; and

S. 1193. An act to make technical amendments to various Indian laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 7, 1991, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1486. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the status of budget authority that was proposed for rescission by the President in his third special impoundment message for fiscal year 1991, dated February 28, 1991, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 102-96); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1487. A letter from the Chief Legislative Liaison, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the decision not to convert to contractor performance and to retain the in-house operation of the commissary storage and warehousing function at Fort Monroe, VA, pursuant to Public Law 100-463, section 8061 (102 Stat. 2270-27); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1488. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting three reports on the Seawolf attack submarine, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2400(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1489. A letter from the Principal Deputy (Production and Logistics), Department of Defense, transmitting a report on its maintenance of firefighting and other emergency services at military installations in the United States, pursuant to Public Law 101-519, section 354(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1490. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the requirement that U.S. currency notes must be reissued after redemption; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1491. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on the Health Care for the Homeless program, pursuant to Public Law 100-77, section 601 (101 Stat. 515); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1492. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the International Labor Conference of the International Labor Organization and their solicitations of nominations of Congressional Advisors; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1493. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting the English and Russians Language texts of amendments I and II to the memorandum of agreement regarding the implementation of the Verification provisions of the treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union on the elimination of their intermediate-range missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1494. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1495. A letter from the Assistant Secretary—Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's notice on leasing systems for the Beaufort Sea, Sale 124, scheduled to be held in June 1991, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(8); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1496. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1497. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1498. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1499. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1500. A letter from the Assistant Director, National Recreation Programs, National Park Service, transmitting a report on America's national scenic, national historic, and national recreation trails for 1989-90; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1501. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 202 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for Presidential waiver authority of certain conflict of interest statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1502. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the management of the Veterans Canteen Service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1503. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting his views concerning renewal of most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1504. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of the Treasury, transmitting an amendment to the Kuwait Assets Control Regulations, pursuant to Public Law 101-513, section 586C(c)(1) (104 Stat. 2048); jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 169. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2038, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1992 for intelligence activities of the U.S. Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-100). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 170. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2508, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and to redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-101). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 2564. A bill to exempt agriculture from certain requirements under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MOODY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2565. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of colorectal screening examinations and certain immunizations under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JAMES, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. ROEMER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 2566. A bill to authorize funds for construction of highways and for highway safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 2567. A bill to establish the Federal Council on Women; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CONDIT (for himself and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 2568. A bill to provide for the coordination of Federal drug treatment programs involved in the criminal justice system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 2569. A bill to encourage the establishment of free trade areas between the United States and certain Pacific rim countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. OAKAR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan):

H.R. 2570. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the District of Columbia Government Operations, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 2571. A bill to promote family preservation and the prevention of foster care with emphasis on families where abuse of alcohol or drugs is present, and to improve the quality and delivery of child welfare, foster care, and adoption services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESPY (for himself, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. TAUZIN):

H.R. 2572. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make a grant to the Lower Mississippi Delta Development Center; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 2573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make S corporations eligible for the rules applicable to real property subdivided for sale by noncorporate taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTTO (for himself and Mr. CALLAHAN):

H.R. 2574. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Perdido River in the States of Florida and Alabama for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO (for himself, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. JONTZ):

H.R. 2575. A bill to implement certain proposals relating to recommendations made pursuant to sections 504 and 902 of the covenant to establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in political union with the United States of America, approved by Public Law 94-214, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Judiciary, Armed Services, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOODY (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. HALL of Ohio):

H.R. 2576. A bill to amend the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 to authorize appropriations to purchase, process, and distribute milk to States for distribution to needy persons in situations of emergency and distress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 2577. A bill to amend title V of Public Law 96-550, designating the Chaco Culture Archaeological Protection Sites, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. SHARP (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LENT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 2578. A bill to amend the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act to require certification and posting for all liquid automotive fuels, to provide the States more authority to enforce automotive fuel posting requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 2579. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage health professionals to serve in medically underserved areas, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MFUME, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 2580. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prohibit the international export and import of certain solid waste; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

