HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, June 28, 1993*

The House met at 12 noon.

Rev. Dr. Ronald F. Christian, Office of the Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Your generosity is shown to us in countless ways each day. Give to us, we pray, both the means and the desire to receive Your daily gifts with gratitude:

For bread to eat and rest from work;

For peace of mind in having done what we could, but also the challenge to do more with what we possess;

For the hope in us that springs eternal, yet the realism that will not let us easily forget another's plight.

These are but daily gifts, so common as to be sometimes expected.

O God, protect us from ever letting the ordinary become the routine and may we never presume Your goodness, demand Your grace, or consider ourselves deserving of Your gifts. 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 gentlewoman from Virginia [Ms. BYRNE] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BYRNE 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.

VOTE "YES" ON AMENDMENT TO RESTORE OVERSIGHT FUNCTION IN NASA

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

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, today we will take up the appropriations bill for the space station. I urge my colleagues to follow the debate closely.

Whether you are for or against continued funding for the space station, it is interesting to note the only specific cost-cutting measures in the appropriations bill are to cut the program management and technical systems activities—in other words, eliminate the watchdog at NASA.

Yes, under the blanket of reorganization the best idea that NASA could come up with is to eliminate the institutional whistleblowers who this January brought to Congress' attention the vast overruns in the space station. This is not reorganization at NASA: This is business as usual. My colleague, Representative WOLF, and I have introduced an amendment to the appropriations bill that restores this vital oversight function. Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members of the House, whether you are for or against the space station appropriation, the fact is we must not allow the technical oversight division to be eliminated under the guise of reorganization and trimming management.

GEORGE H. MAHON FEDERAL BUILDING AND U.S. COURTHOUSE

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

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce my introduction of legislation to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Lubbock, TX, as the George H. Mahon Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse.

As many of you may know, the late Representative George Mahon was elected to the newly created Texas 19th Congressional District in 1934 and was reelected to the 21 succeeding Congresses until his retirement in 1979. During his tenure in Congress, he served with eight Presidents and rose to be the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Mahon served continuously in that position longer than any other man in the 128-year history of the committee. At the time he announced his retirement, he was also the dean of Congress.

It is difficult to drive through the spacious 20-county region which encompasses the 19th District of Texas without noting the legacy of George Mahon. Throughout his distinguished 44-year congressional career, Mahon's leadership for his district, State, and his Nation served as a role model for all other Members of Congress to try and emulate, and to follow.

It is my privilege to introduce this measure naming the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Lubbock, TX, in his honor. I believe it to be a fitting tribute to the legacy of George Mahon to name the 19th District's only Federal building, which is also located in his adopted hometown of Lubbock, after its revered former Congressman.

CLOSE BASES OVERSEAS, NOT AT HOME

(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, for years we have been hearing "Yankee, go home," "Uncle Sam, get out." But what does the Defense Base Closure Commission do? They close bases in Norfolk, Pensacola, Staten Island, San Diego. But they do not close really any bases overseas.

Now figure this out. Our taxpayers pay for the defense of Japan and Germany. Then our Base Closing Commission closes the bases in America, leaving the bases open overseas where our troops are cashing their checks, being nothing more than economic development plans for these countries.

I say it is time to close the bases overseas. It is time to leave the bases in America open. Start killing those jobs overseas, Congress. The American people are tired.

This is unbelievable.

TOBACCO ASHES—LIFESAVING LEGISLATION

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

Mr. HUFFINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored the Tobacco Advertising Subsidies and Health Enhancement Act—Tobacco ASHES—for three reasons.

First, it will redirect $3.5 billion over 5 years to deficit reduction. The crushing cost of our Nation's debt, and the burden of taxes needed to pay it, are destroying our economy and demoralizing our citizens. In that sense, this is tax relief.

Second, without waiting for administration task forces, we can cut the Nation's healthcare bill. Smoking kills more Americans each year than die from the combined total of alcohol, drugs, accidents, homicides and AIDS. The costs of care on the way to these 435,000 American graves are staggering, and we drive them up each day with our subsidies. This is shameful and must be reversed.

Third, by subsidizing tobacco advertising we entice others, even our children, to smoke—knowing it may take their lives. This is unconscionable.

Therefore, Tobacco ASHES is an act of conscience. I am pleased to tell my constituents I have kept my pledge to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

save them money. I will be more pleased to show them, and my children, that I acted to save their lives.

□ 1210

THE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION DECISIONS

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, we in the city of Louisville are very pleased that the case for Naval Ordnance Station which we brought before the Base Closure and Realignment Committee was agreed to, and Naval Ordnance will now stay open and in the fleet at work for national defense and for our Nation's freedoms.

We had a wonderful story. That story was bolstered by my Kentucky and the Indiana colleagues here in the House and in the Senate. The mayor, the county judge, the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor were all unified, advancing our position. We were successful, and we are very thankful.

However, as the speaker a moment ago, my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], said, there are cities in America, and he recounted many of them, that have taken very serious blows as a result of the decisions made to close bases.

We in the Congress cannot be unmindful of the human travail in the sense of the loss that BRAC '93 will bring. We have some responsibility, it seems to me, through various conversion programs, to help these communities and to make sure that they do not suffer unnecessarily.

So while we in Louisville are very happy and proud and pleased and believe the Commission made a correct decision in behalf of Naval Ordnance, we commiserate with our friends around the country, and we pledge to help them to be able to recycle into the new future as quickly and smoothly as possible.

TIME FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON TO GET ANOTHER HAT

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, for months Clinton has been trying to make each new variation of the America's largest tax bill look like other than what it is: America's largest tax bill.

Watching Mr. Clinton, I am reminded of a magician in a traveling carnival. The magician was not very good and had just one real trick: pulling a rabbit out of a hat. The secret to his success was that carnival moved everyday. Much to the magician's misfortune, the carnival was forced to stay in one town for a week.

With each additional show, the magician added more flourish but still pulled out the same rabbit. Finally, a member of the audience, who had seen enough, shouted: "Mister, can't you do something else?" Not wishing to appear unaccomplish, the magician replied: "Of course, but not with this hat."

Like the magician, President Clinton has been trying to add a little more flourish with each multibillion-dollar tax increase. Now, when America questions what is new about a Democrat pulling out hundreds of billions in taxes over and over again, he blames the hat instead of trying what would really be magic to the Nation: to cut spending first.

THE CLINTON DOCTRINE

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was give permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton and his allies in the House are trying an old Democratic trick: When the facts aren't in your favor, try class warfare.

Yes, once again, at the urging of his campaign advisers, Bill Clinton is using the fairness argument. He says the rich don't pay their fair share, and that his taxes will hit only the wealthy.

Under the President's sliding scale of wealth, that may be true. You see, if you have a job, if you own a small business, if you are a contributor to society, that means you are wealthy, at least under the President's definition.

If you employ people, if you create jobs, if you are an entrepreneur, you need to be punished in the name of fairness. That is the Clinton doctrine.

Class warfare may win political campaigns, but it doesn't spur economic growth. Raising the capital gains tax may garner political capital, but it will not create any jobs.

The President should drop his class warfare rhetoric, and work to create wealth rather than simply redistributing it.

DEJA VU ALL OVER AGAIN

(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, the smoke is getting thicker and the mirror is getting shinier on trying to reduce the deficit.

Deja vu all over again. Let me read you this: "For the first time in 10 years we have before us the opportunity to do something that will actually result in the reduction of the Federal deficit, not by 460, but by $500 billion, the gentleman from the Senate said, Mr. MITCHELL. The language seems almost identical to what was said last week, but that was said on October 17, 1990. But the 1990 budget deal, which promised a $500 billion deficit reduction has been since labeled the crime of the century, did not cut the deficit, it pushed it to historic heights. While supporters of the 1990 budget deal forecast the deficit would be reduced $253 billion by 1991, it actually rose to $269 billion. The 1992 deficit was forecast to decline and actually turned out to be nearly $75 billion higher than what was promised.

Deja vu all over again.

AGAINST THE REVOLVING DOOR

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

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak against the nomination of Daniel Tarullo as Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs, the chief trade official at the Department of State.

This nomination is under consideration today in the Committee on Foreign Relations. The nomination of Mr. Tarullo presents a blatant conflict of interest and creates a serious appearance of impropriety.

We would have to search far and wide to find a more troubling example of the revolving door between lobbying and Government service. Mr. Tarullo's law firm has represented, and continues to represent, the Government of Mexico. From August 1991 to January 1993, Mr. Tarullo's firm received more than $5.2 billion to represent the interests of the Mexican Government.

Now, Mr. Tarullo is being considered for a key position where he will have the responsibility of protecting the interests of the American people on issues that will directly affect his client, the Mexican Government. This puts him in an untenable position, and it puts the American people in a position where they will have grave reason to doubt that American interests will be vigorously represented by Mr. Tarullo whenever Mexican interests are involved, as in the case of the implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the revolving door should be closed, and the nomination of Daniel Tarullo should be rejected.

CLASS WARFARE MEANS FEWER JOBS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has been touting the largest tax increase in American history as fair, but the only thing fair

about this $300 billion tax hike is in the class warfare rhetoric being used to sell it.

You would have thought the politics of envy and the policy of income redistribution in the name of retribution that has died around the world would also be discredited in the administration. You would have thought the luxury tax fiasco would have taught a lesson to those who want to punish the successful.

The result of this soak-the-rich approach was that they drowned the everyday working people who built luxury items and they lost money for the Federal Government in the process. Why? Because when you levy taxes, you lessen the activity taxed.

The administration's policy of taxing the producers and the successful will work no better this time than last. Its only aspect of fair will remain in its class warfare, unless you count as fair that everywhere Americans will lose jobs and investments.

PRESIDENT LAUDED FOR RESPONSE TO IRAQI ASSASSINATION PLOT

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

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, last month I rose to express my concern over reports of an Iraqi-sponsored plot to assassinate former President Bush. At that time, I urged the Clinton administration to take swift and definitive retribution against Iraq if the United States investigation proved that Iraq, and specifically its leader Saddam Hussein, sanctioned an assassination of our former President.

Iraq's complicity in the plot now appears conclusive, and I fully support the President's response. The United States unilateral action is appropriate in the face of a planned attack on a former American President for actions he took as Commander in Chief. Federal and international laws mandate that assassination conspiracies against our governmental leaders, past and present, cannot and will not be tolerated, regardless of where those plots are hatched.

The President has reaffirmed a 200-year-old principle of the importance of protecting American citizens, including ex-Presidents, abroad.

DELRAY BEACH, FL—ALL-AMERICAN CITY

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Delray Beach, FL, recently named an All-American City. This honor was bestowed on only 10 cities nationally. During the 1980's this community was polarized by extreme ethnic, economic, and age diversity. Residents from all parts of the city became disenchanted enough to come together to work for their city, establishing three projects which provided the impetus to turn the future of this town around and to win it this recognition.

Taking Back Our Neighborhoods required a new way of approaching the problems of crime and drugs. Community policing on bicycles and community involvement built coalitions between citizens and police which threatened the drug dealers in the drug district. It hasn't been easy, but the resolve of the residents to continue the fight has encouraged more of their neighbors to join in the battle.

The second project was called Sharing for Excellence. An alliance was formed between the citizens of Delray Beach and the Palm Beach County School Board. The goal to save an inner city school targeted for closure and to reverse the school board trend of building new schools outside of the city. The city promised to correct deteriorating neighborhood conditions in exchange for the school board's commitment to keep the old school open and to build two new schools within the city. For their part, the citizens of Delray voted a tax increase to pay for the city's share. All objectives have been met in this project.

The third project is located in downtown Delray Beach, in a block occupied by three historically significant school buildings. When the Palm Beach County School Board announced its intention to close the complex, a citizen's group formed to lobby the city to purchase the property for an alternative use. A total of $5 million was raised for the renovation and reuse of this integral part of the downtown. Old School Square has now become the heart of the downtown renaissance and has erased the east-west boundary of the city.

Delray Beach, FL, is a living model of the power of citizen commitment, and I share the city's pride in these tremendous accomplishments.

□ 1220

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2491, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 208 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 208

Resolved, That during consideration of the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "; $50,000,000 shall" on page 43, line 7, through "State cost share" on line 25. Where points of order are waived against only part of a paragraph, a point of order against matter in the balance of the paragraph may be applied only within the balance of the paragraph and not against the entire paragraph. Debate on the amendment specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution to be offered by Representative Roemer of Indiana or a designee, and on any amendments thereto, may not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and an opponent. The amendments en bloc specified in the report to be offered by Representative Bereuter of Nebraska or a designee and by Representative Solomon of New York or a designee may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes of debate time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 208 is the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2491, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year 1994.

Since general appropriations bills are privileged, the legislation will be considered under the normal legislative process for consideration of appropriations bills. The time devoted to general debate will be determined by a unanimous consent request. The bill will be open to amendment under the 5-minute rule. Any amendment which does not violate the rules of the House or is printed in the Rules Committee report will be in order.

The rule waives points of order under clause 2 and clause 6 of rule XXI against all provisions of the bill except a portion of a paragraph on page 43. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in general appropriations bills. The Appropriations Subcommittee has requested this waiver because many of the accounts and agencies covered by the bill lack authorizations including EPA, NASA, NSF, and FEMA. Clause 6 of rule XXI prohibits reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations in general appropriations

bills. Where points of order are waived against only part of a paragraph, a point of order may lie only against the balance of the paragraph, and not the entire paragraph.

The rule provides for two sets of amendments, one to be offered by Representative BEREUTER and one to be offered by Representative SOLOMON, both to be offered en bloc. These sets of en bloc amendments, printed in the report to accompany the rule, shall be considered as read when offered, are not subject to a demand for a division of the question, and may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment.

Finally, the rule makes in order an amendment to be offered by Representative ROEMER or his designee printed in the report accompanying the rule. Debate on the Roemer amendment, which concerns funding for the space station, and any amendments to that amendment is limited to 2 hours.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2491 provides $68.3 billion in discretionary spending and $19.6 billion in discretionary spending and $19.6 billion in mandatory spending in the fiscal year of 1994 for the activities of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and 19 independent agencies and offices including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and that National Science Foundation. This rule will allow full and fair debate on the provisions of this important bill.

I ask my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with consideration of the merits of the legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, to this point the House has completed initial House consideration on 5 of the 13 general appropriation bills.

The VA–HUD appropriation we will consider under this rule is the first of seven scheduled to be considered by Thursday night of this week.

That will leave only the Defense appropriation bill to be considered after the July 4 district work period.

This rule waives points of order against most parts of the bill for failure to comply with the rules against unauthorized appropriations, legislation on general appropriations, and reappropriations.

In the absence of any rule, general appropriations bills are considered in the Committee of the Whole under an open amending process. This rule does nothing to restrict that normal open amending process. So any amendments that comply with the standing rules of the House may be offered.

For example, the standing rules of the House prohibit legislating on an appropriation bill, and prohibit nongermane amendments.

Mr. Speaker, because the bill spends almost all the money allowed under the subcommittee budget caps, it is not possible to add significant spending.

What can be done is to offer amendments to eliminate or reduce spending, or to strike provisions in the bill.

There is no limit on the debate time for amendments except for the Roemer amendment to strike the funding for the space station, which is limited to 2 hours of debate.

No amendments which violate the rule against legislating on an appropriation bill are made in order by this rule.

Two Members sought to offer as an en bloc package, amendments which cut in one paragraph of the bill and add in another. Both are permitted under this rule.

One is by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]. His amendment will add $2 million to the HUD Indian housing loan guarantee fund and cut the HUD policy development and research account by a like amount.

The other is one which I will offer to restore $20 million to the Selective Service System and take it from the HUD policy development and research account.

Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service System plays a vital role in our capability to mobilize quickly in cases of national defense emergencies.

And, Mr. Speaker, with all the unstable situations around the world today, a national defense emergency could happen at any time.

For the very small cost of $25 million, the Selective Service System has been able to maintain an ongoing, up-to-date list of young men who would be available and prepared to serve in a national emergency.

And, Mr. Speaker, with all the base closings and downsizing of our overall military capability, the need to quickly identify and mobilize additional military personnel becomes even more important.

And that is why President Clinton, at the urging of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of the Army who historically take 97 percent of inductees, have asked Congress—President Clinton has asked Congress—to continue funding the Selective Service System.

Mr. Speaker, the committee of jurisdiction, the Armed Services Committee has not determined that the Selective Service System be closed down, nor have they even held any hearings on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, ever since draft registration was reinstated back when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, millions of young Americans have lived up to their obligation as United States citizens, they have obeyed the law, and have registered for the draft.

Ninety-seven percent of them obeyed the law while the other 3 percent got off scott free and to now say we are going to pardon them and make them eligible for all the Federal programs like Pell grants and college loans and grants, is a slap in the face to all patriotic Americans but particularly to those brave, loyal, patriotic, young men who lived up to their obligations, and who obeyed the law.

Mr. Speaker, this appropriation bill before us today abolishes the Selective Service System.

If we terminate funding today, without making the necessary changes in the Selective Service Act, President Clinton will be placed in the awkward position of having to pardon all of those young men who refused to live up to their obligations as U.S. citizens.

That means these lawbreakers will be once again eligible for all the Federal benefits such as Pell grants, college loans, and Federal job training that they presently are prohibited from receiving.

And, I say to the Members, what a slap in the face that would be to all of these patriotic Americans who obeyed the law and lived up to their obligations to their country.

Mr. Speaker, we can prevent that from happening when the Solomon amendment comes up for a vote later this afternoon.

That amendment is supported by every major veterans organization in America.

On their behalf and on behalf of those young men who complied with the law, I urge you to support the Solomon amendment when it is debated this afternoon.

□ 1230

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, as the members of the Rules Committee know, I sought protection under this rule, I sought a waiver of authorization, legislating on an appropriations bill, for the simple reason that the members of the VA–HUD staff suggested that a provision that I offered in the full Committee on Appropriations, which was adopted overwhelmingly by a voice vote in the Committee on Appropriations, might indeed be legislation, or suggested, not that it might be, but that it was legislating on an appropriations bill.

I disagree completely with that analysis. In fact, when a point of order is raised later today, I fully intend to make that argument based on a series of authorizing pieces of legislation and several international agreements which I believe fully authorizes the language cited in the rule as not being exempt.

Let me cite to you on page 2 of this resolution we are now considering, House Resolution 208, wherein it says that on page 43, line 7, through "State cost share" on line 25, those particular lines are not protected under the waiver provided to every other part of this bill. Every other part of this bill is protected except the amendment approved overwhelmingly in the full Committee on Appropriations to do one thing. And what was that one thing? To protect poor children from becoming sick. That is what that was all about. It provided waste water treatment facility authorization and only $80 million nationwide for a 2,000-mile border with Mexico to try to improve the water and waste water facilities along that border which prevent children from getting hepatitis-A and hepatitis-B, that by the way along the United States-Mexico border is two to three times higher than the national average.

It is ironic to me that Members come down here and berate this administration and the last administration for offering the North American Free-Trade Agreement and complain it is because of bad environment, and yet when we attempt here in the Congress of the United States, Democrats and Republicans alike that helped me on this amendment, when we attempt to see to it that we deal with these environmental hazards and environmental problems of children who live in squalor and poverty on the United States side of the border, that is all this amendment did, deal with it on the United States side of the border, we are told that we are out of order, that we are not going to deal with that. We want to have something to complain about later, I guess.

I think that is a travesty and I think it is ridiculous. So I intend fully to argue after this rule passes and after somebody gets up and objects and raises a point of order against the language in the bill that it somehow is authorizing language on an Appropriations bill, I intend to argue that that is ridiculous, and indeed I think it is a real fault in the legislation.

I would say, too, Mr. Speaker, I think it is ridiculous that we would permit a rule to go forward that protects everything else except the one amendment that was meaningful, that was adopted by the full committee, that suggests that we need to begin to take care of our own citizens wherever they live.

I want to say at the outset here also, I have heard from a number of my Ohio colleagues who seem to believe that this is somehow helpful to the North American Free-Trade Agreement. I do not care if it is or if it is not. If it is, good; but that is not the relevant point here. What is important and what is relevant is whether or not we as a Nation are going to own up to our responsibilities to help take care of the people who can least take care of themselves.

President Bush, to his credit, initiated this line item funding of $80 million for the colonias along the United States-Mexico border. It was followed again by a line item in President Clinton's budget of $80 million for colonias along the United States-Mexico border. Both time, both years, last year and this year, this House has declined to fund it, 2 years in a row.

Last year, thanks to the Senator from Maryland in the other body when she offered the amendment, we were able to get it in conference and we succeeded in having it appropriated.

Why? A lot of us think because it was authorized and because at least in the other body some compassion was shown for children unable to care for themselves who indeed are drinking their own refuse. The cesspools and the water wells are located right next to each other 7 feet apart oftentimes, only 7 feet down in sandy soil.

Why are people living there? Well, it is a long story about lack of economic development, but perhaps more important, we have not had the housing for people to live elsewhere, so they go out and get a piece of land and believe they are earning a part of the American dream.

Well, I want to debate this issue, but I am not going to be allowed to, and I understand why not, because the committee decided that they wanted to be able to raise a point of order against this language, but we will continue to debate it as the afternoon goes forward.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for extending me the opportunity to argue against the passage of this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], another distinguished new Member of this House who I think will make the same argument, and I have some sympathy for the gentleman.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to seek justice. Today we will be considering the VA-HUD appropriations bill on the floor. The Rules Committee has drafted a rule to protect unauthorized programs like the EPA. However, they voted not to protect an amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. The Coleman amendment would help American citizens living in the colonias and requires no additional funds. The colonias are substandard residential subdivisions located along the United States side of the Texas-Mexico border. American citizens living in the colonias have inadequate and in many cases nonexistent drinking water and sewage disposal systems, substandard housing, and inadequate roads and drainage. The human cost is staggering. The Texas Water Development Board estimates that in Texas there are 300,000 residents living in 1,200 colonias.

Last week, the House Appropriations Committee approved the Coleman amendment that restores $80 million for waste water treatment projects along the border in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. This $80 million is not new spending. I repeat this is not new spending. The money is part of a $500 million discretionary program.

The administration believes this project is authorized and I quote:

> The administration commends the committee for specifically identifying $80 million in requested funding for water infrastructure grants for Mexican border projects * * * which is currently authorized in section 510 of the 1987 Water Quality Act. The funding is needed to address major water quality problems in the border area.

Americans that live in the colonias are living in Third World conditions. These proud Americans are not asking for luxury items, but necessities of life any common decent society should provide. Today on the border the temperature will reach over 100 degrees. The stench in the air and the searing heat makes it difficult just to survive day to day.

I am asking this House to remember these forgotten Americans. We must make sure that no American citizens live in Third World conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reemphasize that I believe we have been authorized. The people in the colonias are sick and suffering and will continue to if these water treatment facilities are not built.

The State of Texas has made a commitment by appropriating $250 million for the colonias. I hope the House will help this region of the United States that suffers silently because they do not get the attention that other parts of the country receive. No American citizen should be ignored and forgotten. The people of colonias deserve equal treatment. These American citizens have suffered long enough. I ask the House to recognize that the Coleman amendment is authorized and support its continued inclusion in the bill.

□ 1240

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], and I will ask him to yield to me.

Mr. BONILLA. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that there is certainly a lot of merit to the arguments made by both the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], but let me say this: I just spent the last 48 hours out at the U.S. Naval Academy meeting with Members of both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans. We are a task force that has been formed to try to reform this House and make it work, and work for each and every Member.

Unfortunately, what is happening to the gentleman is something that reflects on this House. Just for example,

at the same time we were having a hearing upstairs last Thursday on this bill—and you gentlemen were up there testifying to waive the point of order to allow you to be able to leave your project in the bill—we were hearing testimony on a transportation appropriations bill.

We on the Rules Committee are going upstairs in a few minutes and we are going to be acting on a rule on the transportation appropriations bill in which we are going to waive the points of order against a myriad of projects that have not been authorized. We are going to waive those points of order and allow those to be brought on the floor, and no points of order can be raised against them. Yet, conversely, you two gentlemen have the same situation. As a matter of fact, your situation is a better situation, in that there is a real gray area here, and when there is the benefit of a doubt, you certainly ought to be given that opportunity. You are being denied that opportunity, and I think that is wrong.

I bring all this out to say that I have sympathy for both gentlemen, but hopefully we are going to be able to reform the rules of this House so that we do not run into these kinds of problems year in and year out, and so that we can treat every Member equally and fairly.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I would also point out that there are unauthorized programs like EPA which just sail right through all the time. Certainly these are important programs, but there is nothing more important than protecting the lives of these young children along the Mexican border who live in Third World conditions.

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

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] for their articulate statements. I would just say that anything we do on the border with respect to environmental cleanup necessarily involves another country, and necessarily every single appropriation has to be subject and conditional to the international agreement between the two nations. We have always worked that way. There is no way for it to work otherwise, and it seems extraordinary that the Rules Committee does not recognize this and respect it, especially when the good health of so many American citizens is dependent on the legislation.

I thank the gentleman for his very appropriate remarks, and I just want to say that the people of southern California who are subjected to some of the extreme dangers because of pollution in the New River will be disserved by what the Rules Committee has done to us today.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for raising these points. They are very good points, and I appreciate that.

I would like to finish by thanking my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], for fighting very hard and taking the lead in this fight for these people along the border.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS].

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding this time to me, and I rise in very strong support of this rule and in very strong support of this appropriations bill.

I would like especially to commend the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], for their very strong support of a sizable budget for NASA and the space program and the space station in this bill this year.

In particular, I will be voting for this bill because it does provide a good budget for NASA, one that looks to the future, and especially I will be voting for this bill because it does provide for full funding of the President's proposal on the centerpiece of the space program and its future, the space station.

We will hear many arguments on the floor later today from opponents of the space station stating that this particular bill robs from other programs to fund space and the space station. I ask my colleagues to look beyond the rhetoric to the facts. The facts are these:

For the EPA, the Appropriations Committee has provided $269 million more than the President requested. For our very important veterans and for veterans programs, the Appropriations Committee has provided $113 million more than the President requested, and the President requested a significant increase. For our housing programs, the Appropriations Committee has provided $398 million more than the President requested, and for NASA, the subject of dispute, the Appropriations Committee, even while providing for a sizable budget, has provided $798 million less than the President requested.