H.R. 2581. A bill to preserve jobs in the aircraft industry by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the luxury excise tax on aircraft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLARZ:

H.R. 2582. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to limit infringement actions for registered marks of professional sports teams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLARZ (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.J. Res. 266. Joint resolution designating the week beginning August 4, 1991, as "International Parental Child Abduction Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAVROULES:

H. Res. 168. Resolution designating 1991 as "National Land Trust Appreciation Year," in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Trustee of Reservations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

167. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to the Michigan National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

168. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to regulation of mine waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

169. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to the automotive industry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

170. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to funding the POW/MIA special investigation conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; to the Committee on Government Operations.

171. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to adopting the President's proposal to turn over to States additional Federal programs in grant form; to the Committee on Government Operations.

172. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to public lands condemned by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

173. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

174. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to benefit-cutting proposals in the Department of Veteran Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

175. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

176. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to the passage of H.R. 1147, the POW/MIA truth bill; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

177. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to funds in the highway trust fund; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Public Works and Transportation.

178. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, relative to equalizing federally funded medical payments; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 2583. A bill for the relief of Gregory E. Walters, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 33: Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 66: Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 125: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 127: Mr. MANTON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 179: Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 200: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 246: Mr. NICHOLS.

H.R. 298: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 299: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 394: Mr. ROSE, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 421: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr.

FROST, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 431: Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 461: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 643: Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 784: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 842: Mr. JENKINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. COX of Illinois.

H.R. 911: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ROE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KLUG, Mr. WELDON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. BYRON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 924: Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 951: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1112: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 1126: Mr. BUSTAMANTE and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 1147: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. KLUG, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. MINK.

H.R. 1156: Mr. BACCHUS and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1177: Mr. TALLON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 1218: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 1287: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1288: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1300: Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 1346: Ms. HORN and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1364: Mr. KOSTMAYER and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

H.R. 1365: Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 1385: Mr. YATRON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 1400: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1423: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 1468: Mr. WALKER and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1472: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. HUBBARD.

H.R. 1474: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1483: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 1495: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. FIELDS.

H.R. 1502: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1523: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1587: Mr. GUNDERSON and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1599: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. JONES of Georgia.

H.R. 1618: Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1655: Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1669: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1703: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1708: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 1725: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 1726: Ms. HORN.

H.R. 1746: Mr. WISE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1860: Mr. MARTIN and Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 2012: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 2040: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 2149: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 2175: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 2199: Mr. FROST and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 2267: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SABO, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 2268: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. SHARP.

H.R. 2309: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MFUME, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 2311: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 2333: Mr. GRANDY and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 2334: Mr. HORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2371: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KLUG, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2382: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2391: Mr. ROE and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 2392: Mr. ROE and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 2452: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2464: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DENNEMEYER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, and Mr. HOPKINS.

H.R. 2470: Mr. MARTIN.

H.R. 2489: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 2511: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 2515: Mr. PARKER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 2542: Mr. BRYANT.

H.J. Res. 95: Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. YATRON.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.J. Res. 196: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.J. Res. 229: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DIXON, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. STARK, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. BACCHUS.

H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. FISH.

H. Con. Res. 123: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H. Con. Res. 126: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. WOLPE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. ROE.

H. Res. 40: Mr. MORRISON.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2508

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

—At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SITUATION IN THE KRAJINA REGION OF YUGOSLAVIA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) ethnic Serbians living in the Republic of Croatia and in other parts of Yugoslavia should not be discriminated against because of their ethnicity;

(2) the people of the Krajina Region including ethnic Serbians, should retain their autonomous status in Yugoslavia, respecting the rights of all peoples and treating them equally under the law;

(3) the people of Krajina Region should be allowed to hold free and fair elections for an Assembly of the Krajina Region, which should be allowed to function as a representative institution reflecting the will of the people; and

(4) Serbian leaders in the Krajina Region and other Yugoslav and Croatian leaders should resolve their differences through negotiations and should not, under any circumstance, resort to violence or repression.