Keep in mind, too, that funding for the space station is just $2 billion out of the $90 billion for this bill, and that funding for NASA is now less than 1 percent of the overall Federal budget. Funding for the space station is just one-seventh of the NASA budget.

Some say that the hard choices and the tough choices are to kill the space station. I say just the opposite is true. The tough choice will be to see through all the rhetoric and see the future and see what the space station and the space program offer to us in terms of science and technology and competitiveness and jobs and growth in the future.

□ 1250

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the Committee on Rules for allowing a vote today on the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to kill the space station, allowing it 5 days after a similar amendment to the NASA authorization bill was considered and failed by one vote.

The question is, Why should the Committee on Rules, less than a week after we voted on this issue, make it in order to vote on it again? I think the answer is an important one, and one that I hope some of my colleagues who voted against the Roemer-Zimmer amendment on Wednesday will consider carefully.

The fact is that a vote for a program in the context of an authorization bill is essentially a free vote, because it is not competing against any other program.

As Senator HATFIELD was quoted as saying in today's Washington Post, legislative authorization "is a hunting license," because it allows a department or agency to look for funding actually to carry out the authorized programs.

In contrast, when you look at the space station in the context of an appropriations bill, as we will today, you are talking about a zero sum game because every dollar spent on the space station is a dollar less spent on something else. It is either a dollar less spent on deficit reduction, a dollar less spent on veterans' programs, a dollar less spent on housing programs, or, as my colleague from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] has pointed out, a dollar less spent on NASA itself.

The fact is that, in ramping up space station expenditures in the appropriations bill in order to meet the request of the Clinton administration, the space shuttle program had to take a considerable reduction in its funding in the Appropriations Committee.

Similarly, there was a $40 million cut made in the HOPE Program, the home ownership program, initiated by Jack Kemp in the last administration, in order to free up money for the space station.

So this is a vote in the context of the real world; a vote in the context of competing needs and competing demands for our budget dollars, and in the context of an overall commitment that many of us have made for deficit reduction.

That is why many Members who voted last year against killing the

space station when the proposal was an amendment to an authorization bill shortly afterwards voted in favor of a similar amendment in the context of an appropriations bill. That is why this year I anticipate that many Members who voted against the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to the authorization bill will vote in favor of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to the appropriations bill, and one of those Members who has publicly announced he will do so is the chairman of the Democratic caucus.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased once again to support an open rule, though I obviously agree there are inequities in the waivers process. Today all Members start the week off right with a chance to impact important legislation through an open amendment process—and that is the way it should be when we are discussing spending taxpayers' money. I certainly commend Chairman STOKES and ranking member JERRY LEWIS for their willingness to place the product of their hard work in the hands of the Members of this House. I do not think they will regret that decision—open debate in the democratic process can only improve legislation.

Today we consider a bill that funds several very important functions—including veterans benefits, housing and the space program. These are diverse subjects but they are competing for the same very scarce resources. Because of the incredibly tight budget, we have a tremendous responsibility to ensure that all money is spent where it is needed most. Unfortunately, despite the hard work of the committee, I think we continue to fail in that challenge when it comes to veterans services. We are still spending millions of dollars in places where the veterans no longer are. Rather than following the veterans, dollars appear to still be following the political path of least resistance.

Florida, whose congressional delegation may not hold the most powerful committee seats, still has the Nation's second largest, oldest, and most severely disabled population of veterans. We have the third largest number of vets who served during wartime eras. And while the Nation's veterans population is declining, Florida's vets population is swelling every year.

During the 1980's Florida became home to almost 100 new veterans every day. Still, in the past 2 years we have ranked 45th in the country for access to VA hospital beds, and 43d in per-veteran expenditure for medical services and administrative costs.

Florida, which has never asked for special treatment, is once again having trouble even getting a fair shake. As the Florida Department of Veterans Affairs puts it:

VA should water where the flowers are, not where it's most convenient.

Using Florida as a case study, it is hard to deny that there is something way off target in the way we are prioritizing our Nation's veterans' resources. While I know we cannot fix the problem in one spending bill, the VA and this Congress have got to face this problem head on. In the meantime, I welcome this open rule so we can continue the debate.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I suppose that comes as no surprise. Minority Members have frequently opposed rules for consideration of bills on the floor of this House. The reasons for doing so today are a little unusual, however, because, as has been pointed out by the previous speaker, this is a generally open rule. I commend the Committee on Rules for bringing an open rule to the floor.

But I rise in opposition to this rule because I support retaining the $80 million in H.R. 2491. This was money added by the Committee on Appropriations for wastewater projects in the border States of Arizona, Texas, California, and New Mexico.

As has been already pointed out by the gentleman from Texas. [Mr. COLEMAN], this amendment was adopted overwhelmingly by a bipartisan vote in the Committee on Appropriations. It designates $80 million from a $500 million general protected fund in the Environmental Protection Agency. This money that is reserved for projects as they are authorized.

Now, I understand the subcommittee's efforts to fund only those projects that have been authorized. But I think there is a legitimate dispute here, one that suggests that these wastewater projects have already been authorized by previous legislation. Specifically, I am talking about the Rio Grande Pollution Control Act of 1987.

In fact, the author of that legislation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], testified before the Committee on Rules that his intent was to authorize such sums as necessary for the EPA and the International Boundary and Water Commission to oversee border wastewater construction projects.

Furthermore, I would point out that the $80 million will be used for projects originally requested by the EPA in its fiscal year 1994 budget request.

There is no doubt that these projects are very critical. The conditions along the border pose significant health hazards.

You have heard from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] about the colonias problem in Texas. I am more familiar with the problem we have, which is clearly a wastewater treatment problem in Arizona, where we have gravity flow from wastewater overflow.

In Arizona we have a problem of sewage overflow from Nogales, Sonora. Nogales is a community that burgeoning in population; it has grown more than tenfold in the last two or three decades. The capacity of the plant on this side of the border to handle that flow that has now been exceeded, and we desperately need a new wastewater treatment plant.

We must have additional capacity in the Nogales wastewater treatment plant in order to accommodate future growth. Some say this can get mixed up in the issue of whether or not we have a North American Free-Trade Agreement. I say, regardless of whether we have NAFTA or not, these problems along the border are going to become more pressing because the amount of trade and commerce between our two countries will grow. We simply must deal with these problems.

□ 1300

I urge my colleagues to say today, the time has come for Congress to take notice of this problem and to provide for funding for these projects. I urge that this rule be defeated so that we might make in order this amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, who just was with me at the U.S. Naval Academy, trying to reform this Congress.

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

I have been listening with interest to the arguments made thus far with regard to the space station vote that we are about to have in a little while. I was interested in noting, in reading the Committee on Rules report, that the amendment made in order for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] to offer on the floor with regard to the space station cut the money but does not cut the 602(b) allocation. So that when the argument is made on the floor that somehow this money is going to go to deficit reduction, it is not. It is going to stay in the 602(b) account allocated in this area.

Then we had, a few minutes ago, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] come to the floor and say where he wants to put the money back in, evidently, is into the Space Shuttle Program.

We just had a debate out here the other week about whether or not things had scientific value or not. The fact is that we are going to get a lot more scientific value out of the space station than we are spending the

money for sending people for short duration flights, floating around the Earth in the space shuttle. So all of a sudden, now we are beginning to get down to the real questions about what we are going to spend this money for.

It is not going to deficit reduction, pure and simple. None of this money is going to go into deficit reduction. That is not in the amendment. All this is going to do is be spent in other venues.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has sent out a letter, and he wants to put it into social welfare spending. That is what our real choice is. Do we choose to spend it on things that we already know how to do or do we choose to spend it on ourselves or do we choose to spend it on the future?

The fact is, this amendment is not going to give us one penny of deficit reduction. What it is going to do is reprioritize the spending either toward more social welfare spending or toward the space flying that we already do; namely, the shuttle flight. So now it has become clear, we have gone through the authorization fight. The authorization fight was supposedly on the issue of whether or not we were going to reduce the deficit. They lost that fight.

Now they are coming back, and they want to cut the appropriation. But in cutting the appropriation, it is about apportioning the money elsewhere. These gentlemen have decided it should go to social welfare spending and to shuttle flights.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

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

I just want to make one point. I was reporting on what the Committee on Appropriations did last week in cutting from NASA to fund the space station. The account they chose to cut last week was the space shuttle. But in the past, in the very recent past, we have seen many, many programs involved in space exploration and space science, the cutting edge sort of technology that both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I are in favor of, we have seen them cut over and over again. Among the space programs that have been cut or delayed have been programs aimed at the examination of the x-ray spectra and the infrared spectra of the universe and the study of comets and the outer planets in the solar system. We have even seen the zeroing out of the space exploration initiative, the only long-term planning program for human exploration into the solar system, because of the pressures on the NASA budget.

In my opinion, those pressures come principally from the space station.

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

Let me just point out that under this rule, it is an open, amending process. In other words, all the amendments that were requested before the Committee on Rules that meet the rules of the House, as projected by the Parliamentarian, are being allowed on the floor here today.

I do have some questions about the Coleman-Bonilla amendment, because in my opinion, I think it should be an authorized project.

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

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from New York for his assistance in the rules process. As a matter of fact, I think it should be pointed out to our colleagues that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has been very supportive of our efforts. I appreciate his statements on the floor today.

I would only say that the problem with the rule is that it does not provide the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] and I to have an amendment offered. As the gentleman said, it is because that is the reason we offered it in committee, believing it was authorized. And we will have to go to the Parliamentarian, I suspect, with our case today, because someone will surely raise a point of order against the amendment that is in the bill, because it was not protected by the Committee on Rules.

What we asked the Committee on Rules to do, as the gentleman may recall, was simply to permit us the opportunity to have our case here on the floor. If somebody wanted a striking amendment from the committee on the Democratic side, on the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, we want that to be made in order. Let us debate the issue on the floor, whether or not this is, a, authorized or not, or b, even in the event it is not, is it worth doing? Is disease of children along the border, which does not know a border, and by the way, it will be in Chicago and Los Angeles and everywhere else, once it happens on the border, I hope that Members understand that all we wanted was that opportunity.

So I just would say, that is the fallacy, that is the crippling part of this rule. It does not permit us to have our day before the House.

But I want to say to the gentleman from New York, I very much appreciate his efforts on behalf, in particular, on behalf of those children.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, again, just in final summation, I just again have great sympathy for the gentleman's position. The argument, of course, is with the Parliamentarian, whether this is an authorized project.

Again, I just feel every Member should be treated fairly. I do not believe they are in this House sometimes, and we really do need reform of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 132, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

YEAS—206

Abercrombie	Frost	McKinney
Allard	Furse	McNulty
Andrews (NJ)	Gallo	Meehan
Andrews (TX)	Gejdenson	Miller (CA)
Bacchus (FL)	Gephardt	Mineta
Barca	Glickman	Minge
Barcia	Gonzalez	Mink
Barlow	Gordon	Moakley
Barrett (WI)	Goss	Mollohan
Bateman	Greenwood	Montgomery
Beilenson	Gutierrez	Moran
Bevill	Hall (OH)	Murphy
Bishop	Hall (TX)	Murtha
Blackwell	Hamilton	Nadler
Bonior	Hastings	Natcher
Borski	Hayes	Neal (NC)
Brewster	Hefner	Nussle
Brooks	Hilliard	Oberstar
Brown (CA)	Hinchey	Obey
Byrne	Hoagland	Olver
Canady	Hochbrueckner	Orton
Cantwell	Hoke	Oxley
Carr	Holden	Packard
Chapman	Hoyer	Pallone
Clay	Hughes	Penny
Clayton	Hutto	Peterson (FL)
Clement	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Clyburn	Jacobs	Pickett
Collins (IL)	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Collins (MI)	Johnson (CT)	Poshard
Coppersmith	Johnson, E.B.	Price (NC)
Costello	Johnston	Quillen
Coyne	Kanjorski	Quinn
Cramer	Kaptur	Rahall
Danner	Kennelly	Reed
Darden	Kildee	Reynolds
de la Garza	Kleczka	Roemer
DeFazio	Klein	Rose
DeLauro	Klink	Rostenkowski
DeLay	Kopetski	Rowland
Derrick	Kreidler	Roybal-Allard
Deutsch	LaFalce	Royce
Dicks	Lambert	Sabo
Dingell	Lancaster	Sarpalius
Dixon	Levin	Schroeder
Dooley	Lewis (CA)	Schumer
Durbin	Lewis (GA)	Sharp
Edwards (CA)	Lipinski	Shaw
Edwards (TX)	Long	Shepherd
English (AZ)	Lowey	Shuster
English (OK)	Maloney	Sisisky
Eshoo	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Skaggs
Farr	Markey	Skelton
Fazio	Martinez	Slattery
Fields (LA)	Matsui	Slaughter
Filner	Mazzoli	Smith (IA)
Fingerhut	McCloskey	Smith (OR)
Ford (MI)	McDermott	Spratt
Fowler	McHale	Stark
Frank (MA)		Stenholm

Stokes	Thompson	Whitten
Strickland	Thornton	Wilson
Studds	Thurman	Wise
Stupak	Traficant	Woolsey
Swift	Valentine	Wyden
Synar	Visclosky	Wynn
Tanner	Volkmer	Yates
Tauzin	Watt	Young (AK)
Thomas (WY)	Wheat	Young (FL)

NAYS—132

Archer	Green	Miller (FL)
Bachus (AL)	Gunderson	Molinari
Baker (CA)	Hancock	Moorhead
Baker (LA)	Hansen	Morella
Barrett (NE)	Hastert	Myers
Bartlett	Hefley	Ortiz
Barton	Herger	Pastor
Bentley	Hobson	Paxon
Bilbray	Hoekstra	Petri
Bilirakis	Houghton	Pombo
Bliley	Huffington	Porter
Bonilla	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Bryant	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Bunning	Hyde	Ravenel
Burton	Inglis	Regula
Buyer	Inhofe	Roberts
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Camp	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Castle	Kim	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	King	Roth
Coleman	Kingston	Roukema
Combest	Klug	Santorum
Crapo	Knollenberg	Saxton
Cunningham	Kolbe	Schaefer
Diaz-Balart	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Dickey	Laughlin	Shays
Doolittle	Lazio	Smith (MI)
Dreier	Leach	Smith (TX)
Duncan	Levy	Snowe
Dunn	Lewis (FL)	Solomon
Emerson	Lightfoot	Spence
Ewing	Linder	Stump
Fawell	Livingston	Talent
Fields (TX)	Machtley	Taylor (MS)
Fish	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Franks (CT)	McCandless	Tejeda
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Thomas (CA)
Gallegly	McCrery	Upton
Gekas	McDade	Vucanovich
Gilchrest	McHugh	Walker
Goodlatte	McInnis	Walsh
Goodling	McKeon	Wolf
Grams	Meyers	Zeliff
Grandy	Michel	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—96

Ackerman	Foglietta	Pelosi
Andrews (ME)	Ford (TN)	Pickle
Applegate	Geren	Portman
Armey	Gibbons	Rangel
Baesler	Gillmor	Richardson
Ballenger	Gilman	Ridge
Becerra	Gingrich	Rush
Bereuter	Hamburg	Sanders
Berman	Harman	Sangmeister
Blute	Henry	Sawyer
Boehlert	Horn	Schenk
Boehner	Istook	Schiff
Boucher	Johnson (GA)	Scott
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Serrano
Brown (FL)	Kennedy	Skeen
Brown (OH)	Lantos	Smith (NJ)
Callahan	LaRocco	Stearns
Cardin	Lehman	Sundquist
Clinger	Lloyd	Swett
Collins (GA)	Mann	Torkildsen
Condit	Manton	Torres
Conyers	McCurdy	Torricelli
Cooper	McMillan	Towns
Cox	Meek	Tucker
Crane	Menendez	Unsoeld
Deal	Mfume	Velazquez
Dellums	Mica	Vento
Dornan	Neal (MA)	Washington
Engel	Owens	Waters
Evans	Parker	Waxman
Everett	Payne (NJ)	Weldon
Flake	Payne (VA)	Williams

□ 1328

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Berman for, with Mr. Armey against.

Mr. Manton for, with Mr. Skeen against.

Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Collins of Georgia against.

Mr. Richardson for, with Mr. Stearns against.

Mr. Sangmeister for, with Mr. Cox against.

Messrs. ROHRABACHER, McINNIS, and SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NADLER 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. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material, on H.R. 2491, the bill about to be considered.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was returning to Washington, DC, when the first vote was called. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on House Resolution 208, the rule to consider the fiscal year 1994 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies appropriation bill (H.R. 2491).

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. STOKES. 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. 2491) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2491, 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.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

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

Mr. Chairman, we bring before the House today the 1994 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies appropriations bill. As always, this is a very difficult bill to prepare, because it demands very difficult choices.

But in making those choices, we as a subcommittee, I believe, have attempted to be fair.

Our allocation was $900 million in outlays and $1,300 million in budget authority below the President's request. The question quickly becomes what programs should be reduced to meet that allocation.

This problem, of course, is not unique to this subcommittee. All discretionary spending is being squeezed as the budget caps, approved in 1990, continue to shrink the money available.

And I think I can accurately predict that next year we will be facing a fiscal year 1995 discretionary cap that will force further spending cuts. And frankly, the outlook beyond 1995 looks equally grim.

The Members may want to glance at page 3 of our report where the rationale we used for the 1994 bill is explained. The crux of the problem, as I suggested, is trying to achieve a $900 million outlay reduction below the President's request. Because, in this bill, 75 percent of first-year outlays occur in just two areas—VA medical care and NASA—that means that in order to absorb the $900 million outlay reduction, we must reduce one or both of those areas substantially.

But as I said, I believe we have been fair.

We are proposing a balanced recommendation. Every programmatic area has been affected—including VA medical care.

Obviously, we could not fully fund, or perhaps even fund at all, every meritorious program and activity in this bill. But I think we have tried to accommodate, as best we could, as many congressional and Presidential priorities as possible.

For the Department of Veterans Affairs medical care account, we have provided a total $15,522 million—a reduction of $120 million below the request. As the report suggests, we can make that cut because VA is experiencing a lower average salary cost than was estimated when the 1994 budget was put together last fall.

The medical care appropriation will support the requested staffing level of 205,000 personnel—including an increase of 2,554 FTE above the 1993 level.

Mr. Chairman, a part of the $120 million reduction in medical care was applied to medical and prosthetic research. In that account, we restored a $26 million reduction the President proposed below the 1993 level—and, at the suggestion of Mr. MONTGOMERY, chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, we added an additional $20 million to that account.

We have always believed that with a small investment in research dollars—we get major benefits in attracting doctors to our VA hospitals.

Under Housing, we are recommending $24,952 million—which is an increase of $390 million above the President's request. However, let me quickly point out that pending the authorization of VA construction activities and the new National Service Program—we have parked almost $400 million in budget authority in the assisted housing account.

When we take that into consideration—the committee is recommending essentially the President's request of $25.6 billion for the programs managed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Briefly summarizing some of the important housing programs, the bill makes available 64,510 incremental housing units—including 7,525 public and Indian housing units, 11,370 section 202 elderly and disabled units, and 41,338 incremental rental assistance units.

The bill also includes $1,250 million for the Home Investment Partnership Program—which is a reduction of $350 million below the President's request.

In response to a recent budget amendment, we have added $125 million to the HOME and CDBG programs and specifically target those moneys for ongoing assistance to the victims of Hurricanes Andrew and Iniki and Typhoon Omar.

We also include the President's request of $4,223,675,000 for community development grants and $702,900,000 for assistance to the homeless.

Turning to EPA, the committee is recommending a total of $6,632,583,000 in 1994 for the activities of the Environmental Protection Agency. That is $269 million above the budget request.

But before I describe some of the EPA details—I want to explain to the committee the ground rules we used regarding legislation and projects in the 1994 bill.

All of us are familiar with the fact that the committee has come under considerable criticism for legislating in appropriation bills and for including numerous unauthorized projects in our report language.

Consequently, Senator MIKULSKI and I met earlier this year and agreed that we would include no legislation—including language requested by the President—in the 1994 bill. The only exceptions made are limitations in order under the rules, technical legislation carried previously in this bill, and of course, major program activities lacking general authorization such as EPA, NASA, and NSF.

Further, we agreed that we would not include in the report any unauthorized site specific programs for projects. The bottom line is that any site specific project included here is authorized under program responsibilities for the agencies carried in this bill.

Probably no agency was more affected by this policy than EPA. I can tell you without hesitation that we have been importuned by many Members requesting legislation for projects that are not authorized—including requests from some Members who complained the loudest about the committee legislating in an appropriations bill.

We have resisted all of these requests. However, because the budget included a number of special water projects, the subcommittee recommended creation of a $500 million reserve that was available for grants to communities with unique circumstances or difficulties in meeting water quality standards. If these special water projects are authorized prior to March 31, 1994, they would be eligible to tap funds from this reserve.

Within EPA we have provided the budget request of $353 million for research and development activities—and the details of that account are outlined on pages 45 through 48 of the report.

We have also included the budget estimate of $1,367,535,000 for the abatement control and compliance account—and the increases recommended above the request are detailed on pages 48 through 54 of the report.

But, unfortunately, in our full committee, an amendment was adopted that earmarked $80 million of the $500 million pot for the colonias water projects along the United States-Mexican border. And, Mr. Chairman, we have no argument with the merits of this money. These communities desperately need assistance to ensure that proper sanitation and clean water is available day and night.

What incentive does the Public Works Committee have to get these projects authorized if the Appropriations Committee comes along every year and does it for them?

So at the appropriate time, I will offer a point of order striking the $80 million colonias provision and the accompanying legislation.

But that is not the issue. If we are going to fix the problem of having the Appropriations Committee carry pages, and pages of legislation that is not authorized—and then be told that when we try our best—exceptions will still be made—that simply is not fair.

Mr. Chairman, having said all of this, I also want to tell you that we will do everything in our power to assure that in the end we get these projects funded. We will extend the date beyond March 31 of next year if that's what it takes to reserve this $500 million for proper authorization.

We will do everything it takes short of legislation. We want to be helpful—but we also want to observe the rules of the House and try to turn the committee in a different direction.

The Superfund Program has been reduced by $80 million to $1,416 million. We continue to be concerned with the cost of the Superfund Program—particularly the cost of those activities, such as legal expenses, that have very little to do with cleaning up Superfund sites. The Administrator told us that further streamlining efforts were underway, and we are asking that EPA report on those activities by November of this year.

Additionally, a total of $2,477 million was included in the bill for water infrastructure activities—including the $500 million reserve I described earlier.

Turning to NASA, we have included $15,556,491,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

That is a reduction of $708,509,000 below the budget request.

As you are aware, the President ordered a NASA redesign team to take another look at the space station program.

That report was issued 2 weeks ago, and last week the President chose what is known as option A—a smaller, simpler, more modular space station—costing about $4 to $5 billion less than the current design.

I have not been a supporter of the space station program in votes that were taken during the last 3 years.

But I want to applaud the President for his efforts in trying to slim down this very ambitious project. I also want to support the President—and at the appropriate time, I will discuss the space station further.

In summary, however, we have included $2.1 billion for the space station program in 1994. In addition, the bill provides $200 million requested by the President for the new technology initiatives.

Many of these activities include exciting new technology—such as the hybrid rocket program and other competitive efforts. Coming back to the space station for just a minute, I want to pay tribute to the redesign team.

They did an excellent job. Probably for the first time, the true costs of the

program have been revealed. And what they reveal is that even the most modest version of a redesigned space station is significantly higher than the President had originally targeted for 1994 and outyear spending.

But now that the choice has been made, we have provided the money necessary to meet the program's goals.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all the members of the subcommittee for their active and interested participation—and conscientiously attending and participating in the hearings and deliberations that resulted in the development of this bill, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TORRES, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. GALLO.

I believe this is a balanced bill, a reasonable bill, and a compassionate bill.

It has not been easy, but I think our recommendations can be supported by the members of this committee and by the House.

Lastly, I want to thank the ranking member of this subcommittee, Mr. JERRY LEWIS, for his cooperation. JERRY and I were both new to our present responsibilities but we managed to get through it with the help of a great subcommittee staff.

In order to produce this bill our staff worked tirelessly and endlessly and gave up many weekends, including working late many nights. I want to especially thank Dick Malow, Paul Thomson, Michelle Burkett, Dan Cantu, and Shirley Day for all of their hard work on this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has indicated, this is our first year of working together as the chairman and ranking member of the HUD and Independent Agencies Subcommittee. It has been, to say the least, a most enlightening experience, for this is a very, very tough bill. It is one of those bills that has as much appropriations responsibility as any of the 13 subcommittees of the full Committee on Appropriations.

We have some $90 billion in expenditures within our bill, some $70 billion of that in discretionary spending. The mix of responsibility is extremely difficult.

When you look at the variety and mix of services that we provide for the veterans of this country, for example, they are very important programs. The people who are served by those programs are extremely sensitive about the priorities we establish.

Those programs then are in competition with housing programs across the country.

We fund the EPA within our bill. We also fund the National Science Foundation and the space program. Indeed, the competition is real in a year when you have got few new dollars to go around.

I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for his responsiveness as he has gone about the process of working with the ranking member.

As the chairman has noted, the 1994 fiscal year bill reflects those difficult choices that I have outlined, but difficult in no small part because they are driven by two fundamental realities. Our 1994 602(b) allocation increases spending over last year by $2.26 billion in its discretionary accounts, but that still falls $1.27 billion below what the administration has requested.

□ 1350

Mr. Chairman, our primary constraint is that we are some $900 million below what Mr. Clinton requested in our outlay allocations.

This bill reaches a number of decisions that I trust will meet with bipartisan support, and maybe even some enthusiasm.

We have increased medical care in the VA by $880 million or 6.4 percent over the 1993 levels. An amendment to come along later, may make another adjustment in that area dealing with VA medical research. We have increased the research funding for basic science missions of the National Science Foundation by nearly $190 million. We have fully funded the administration's request for HUD's highly popular community development block grant program at $4.2 billion.

More fundamentally, we have deliberately altered the way this subcommittee has worked to reflect the fact that the chairman and I are both in our first of responsibilities not just with the bill, but in shepherding the budgets of two Cabinet agencies and 22 independent agencies. Taking them through the appropriation gauntlet has been an education, to say the least. We have worked with at least four separate authorizing committees and deferred decisions subject to timely action on their priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for me to point out that the chairman has been very tough on items which have not yet received appropriate authorization.

We have not funded the administration's $394 million national service initiative pending final action by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

We have not included five separate VA major construction projects because they were not authorized by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on a timely basis prior to today's action.

We have fully capitalized the new safe drinking water revolving fund at $599 million subject to timely action by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation before this bill goes to conference.

And we have deferred actions on OMB approved budget amendments submitted by Secretary Cisneros in order to allow the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs to accept revised priorities with sufficient offsets. They have not been able to meet the Secretary's requirement on this point.

Last, Mr. Chairman, we have or are about to make choices which will be difficult for many in the House to accept. This bill operates from the policy perspective that a national draft for military service is needed only for a prolonged, global, and conventional war. For that reason, it terminates the Selective Service System and provides $5 million for the orderly conclusion of the draft. We will have an amendment that has been made in order in which we will have a thorough discussion of that question, and the House will work its will.

I am personally disappointed with the new administration's decision to diminish and then terminate Secretary Kemp's HOPE initiative. With the adoption of the chairman's amendment to find the $450 million needed to fund station and the NASA technology investment package an additional $85 million in HOPE funds will be rescinded. The subcommittee had already accepted the new Secretary's guidance and applied a cut of some 83.5 percent or $552 million from the fiscal year 1993 level on HOPE.

If I could speak just briefly regarding the 2 hours that we have set aside for discussion of NASA's responsibility, specifically station, I would hope that during that debate we would focus less than we sometimes do on the rhetoric. Instead we should make an attempt to reflect in some depth upon the importance of America's leadership and our responsibility and role in space.

Indeed the House has made its decision regarding authorization as it relates to space station. America is on a pathway that commits it to continuing its leadership in that program. In this measure we will be considering the President's direction as it relates to space station and its important role in space. The funding that is provided in this measure is a reflection of the work directed by the President. Those who worked on the Independent Review Committee and NASA's senior managers have made important sacrifices to bring us to this point.

Indeed we should do so with great caution and recognize that we have other high priorities within the bill and within our country. Americans are committed to the pioneering spirit that has brought us to our position of leadership in the world. America does have a responsibility as we explore that next horizon.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. This is the sixth appropriations bill for fiscal 1994 to come before the House and the first of seven for this week.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Stokes], the chairman of the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for bringing out an excellent bill.

This bill, as my colleagues know, Mr. Chairman, funds veterans, housing and science programs. The need for these programs continues to rise each year. Developing this bill with constrained funding allocations is quite a challenge. This subcommittee has done an excellent job under very difficult circumstances.

As I said earlier, this week will be an active one, Mr. Chairman, on the floor as the House considers the seven bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations last week. At the end of this week, the House will have considered 12 of the 13 appropriations bills. Only one remains, and that is the Defense appropriations bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], Mr. Chairman, are ready to bring this bill out. They are waiting on the Authorizing Committee, on some language that must be developed in the Authorizing Committee. We wanted all of these bills passed in the House by July 4, and sent to the other body, but one is held up.

I want to commend all of the members on the subcommittee for a job well done, Mr. Chairman, and to the staff of this subcommittee. This subcommittee has an excellent staff, as pointed out by the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the same as we do on all 13 of our subcommittees.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill, and I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for having yielded this time to me.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking member, on the work product which they bring to us today. I was privileged to serve on this subcommittee some years ago, and I say without hesitation that the content matter of this bill is as complex as any bill which reaches the floor of this House. The subject matter it covers and the range of topics which it addresses are absolutely mind-boggling, and it takes special people to come together and, like the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from California, bring us this bill which comes in a form which I find most acceptable. I want to congratulate them for the work they have done in this bill. I want to congratulate all the members of the subcommittee and staff who support them.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members of the House will give this bill a resounding vote of confidence.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2491, the VA, HUD appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

As a new member of this subcommittee, I have enjoyed working with our chairman, LOUIS STOKES and my ranking member, JERRY LEWIS.

A special thanks to our minority staff as well—Doc Syers and Bill Warfield—for their help.

Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has a difficult job of balancing priorities that are as diverse as any subcommittee on appropriations.

Within the budget we are given, we provide for our Nation's veterans, our local communities, our Nation's housing needs, protecting our environment and exploring our universe, through our space station.

I believe we have come very close to reaching the appropriate balance among all these competing needs.

We cannot do everything for all people under any of these programs. It requires tough choices and I am proud that our subcommittee has made those tough choices.

I am particularly pleased that we restored funding for senior citizen housing from the proposed cut in the President's budget.

I am also pleased that in EPA, we have provided some funding for clean lakes and for developing alternatives to ocean dumping of wastes.

I remain concerned about the reduction in Superfund especially in light of additional cuts to Superfund in the President's stimulus package. I hope that the committee will continue to work toward a conference agreement on this issue that will keep all planned cleanups on schedule.

In response to some criticisms of contracting expenses under Superfund, I am pleased that the committee adopted my amendment to cap those costs at 11 percent as recommended in a recent report by the GAO.

These are just a few of the items worthy of note in this bill.

I would simply say to my colleagues that this is a balanced bill worthy of your support and within the guidelines established by the budget and our 602(b) allocation.

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

□ 1400

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2491, the VA-HUD fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill.

Under the outstanding leadership of our new chairman and ranking member, we have produced a bill that all Members can be proud of.

Chairman STOKES has conducted the business of the subcommittee in an exemplary fashion. He has displayed the highest form of dignity and fairness in his work with Members on both sides of the aisle and with each agency under our jurisdiction.

This appropriations bill supports the need of our Nation's veterans. We have provided a 6-percent increase for veterans medical care. The bill also includes a 2-percent increase for veterans' service-connected compensation benefits and pensions. Medical and prosthetic research in one area in which the VA has been making great strides. Therefore, the committee felt it important to increase the budget request for this account.

For HUD, our bill strikes a delicate balance between encouraging home ownership and recognizing the need to preserve and improve public housing and rental assistance programs.

I am pleased to tell my rural colleagues that this bill is very friendly to our specific concerns and interests. It reflects the administration's new commitment to the special housing needs of small and rural communities and increases funding for programs that are successful in both rural and urban areas.

Funding has been significantly increased for community development block grants, home, section 8, homelessness assistance, and housing for the elderly and disabled, just to name a few.

Our subcommittee has followed Secretary Cisneros' able lead in crafting this section of the bill—we have laid the groundwork for fulfilling his goal to reinvent HUD.

For the Environmental Protection Agency, the committee has been sensitive to the needs of rural areas through strong support of the water infrastructure programs. We have also increased public water system supervision grants and provided funding for rural water assistance activities.

Every Member representing rural America knows of communities who

have difficulty complying with safe drinking water and Clean Water Act requirements. Let me assure Members that this committee is making every effort to solve these problems.

The subcommittee has recommended a modest 2-percent increase for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and within this budget we have successfully achieved funding for a balanced space program.

We have included significant increases for aeronautical research and development, a key component of President Clinton's competitiveness agenda. We have funded the redesigned space station program, maintained our commitment to a robust space shuttle program, and continued our strong support for NASA's mission to planet Earth. Further, we have ensured that NASA's space science programs are supported to reflect their priority role in the civil space program.

Despite a difficult fiscal environment, we have demonstrated strong support for our Nation's basic research capability by recommending an 11-percent increase for the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2491, the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. As ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I particularly wish to address the veterans' portion of the bill.

In my view, the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies faces one of the most difficult tasks of all the appropriations subcommittees. It has an almost impossible mix of high visibility and high priority programs with a funding allocation that just won't stretch far enough. I want to compliment Chairman LOUIS STOKES and ranking minority member JERRY LEWIS for doing the best they could for veterans under difficult circumstances.

Also, I want to compliment Chairman WILLIAM NATCHER and ranking minority member JOE MCDADE of the full Appropriations Committee. They have gone to bat for veterans many times over the years and I know that they too have done the best they could for veterans.

But, Mr. Chairman, from the time the VA and OMB in the executive branch send over a budget request and it goes through the convoluted process here in Congress, to the time appropriations finally result, the actual share of Federal dollars for veterans is billions smaller than it should be.

The dedicated men and women in uniform who earned the peace dividend aren't seeing their fair share of it. Our Nation's veterans deserve better funding for their benefits and services than they are getting from the administration and the Congress. With the level of funding H.R. 2491 would provide for fiscal year 1994, the Department of Veterans Affairs would not be adequately funded to carry out its major statutory mandates.

Veterans' health care would receive almost $900 million more than the current fiscal year. However, the increase is not close to current services budget. According to the highly respected independent budget analysis presented to the Veterans' Affairs Committee by AMVETS, the VFW, PVA, and the DAV, current services fiscal year 1994 funding for veterans health care would be $17.1 billion, not the $15.5 billion proposed in this appropriations bill. The independent budget uses as a base line fiscal year 1988, which is generally agreed to have been the last year the VA health care budget was adequate. A total of 38 veterans' groups, military associations and health care professional groups, including the American Association of Medical Colleges, have endorsed the Independent Budget.

The result of chronic underfunding is a VA health care system which is vulnerable to being absorbed or broken up under a new national health care policy, whatever it might turn out to be. Too many veterans must endure long waits for needed health care, and too many hospitals and clinics are obsolescent. The quality of care is generally good, but some VA hospitals are falling behind community hospitals, in what they can offer. The backlog of needed new medical equipment is nearly a billion dollars. There is nothing at all in this bill to reduce the backlog.

Mr. Chairman, the bill does have one funding enhancement which should not go unacknowledged. On May 11, 1993, I was an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 99, to call for restoration of critical funds for the VA's Medical and Prosthetic Research Program. VA medical research was literally facing extinction under the administration's completely inadequate research budget request of $206 million, a reduction of $26 million from the current year's appropriation. It contained no money for any new research projects. In a couple of years, as VA medical research programs were completed or ran out of funding, VA research would have gone out of business to the detriment of veterans and the public. Recognizing the seriousness of the problem the Appropriations Committee would restore funding to a sufficient level of $252 million for VA research programs to continue. I salute Messrs. NATCHER, STOKES, MCDADE, and LEWIS for their wise action to save the VA Medical Research Program.

Mr. Chairman, the overall story is unfortunately not much different for veterans' compensation and pensions. The VA does not have the resources necessary for timely and accurate claims processing. The backlog of VA claims is approaching 900,000. By this time next year, it could well be over a million. Service-connected disabled veterans wait many months for their benefits, and sometimes more than a year. It just isn't right that these men and women, some of them severely disabled, must endure a VA bureaucracy which does not have the staff and data processing equipment to do its job right. There is nothing in this bill to turn the situation around.

Our veterans who won the cold war and the Persian Gulf war have enabled the Government to save more than $150 billion. Tens of billions are being spent on mega science projects, food stamps, education grants and public housing. If it is approved, over $7 billion will be spent on a new nonmilitary national service program which will come out of this appropriations allocation in competition against veterans program. Veterans will receive a small increase of about $1.1 billion in the VA budget, an increase too small to meet their needs or even keep up with inflation.

Mr. Chairman, we should be able to do better by our veterans.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. Chairman, as we begin the business of this week in legislation, I fear that we may end up continuing to go down the path we set off on last week. This House is, step by step, presiding over the dismantling of this Nation's research and development activities.

Last week the space station survived by just one vote in the authorization process, but we voted to kill the Space Power Program, the Light Metal Reactor Program, and the superconducting super collider. Many of us were forced to make tough decisions, balancing the cost of a given program with its potential return, and then making a decision about whether that project should be funded by the Federal Government.

Others, however, seemed to develop a meat ax approach, viewing any program as pork barrel with deficit funding, even saying so on the House floor. I ended up wondering at the end of the week how many press secretaries used the term, "Jurassic pork," in some form in the press releases they sent out. Enough Members said it out here on the floor that it must have been the catch phrase of the week.

Today, however, we will again be facing important votes on the future of this Nation's space programs. I urge my colleagues to avoid the temptation of tarring every project with the same brush. Not all science is pork, and just

because this spending is discretionary does not mean that it is necessarily unworthy. What we have to do is look at our sense of priorities.

If we continue in the same pattern of cutting research and development, this Congress will be known not for its vision but for the relegation of this country to a second-class technological power. The jobs of our children and our grandchildren depend on having a technological edge on the rest of the world. We are in the process of cancelling their opportunities and the edge we have always had as a result of our space activities.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio, chairman of the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee, to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. STOKES. Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be happy to engage in a colloquy with the gentlemen from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of all the Members here today the importance of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

Congress, too, recognized the importance of this area in 1990 by enacting the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Act. This sanctuary is one of the largest marine-protected areas in the United States, and undoubtedly, the most heavily used and threatened. It also protects America's most valuable marine ecosystem.

Mr. STOKES. It sounds as though the Florida Bay is extremely important to water quality in this area.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes, it is. Water quality was the driving concern which caused Congress to expeditiously designate the waters around the Florida Keys, including the only living coral reef in North America, as a marine sanctuary in 1990.

Over the past 2 years, a detailed research and monitoring plan has been developed with the participation of State and local governments. The highest priority identified in this plan is the crisis in Florida Bay. The water quality problems of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary have geographic dimensions far greater than the 3,000-square-mile area within the boundaries of the sanctuary itself.

Further funding is necessary for the plan to begin scientific research and monitoring to guide and evaluate corrective actions that are moving ahead with the cooperation of many agencies. The Federal Government is not being asked to pay the entire cost of the needed actions, as the State of Florida and local governments are jointly involved.

It would seem to me that in order to fulfill our commitment to protecting this most valuable national resource, we must emphasize the need to fully support the water quality protection program now developed for the marine sanctuary.

I would ask my colleague for his assurance that, should additional funds for this project be provided later in the process, he will do everything he can to provide these funds.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has my assurance that I will make every effort to provide additional funds for this purpose and to review this issue during conference with the other body.

□ 1410

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that the appropriations subcommittees this year appear to be headed in the right direction by scrutinizing projects and spending more closely than they have in the past. However, there are still some improvements that can be made.

For instance, this bill contains $4.223 billion for community development block grants. That is up $223 million from fiscal year 1993.

When the President brought his stimulus package to the floor, we had a lot of money in there for community development block grant programs. We are going to be spending this extra $223 million on some of those programs.

Some of those programs included such things as a golf course, a beach parking garage at $5 million, a cemetery, historic preservation of a movie theater at $3.5 million, gym replacement at $4.5 million, swimming pool renovation at $3.22 million, and so forth.

So, I believe there is a need for community development block grant money. But to increase it at a time when we are having these severe fiscal problems is highly questionable, No. 1, and, No. 2, I question where this money is going to be spent and for what it is going to be spent.

In addition to that, I will be proposing an amendment that deals with the policy development and research at HUD. They are going to be requesting $25 million more than in fiscal year 1993. That is $50 million more than President Clinton has asked for. In addition to that, there is a real problem, because the spending in this area is going to be changed and it is going to be distributed at the Secretary of HUD's discretion. Do any of my colleagues remember the HUD scandal that we had before?

There should be congressional oversight of these spending programs, and we should not have a slush fund once again created at HUD. It appears as though that is what we are talking about doing.

So I would just like to say to my colleague, I will have two amendments dealing with these two areas, and I hope Members will look with favor upon both of them.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy about the Council on Environmental Quality [CEQ].

Mr. STOKES. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. As you know, the administration has proposed to abolish CEQ and transfer many of its functions to a new Department of Environmental Protection.

CEQ oversees the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA] by Federal agencies. It, or some successor institution, must continue to administer NEPA, one of this Nation's most important environmental laws.

I believe that none of us want to see the Council abolished without a suitable replacement to implement NEPA. Terminating the Council will require appropriate legislation, which is likely to be considered when this House takes up the EPA-Cabinet bill.

The father of NEPA and CEQ here in the House, our esteemed colleague, JOHN DINGELL, and I have been working on a proposal for a responsible replacement for CEQ and the transfer of some NEPA functions to the new Environmental Protection Department. I believe that we will be able to reach an agreement that is satisfactory to the administration, the Congress, the environmental community, and others.

Mr. Chairman, there remains the possibility that the EPA-Cabinet bill or the CEQ legislation will not be enacted by the end of this fiscal year. In that event, CEQ will need to be continued into fiscal year 1994 to carry out essential NEPA-related work.

I note that your bill, in conformance with the request of the administration, does not include an appropriation for the Council. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. STOKES. That is correct.

Mr. STUDDS. It was expected that the CEQ matter and the NEPA-related responsibilities would be completed by now. Unfortunately, these issues are not resolved.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like your assurance that, pending the enactment of a bill to replace CEQ, you will work with the other body in conference to address this matter and to support the Council for 1 more year

until this issue can be worked out with all parties concerned.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the authorizing committee that has jurisdiction over NEPA and CEQ, that I recognize the importance of the Council for the implementation of NEPA.

It is my understanding that, in the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill passed in the House recently, funds were provided for the new Office of Environmental Policy. This new entity was, in part, created to carry out some of the activities now conducted by the Council on Environmental Quality.

The gentleman has my assurance that, if a legislative resolution of this matter has not been found by the time this bill goes to conference with the other body, and the issue of the roles of the Office of Environmental Policy and CEQ have been resolved—including funding and staffing issues, I will make every effort to support CEQ at the time of conference. I would hope that I might get the gentleman's assurance too that he will do what he can to settle this matter legislatively as soon as possible.

Mr. STUDDS. The gentleman from Ohio has my assurance that Chairman DINGELL and I will make every effort to resolve the CEQ issue well before this appropriations bill is in conference. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his time and for his expression of support for CEQ.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this appropriation legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support, in general, of H.R. 2491—the important exception being the proposed funding for the space station.

This Member would also like to direct commendations to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking member of the subcommittee for their exceptional work in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the 1994 VA/HUD/Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 includes funding in the amount of $257,320,000 for Indian housing new construction. That amount is the level requested by the administration and is the same amount as last year's appropriation.

Balancing the great need for new housing in Indian country with the imperative facing us to reduce our budget deficit, a freeze at last year's funding level is entirely appropriate and the members of the committee should be commended for funding this program at this level. This Member also supports the appropriations level for the Community Development Block Grant Program, which is among the most effective and important to the Nation's municipalities of all sizes,

Again, Mr. Chairman, this Member commends the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking member of the subcommittee for their continued support of this important project.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

□ 1420

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and I do so by expressing my deep appreciation to my colleague from California for his leadership on the authorizing committee.

I must say to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], if he had not gone through the extended process, holding separate hearings, inviting Members not on the committee in to hear expert testimony, we would not have had the kind of support we had during the authorizing process. Indeed, I think the contribution he has made to this appropriations process is very important. I want the Members to know that, and I want to express my appreciation for that.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I certainly am grateful to the gentleman for his expression. Of course, since he participated in these activities, he knows how hard we worked. He also knows how much I appreciate the contribution that he has made to getting a better understanding of these programs and helping to support them.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

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

Let me just start out by associating myself with what the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], has said about the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and along with that my congratulations to the chairman of this committee on his maiden voyage as chairman of this subcommittee. I have thoroughly enjoyed serving with him.

I must say that the chairman is very much a breath of fresh air when it comes to NASA.

The gentleman from Ohio, Chairman STOKES, has been very open and honest with those of us that support the space program in this country and has been very cooperative. Our ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has done a yoeman's job in supporting NASA. And, of course, the gentleman from California, Chairman BROWN and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] have been just fantastic.

All four of these gentlemen understand how important to this country a space program is, how important it is to our young people, how important it is to our technology race in the world, and how important it is in developing new products and new services that create jobs in this country.

The President has recognized the importance of investing in our future through the space station program. He has also recognized the wisdom of selecting an option that preserves as much of the current space station *Freedom* design as possible, building upon the investment we have already made toward the goals of permanent human presence in space and full scientific capability in the orbiting laboratory.

Through the space station redesign process, billions of dollars have been targeted as savings. This is one Member that criticized the redesign process, when it was started by the President, but I must admit here and now that I was wrong. The redesign process has done some excellent work, particularly in the area of redesigning the management of our space program and bringing us a model of management that will make the space program run more efficiently. And we will be able to get the biggest bang for the buck.

But the space station funding in this bill represents more than $4 billion reduction over the next 5 years. That is at least a 25-percent savings. The annual cost of operating the station, once it has been in orbit, has been cut in half from $2 billion to about $1 billion. We can have a real space station and contribute to deficit reduction at the same time.

As a result of the redesign process, NASA plans to make major management restructuring, which they estimate will save $300 million a year. The Vest Committee believes savings from management changes alone can add up to anywhere between $700 million to $1 billion per year for NASA overall.

NASA, with a budget at seven-tenths of 1 percent of the Federal total, generates about $7 in return for every dollar invested by the Government. Dollars return in jobs, reinvestment in communities, and spin-off technologies.

Nationally, 75,000 people in 40 States are employed in space station-related jobs. At a time of cutbacks in defense spending and a weak airline industry, we cannot afford to deal yet another blow to the aerospace industry.

The space station is absolutely vital if human beings are to learn to live and work in space so that we return permanently to the Moon and go to Mars and explore outer space. We need the station to study the effects on the human body of long-term exposure to the rigors of space and a gravity-free environment.

Americans have always been pioneers. With the space station, we can

explore the most challenging frontier of all.

But as important as all this, space exploration has long served as an inspiration to our children. At a time when interest in math and science are waning, the exciting conquest of space has inspired many engineers and scientists. We cannot afford not to be in space and developing a space program in this country.

I appreciate our subcommittee and our full committee for supporting the space station and supporting NASA programs.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition today to this legislation. Most specifically, I rise in opposition to the expenditure of $1.4 billion to the EPA's Superfund.

I serve as a member of the Committee on Government Operations. As a new member, I have been appalled by the amount of waste, fraud, abuse, and lack of oversight of EPA.

During the hearings that we have held in the last few months we have come across facts that in the Superfund there is a total of $4.8 billion that could be lost because of the mismanagement, because of the inability of this agency to operate in a professional manner in the best interest of the taxpayers of the United States.

I offered before the Committee on Rules a measure that was ruled to possibly legislate on this type of appropriations bill. I just asked that a small amount of these funds be set aside to form a joint task force between the Department of Justice and EPA to go after the polluters.

This bill, as it is now structured, requires the taxpayers to foot the bill. Superfund was supposed to be a self-funding mechanism. This bill contains $1.4 billion to fund that supposedly self-funding legislation that we passed a long time ago.

This legislation allows that to continue. So it is with reluctance but in the interest of the taxpayers that I was elected to represent that I stand and speak in opposition to this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2491.

I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the new chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for their work on this bill as it relates to veterans programs. This is a very important measure for millions of Americans, especially veterans. It includes funding of $35.7 billion for veterans programs, an increase of $1.1 billion over last year.

Mr. Chairman, although the total amount provided in this bill for veterans is slightly less than what the administration proposed, it is a very good bill. In fact, it is actually much better than the administration's proposal in the important area of medical research. The administration's proposed budget for medical research would have required a reduction of $26 million in research. Had the subcommittee accepted the administration's proposal, the number of projects funded with VA research dollars would have dropped by more than 30 percent in 1 year. Instead, this bill provides $252 million for medical research—$20 million more than last year and $46 million more than the administration's proposal. This level of funding will allow the continuation of vital research at VA medical centers.

This is a very important change in policy, and I want to thank Chairman STOKES and members of the committee for honoring my request to not only restore this important program to last year's level but to actually increase the funding by $20 million. At a time when there is a movement to reduce the number of persons employed by the Federal Government, we must preserve the invaluable investment realized by VA research dollars.

I want to say a word or two about funding for the other veterans programs. Generally, the bill provides funding at the level proposed by the President—full funding for all veterans education, compensation, insurance, housing and other benefit programs. Since we have not yet reached agreement with the Senate on authorization for $112 million in major medical construction projects, funding for four projects proposed by the administration and three projects authorized by the House have been deferred. The subcommittee report notes that "sufficient funds will be available for these projects when the authorization bill is enacted."

With regard to funding for medical care, I think the subcommittee acted responsibly, and I will defend their actions for two reasons. First, the VA made a mistake in projecting how much money would be needed to pay its medical care work force. There have been major changes in the last few years in pay rates for doctors and nurses. These were changes resulting from laws we passed to make the VA a more attractive employer. VA overestimated the pay costs for over 205,000 medical employees during the next fiscal year. The error was about $125 million. So the reduction of $120 million in medical care should not have an adverse impact.

Let me emphasize this point. The dollars provided for VA medical care—$15.5 billion, $900 million above the 1993 level—will allow VA to provide more care and improve programs compared to the 1993 level. Employment will grow to over 205,000 FTEE, an increase of 2,554 above the 1993 level, exactly what the President proposed. This is a substantial gain for veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Mr. STOKES and the subcommittee for language contained in the report which urges the American Battle Monuments Commission to provide modest assistance in memorializing Bauer Field at Port Vila, Vanuatu. As the report states, it was from this island nation, formerly known as the New Hebrides, that the United States staged many hard-fought campaigns throughout the South Pacific.

I join the committee in hoping that some effort to memorialize this important and vital military activity can be undertaken as soon as possible.

Finally, I want to convey my concern for the reduction of $238,000 and 13.5 FTEE in the appropriation for the U.S. Court of Veterans Appeals.

The committee has reduced the court's budget request beyond the cuts OMB imposed on the executive branch. The court's request included eliminating four FTEE's. The reduction was specifically brought to the attention of the Appropriations Subcommittee. In the markup, the committee took the view that—from its own case projection for the court—a further 9.5 FTEE reduction should be imposed. The translated amount of the cut is $238,000. The imposed 9.5 FTEE reduction is really 13.5 FTEE or about a 16-percent reduction from the court's current 87 FTEE level.

Moreover, the Appropriations Committee's case projection seems to eliminate from the calculus the number of appeals which must be expected to arise from the ultimate final decision of the many cases—over 50 percent in fiscal year 1992—remanded by the board to the regional offices. Additionally, the report indicates that the committee applied to the court a case-staff ratio employed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. As explained to the subcommittee in the court's testimony on March 23, 1993, the court's far higher pro se rate makes that ratio inapposite to the court.

The additional 9.5 FTEE reduction would constitute a cut of 33 percent in the court's case-management personnel. Such a cut would not only delay case dispositions, but also would have a particularly deleterious effect on the special attention that the court gives to its predominantly pro se appellants. Finally, the committee report suggests that the committee intended only a total reduction of 9.5, not 13.5 FTEE since the report projected case-management staffing of 20 FTEE as compared to the court's current 29.5 FTEE, rather than the fiscal year 1994 request of 25.5 FTEE, for these personnel.

Again, I want to commend the leadership of the subcommittee as well as my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. NATCHER, and all members of the committee for their support of our Nation's veterans.

I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to the $12.3 million that this measure Appropriates for NASA's so-called Toward Other Planetary Systems or TOPS Program.

This $12.3 million continues the ongoing saga of NASA's infamous $100 million Seti project which scans the heavens for radio signals coming from extraterrestrial beings.

This is the same project which the Associated Press described as looking for little green men.

According to the story, more than 50 searches for space aliens have been conducted since 1960, scanning space for signals by intelligent life forms within our Milky Way Galaxy and others; with no results.

To me, this kind of track record does not exactly justify another $12 million appropriation.

In these tough economic times, I just do not think looking for extraterrestrial life forms is a priority.

I can almost guarantee that if Members of Congress went home to their districts today and asked any number of citizens what our Nation's top priorities should be, not very many would say "spending $12 million to look for extraterrestrial intelligence."

With our Naiton in such financial straits, I find it incredible that we are continuing on with this luxury program. It is just ridiculous.

The TOPS Program is a program that will not die. This is not the first time that opposition to this program has been voiced. My distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] offered an amendment similar to this in the 101st Congress, and the House supported his position. But the program continued. Last year we cut this program here in the House, as did the Senate in their authorizing bill. But the program continued. This program remains today because the Senate Appropriations Committee was able to skirt the authorization language by simply changing its name.

At a time when our country faces massive budget deficits, urgent health care needs, and inadequate educational funding, we have no business looking for aliens—intelligent or not.

Some supporters of the TOPS Program claim it has great educational benefits, and I am sure that there are many. But the amount of money that we are spending for this program could do much more good if we spent it directly on scholarships or educational programs.

But since the TOPS supporters have gone through the trouble to rename this entire project, they must have deduced that the American people are beginning to catch on to this bondoggle.

At least we could be fair with the people at home and change what the TOPS acronym stands for; maybe we should be honest and call the program "taking ordinary people's savings."

I realize that this $12.3 million will not make much of a difference in light of our yearly $300 billion deficits and our $4 trillion debt. However, the money we are spending on this program is money we do not have.

In an ideal world with unlimited resources, this program might be worth considering. I am a strong supporter of scientific research. Like all Americans, I enjoy the spirit of exploration. I, too, am curious to know if life exists on other planets. However, I just cannot believe that most hard-working Americans are curious enough to have us spend $12.3 million of their tax dollars to look for extraterrestrial.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2491, the Veterans Affairs [VA] and Housing and Urban Development [HUD], and Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

Agencies that H.R. 2491 funds in addition to the VA and HUD, include the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA], the National Science Foundation [NSF], the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC], and the Resolution Trust Corporation [FTC]. These diverse agencies support everything from community and neighborhood development, to programs for the homeless, to disaster assistance, to medical care and treatment for veterans and their eligible beneficiaries, to pollution control.

The major EPA programs which are funded by this bill include pollution abatement, control and compliance; waste water treatment facilities; and oilspill prevention and response activities. The EPA also subsidizes the costs of loans made to needy local education agencies to remove hazardous asbestos in school buildings. It additionally operates the hazardous substance Superfund Program, which was established to clean up emergency hazardous materials and spills and dangerous, uncontrolled, and abandoned hazardous waste sites.

H.R. 2941 also funds FEMA, the Agency that is charged with coordinating the entire Federal disaster assistance response by providing support and relief to public entities, individuals, and families. This includes protective measures, debris clearance, the repair and restoration of damaged facilities, and temporary housing.

The funds provided in this bill enable the VA to administer benefits for 27 million veterans, 42 million family members of living veterans, and 1.5 million survivors of deceased veterans—a total of 70.5 million people, or 28.7 percent of our total population. These benefits include pension payments; disability compensation payments; educational training and vocational assistance; guaranteed loans for housing assistance; life insurance policies; and inpatient care and treatment in hospitals, nursing homes, and clinics. The bill also provides for the major construction, modernization, alteration, and improvement of VA facilities, and supplies matching grants to assist States in the construction and establishment of State veterans' homes and nursing care facilities.

Through HUD, the bill funds programs that support our housing needs and the development and preservation of our communities. These include mortgage insurance programs that help families become homeowners and facilitate the construction and rehabilitation of rental units; rental assistance programs for lower income families who otherwise could not afford decent housing; programs that aid community and neighborhood development and preservation; and programs that help protect the home buyer in the marketplace.

One of HUD's most effective programs is the Community Development Block Grant Program, or CDBG, which supports grants to State and local governments for local community development initiatives, such as decent, affordable housing, suitable living environments, and expansion of economic opportunity. These CDBG funds are often the only sources of revenue for new or previously unfunded public services, particularly in rural areas. These funds also generate local employment opportunities.

For example, CDBG loans to small businesses—at favorable rates and terms—enable them to hire local workers, both temporarily and permanently. When the loans are repaid, they are recycled to other businesses, continually feeding and sustaining the local economy. The fallout from a CDBG loan can be enormous, especially in an area where unemployment is high.

Colusa County, in my district, has participated in the CDBG Program for over 10 years now, and uses much of its CDBG funds for economic development. Its revolving loan fund for small businesses has enabled many of them to stay afloat and support the surrounding area. CDBG funds also provide support for Tehama County's Housing Rehabilitation Program, which assists low-income residents in securing home repair assistance thru affordable loans, project planning assistance, and the services of a licensed contractor.

In Yolo County, CDBG funds are used primarily for housing rehabilitation; over 100 units have been rehabilitated since 1987. However, the county also lent CDBG economic development funds to a small firm for job creation. The firm has since then totally repaid the loan, and the county can now recycle the funds into a revolving loan fund for job generation in other small businesses.

CDBG funds eliminated a health hazard by supporting a water hookup program in unincorporated Yuba City. In an area where low-income homes were built close together on small lots, their wells and septic tanks were also right next to each other. This created a health problem—The septic tanks were contaminating the well water. However, CDBG funds were put to use installing a water line, enabling the residents to access the city's water system and abandon their contaminated wells.

The city of Orland used CDBG funds to enable the local almost industry to bring its brine sewer ponds in compliance with new State standards for protecting ground water from brine water contamination. Without CDBG support, the industry would have been unable to meet the required standards and would have been forced to shut down and leave the area. Because of CDBG funding, however, 90 direct jobs were retained—jobs that would have been eliminated when these businesses closed. The economic impact was even greater because, in Orland, each of these direct agricultural jobs creates approximately seven other indirect jobs.

Chairman STOKES and the members and staff of the subcommittee have set funding priorities for the wide variety of agencies and programs that this bill supports. Yet, the total funding level in bill that they have produced is significantly below both the subcommittee's funding target and the President's budget request. The total funds appropriated in the bill are $14 million less than its target, and $1.3 billion less than requested by the President.

The subcommittee has managed to achieve a balance—between meeting the needs of the many Americans who depend on the programs and services that this bill funds, and being fiscally responsible. H.R. 2941 will ensure that millions of Americans have access to decent housing and neighborhoods, quality medical care, and a clean environment. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I commend the leadership of Chairman STOKES and laud him for educating the public and the Congress on the value of space station *Freedom*.

Last week, this body authorized space station *Freedom* by one vote.

Where is the leadership, where is the desire to keep America's competitive edge, where is the drive to explore new frontiers? We must,

as a nation, continue to foster discovery and exploration.

Today's vote is a referendum on our Nation's commitment to excellence, our vision for the future, and our ability to compete in the global marketplace.

Of course we, as a deliberative body, must face the current fiscal reality. I've weighed the pros and cons of NASA's space station. I've looked at its budgetary and economic impact. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have worked to get assurances from NASA that new management reforms will bring tighter budgetary controls on the space station.

There is no question in my mind that for this society to progress we must have a lofty goal to reach. Space station *Freedom* embodies American frontierism. This Congress must realize the importance of providing the platform for scientific, educational, and cultural leadership.

Our action on the space station will affect over 230,000 Americans working on NASA's programs. In the State of California alone, space station *Freedom* employs 4,261 people. These individuals are among America's finest in the world's scientific community. They are the engine that powers our Nation's technological progress. I urge my colleagues not to put the blinders on America's scientific and competitive edge. Now, more than ever, now, we must fund space station *Freedom*. Haven't we been looking for ways to redirect our Nation's high technology expertise in defense related industries. How can we justify eliminating space station when we are leaving thousands unemployed in defense. The best defense conversion plan for our Nation is to fully fund NASA's programs and the space station.

Some would say that the private sector will pick up the pieces of the American space program. The only thing I've seen coming out of the private sector is a plan for giant space billboard—this is not high technology, this is not leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support space station *Freedom* and keep American frontierism alive.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an annual connundrum for Members such as myself who are basically supportive of most of the funding in the VA/HUD/Independent Agencies bill for HUD housing and community development programs, for the Environmental Protection Agency, for our veterans programs, and for basic science and research programs. Nonetheless, I continue to oppose science fiction-like programs; the space station program and other such spending like the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor [ASRM] which is generously maintained through this appropriation legislation—business as usual. In these leaner budget times, I am hard pressed to support legislation that provides for the continued cannibalization of our critically important domestic programs on Earth for make believe space science research benefits and programs. With the justification that it is important to tangential medical research, that it is too big a project to stop. Is the space station too big to stop? I don't think so nor should my colleagues.

There are some substantial reasons, however, to support this 1994 spending bill measure. I am extremely pleased at the direction the funding has taken for the homeless assistance programs that are part of the McKinney Homeless Assistance authorization bill that I sponsor. In lieu of the problematic administration requests for the homeless programs since their inception, this year Congress received requests to increase the funding for the McKinney homeless programs. Additionally, this bill redirects funds from a less successful Shelter Plus Care Program to the highly successful and utilized Emergency Shelter Grants Program. I am pleased at this recognition and at the more modest increase in the FEMA Emergency Food and Shelter Program whose work is exemplary in our local communities. Along with these and the ongoing homeless Veterans health care programs, this bill does specifically appropriate $10 million in funds for the new Veteran's Community Based Organization Grant Program for homeless veterans, which I support.

I am pleased at the attention the subcommittee and committee have paid toward increasing funds for certain housing programs, like the HOME Program, CDBG, and public housing for a total appropriation for HUD housing programs of $20.1 billion. I remain hopeful that our next appropriations bill will see additional funding for assisted housing, section 8 assistance, and public housing as that funding is key to moving beyond the McKinney homeless programs to permanent housing for our citizens. That will only be possible if we can redirect our priorities to address the human deficit which has grown so dramatically the last decade. To achieve such change we must cut the excess of the space station, the ASRM, and other bloated programs, and truly reorder our priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I would note my support for some specific programs, such as the highly successful Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. NRC, whose programs include the Neighborworks Network, received an increase in funding to bring them to $30.5 million. This is funding well spent as they leverage these Federal funds to bring community revitalization to hundreds of neighborhoods around the country.

I am unable to point out all the specifics concerning this proposed appropriation, suffice it to note that these programs of HUD, EPA, and VA respond to commitments to people and real needs. I strongly urge support for the amendment to cut funding for the space station, and then to support the passage of this instrumental appropriations bill. I thank Chairman STOKES and his staff for their work in crafting these spending priorities and am hopeful that we will, with this measure, begin to address the many commitments and concerns within our communities and cities.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2491. I do so reluctantly, because I strongly support improved medical care for America's veterans. These brave men and women risked their lives for our country, and the least we can do is ensure that they receive the best medical treatment available.

Yet I fail to understand why, year after year, our veterans are held hostage to pork-barrel spending during the House appropriations process—and this bill has too much pork.

It is only the sheer arbitrariness of this process that causes funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA] to be thrown into the same bill with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, NASA and 19 other independent agencies.

Why should our veterans—who have already fought and bled for all of us—now be forced to fight for increasingly scarce Federal dollars against space stations, pork for big-city mayors and executive branch slush funds?

It is patently unfair that Congress' failure to cut out wasteful Government spending and reduce the budget deficit is being placed on the backs of veterans. As a cosponsor of House Resolution 154, which would separate funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs from all other general appropriations bills, I cannot in good conscience vote for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we already have clean, separate votes on defense spending and military construction projects—why can't we do the same for veterans' health care, compensation payments and pensions? It is simply political cynicism to pit these worthy programs against the space station.

While I vote against this bill today with great reluctance, I offer one message for my colleagues: In the future, let us have a separate vote for VA funding and honor our commitment to our Nation's brave veterans.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment to kill the advanced liquid metal reactor.

The ALMR system is an advanced reactor power plant and fuel cycle concept being jointly developed by U.S. industry and the National Laboratories under DOE sponsorship. We in Congress have supported this ALMR development for the past several years. This important cost-shared R&D program is also supported by utilities, industry, and foreign countries with great potential for commercialization after 2010.

Mr. Speaker, countries around the world recognize the important role nuclear power must play in the production of clean, safe, economical, and abundant electricity. Global markets for United States industry are rapidly increasing in countries such as Japan, Taiwan, Korea, and Indonesia. These countries continue to look to America for leadership in nuclear power technology. The nuclear power plant market potential in the Pacific rim nations during the next 15 years is estimated to be over $175 billion. This represents well over 100,000 U.S. jobs.

The United States cannot send the signal to the international marketplace that we are abandoning our leadership role in nuclear energy. Clearly we need to continue the commitment needed to maintain U.S. industries leadership for an effective national and export program for nuclear plants, technology, and services.

Mr. Speaker, the advanced liquid metal reactor program has the potential to meet our Nation's long-term energy needs. In addition, the ALMR will address the spent fuel challenges of the light-water reactor industry, provide a path for conversion of weapons plutonium to useful energy, and strengthen the United States technical and economic world leadership. A strong U.S. nuclear industry can and must be a major contributor to the world's need for clean, safe, and low cost electricity.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment to cancel the ALMR program.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is an opportunity for Congress to recognize the efforts of our veterans for their past duty to our country. It allows our country's children to reap future rewards from wise investment today. Finally, it empowers low-income Americans by giving them the chance to own a home. These important provisions lead me to support H.R. 2491.

The United States does more to provide for those who have fought for democracy and liberty than any other country in the world, and this commitment should continue in 1994. H.R. 2491 would provide almost $36 billion in fiscal year 1994 for veterans' programs and benefits. Our 27 million veterans and their families currently benefit from worthwhile veterans' programs such as housing loan guarantees, life insurance, educational assistance, medical benefits, pensions, and a national cemetery system. This bill will see that the needs of veterans are fulfilled as the Government has promised.

Veterans have served our country to defend and preserve our freedom and the freedom of other nations throughout the world. I believe that Congress must place a high priority on improving and expanding, not just maintaining, veterans' programs. The $1.1 billion increase in funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs will work toward this goal.

H.R. 2491 also provides over $2 billion in funding for space station *Freedom*. Although I am aware that the space station is a significant financial commitment, it is my feeling that the potential long-term benefits of the space station far outweigh the immediate costs of the program. Over the years, research conducted through our space program has advanced human knowledge and resulted in technological innovations that help Americans today. Space station *Freedom* could lead us to advancements in telecommunications, medicine, surgery, and optics. Our children can enjoy a greater standard of living tomorrow with this important investment today.

The space station is also a vital component in our Nation's drive to remain technologically competitive in the global economy. Without this proper Federal investment in space technology, I fear that intellectual and technological progress will stagnate in our country.

I also want to emphasize the importance of the HOPE Program that is funded in this bill. HOPE provides Federal assistance to help low-income families buy and rehabilitate single-family homes. Although there have been some bureaucratic problems and delays in getting this program fully functional since its inception 3 years ago, I feel that the concept of allowing low-income Americans to own their homes is a sound idea that has great potential to transform urban neighborhoods. If someone owns property, that person will have more incentive to maintain and improve it. Community pride attained through ownership can be a major force in revitalizing troubled areas in our country.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2491, the Veterans Affairs [VA] and Housing and Urban Development [HUD], and Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

Agencies that H.R. 2491 funds in addition to the VA and HUD include the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA], the National Science Foundation [NSF], the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC] and the Resolution Trust Corporation [RTC]. These diverse agencies support everything from community and neighborhood development, to programs for the homeless, to disaster assistance, to pollution control, to medical care and treatment for veterans and their eligible beneficiaries.

The major EPA programs which are funded by this bill include pollution abatement, control and compliance; wastewater treatment facilities; and oil spill prevention and response activities. The EPA also subsidizes the costs of loans made to needy local education agencies to remove hazardous asbestos in school buildings. It additionally operates the hazardous substance Superfund Program, which was established to clean up emergency hazardous materials and spills and dangerous, uncontrolled and abandoned hazardous waste sites.

H.R. 2491 also funds FEMA, the agency that is charged with coordinating the entire Federal disaster assistance response by providing support and relief to public entities, individuals and families. This includes protective measures, debris clearance, the repair and restoration of damaged facilities, and temporary housing.

The funds provided in this bill enable the VA to administer benefits for 27 million veterans, 42 million family members of living veterans, and 1.5 million survivors of deceased veterans—a total of 70.5 million people, or 28.7 percent of our total population. These benefits include pension payments, disability compensation payments, educational training and vocational assistance, guaranteed loans for housing assistance, life insurance policies, and inpatient care and treatment in hospitals, nursing homes, and clinics. The bill also provides for the major construction, modernization, alteration, and improvement of VA facilities, and supplies matching grants to assist States in the construction and establishment of State veterans' homes and nursing care facilities.

Through HUD, the bill funds programs that support our housing needs and the development and preservation of our communities. These include mortgage insurance programs that help families become homeowners and facilitate the construction and rehabilitation of rental units; rental assistance programs for lower income families who otherwise could not afford decent housing; programs that aid community and neighborhood development and preservation; and programs that help protect the homebuyer in the marketplace.

One of HUD's most effective programs is the Community Development Block Grant, or CDBG, Program, which supports grants to State and local governments for local community development initiatives, such as decent, affordable housing, suitable living environments, and expansion of economic opportunity. These CDBG funds are often the only sources of revenue for new or previously unfunded public services, particularly in rural areas. These funds also generate local employment opportunities.

For example, CDBG loans to small businesses—at favorable rates and terms—enable them to hire local workers, both temporarily and permanently. When the loans are repaid, they are recycled to other businesses, continually feeding and sustaining the local economy. The fallout from a CDBG loan can be enormous, especially in an area where unemployment is high.

Colusa County, in my district, has participated in the CDBG program for over 10 years now, and uses much of its CDBG funds for economic development. Its revolving loan fund for small businesses has enabled many of them to stay afloat and support the surrounding area. CDBG funds also provide support for Tehama County's Housing Rehabilitation Program, which assists low-income residents in securing home repair assistance through affordable loans, project planning assistance and the services of a licensed contractor.

In Yolo County, CDBG funds are used primarily for housing rehabilitation; over 100 units have been rehabilitated since 1987. However, the county also lent CDBG economic development funds to a small firm for job creation. The firm has since then totally repaid the loan, and the county can now recycle the funds into a revolving loan fund for job generation in other small businesses.

CDBG funds eliminated a health hazard by supporting a water hookup program in unincorporated Yuba City. In an area where low-income homes were built close together on small lots, their wells and septic tanks were also right next to each other. This created a health problem—the septic tanks were contaminating the well water. However, CDBG funds were put to use installing a water line, enabling the residents to access the city's water system and abandon their contaminated wells.

The city of Orland used CDBG funds to enable the local almond industry to bring its brine sewer ponds in compliance with new State standards for protecting groundwater from brine water contamination. Without CDBG support, the industry would have been unable to meet the required standards and would have been forced to shut down and leave the area. Because of CDBG funding, however, 90 direct jobs were retained—jobs that would have been eliminated when these businesses closed. The economic impact was even greater because, in Orland, each of these direct agricultural jobs creates approximately seven other indirect jobs.

Chairman STOKES and the members and staff of the subcommittee have set funding priorities for the wide variety of agencies and programs that this bill supports. Yet, the total funding level in bill that they have produced is significantly below both the subcommittee's funding target and the President's budget request. The total funds appropriated in the bill are $14 million less than its target, and $1.3 billion less than requested by the President.

The subcommittee has managed to achieve a balance—between meeting the needs of the many Americans who depend on the programs and services that this bill funds, and being fiscally responsible. H.R. 2491 will ensure that millions of Americans have access to decent housing and neighborhoods, quality medical care and a clean environment. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, debate on the amendment specified in House Report 103–159, to be offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] or a designee, and on any amendments thereto, shall be debatable for 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendments en bloc specified in House Report 103–159 to be offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] or a designee, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], or a designee, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to amendment.

□ 1430

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of Article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, and for other benefits as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 50 U.S.C. App. 540–548; 43 Stat. 122, 123; 45 Stat. 735; 76 Stat. 1198), $16,828,446,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than $38,919,000 of the amount appropriated shall be reimbursed to "General operating expenses" and "Medical care" for necessary expenses in implementing those provisions authorized in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, Public Law 101–508, and in the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992, Public Law 102–568, the funding source for which is specifically provided as the "Compensation and pensions" appropriation: *Provided further*, That $6,000,000 of the amount appropriated shall be transferred to "Medical facilities revolving fund" to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized by the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992, Public Law 102–568.

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, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61), $947,400,000, 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), $15,370,000, to remain available until expended.

GUARANTY AND INDEMNITY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $56,231,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $70,716,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That during 1994, 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, $2,863,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $1,032, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 3698, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $3,571.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $186,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $53,000, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 31, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $2,387,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $751,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by section 38, U.S.C. chapter 37, subchapter V, as amended, $156,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries receiving care in Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs; oversight, engineering and architectural activities not charged to project cost; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); aid to State homes as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 1741); and not to exceed $2,000,000 to fund cost comparison studies as referred to in 38 U.S.C. 8110(a)(5); $15,522,452,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That of the sum appropriated, $9,850,000,000 is available only for expenses in the personnel compensation and benefits object classifications: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $531,350,000 is for the equipment and land and structures object classifications only, which amount shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 1994, and shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided further*, That of the sum appropriated, $10,000,000 is for homeless programs authorized by sections 2, 3, and 4 of Public Law 102–590.

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, 1995, $252,000,000, 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, $10,386,000.

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; administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, architectural, engineering, real property acquisition and disposition, construction and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including site acquisition; engineering and architectural activities not charged to project cost; and research and development in building construction technology; $68,500,000, 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. 1732), 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, 1995.

TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $7,000, as authorized by Public Law 102-54, section 8: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $70,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $52,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the "General post fund", as authorized by Public Law 102-54, section 8.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail; $823,249,000.

NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of the National Cemetery System not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of six passenger motor vehicles, for use in cemeterial operations; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $70,507,000.

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, $31,436,000.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is $3,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, $322,793,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $14,000,000 shall be transferred from the Parking revolving fund to this account and the amounts transferred shall be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as funds appropriated to this account: *Provided further*, 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 1994, for each approved project shall be obligated (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 1994, and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 1995: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall promptly report in writing to the Comptroller General and to the Committees on Appropriations any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above; and the Comptroller General shall review the report in accordance with the procedures established by section 1015 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (title X of Public Law 93-344): *Provided further*, That no funds from any other account except the "Parking revolving fund", may be obligated for constructing, altering, extending, or improving a project which was approved in the budget process and funded in this account until one year after substantial completion and beneficial occupancy by the Department of Veterans Affairs of the project or any part thereof with respect to that part only: *Provided further*, That 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, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than $3,000,000, $153,540,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous "Construction, minor projects" appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is less than $3,000,000: *Provided*, That funds in this account shall be available for (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe, and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

For the parking revolving fund as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 8109), $1,353,000, 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. 8109 except operations and maintenance costs which will be funded from "Medical care".

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist the several States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 8131-8137), $41,080,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veteran cemeteries as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 2408), $5,242,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Any appropriation for 1994 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 1994 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 revolving fund") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

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 1994 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 1993.

Appropriations accounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1994 shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from title X of the Competitive Equality Banking Act,

Public Law 100–86, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable from "Compensation and pensions".

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND OPPORTUNITY FOR PEOPLE EVERYWHERE GRANTS (HOPE GRANTS)

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For the homeownership and opportunity for people everywhere (HOPE grants) program as authorized under title III of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437aaa et seq.) and subtitles A, B, and C of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101–625), $109,190,000, to remain available until expended, of which up to one and one-half percent may be made available for technical assistance to potential applicants, applicants and recipients of assistance under this head as authorized under subtitle E of title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992.

Of the amounts provided under this heading in Public Law 102–389 and Public Law 102–139, $250,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount, $130,000,000 shall be deducted from the amount earmarked for HOPE for the Public and Indian Housing Homeownership Program and $75,000,000 shall be deducted from the amount earmarked for HOPE for Homeownership of Multifamily Units Program in Public Law 102–389, and $45,000,000 shall be deducted from the amount earmarked for HOPE for the Public and Indian Housing Homeownership Program in Public Law 102–139.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101–625), as amended, $1,250,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For additional amounts for the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, subject to the terms provided under this head in the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1992, Public Law 102–368, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended ("the Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 1437), not otherwise provided for, $9,192,900,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That to be added to and merged with the foregoing amounts there shall be up to $242,680,000 of amounts of budget authority (and contract authority) reserved or obligated in prior years 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 herein provided, for programs under section 8 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f), which are recaptured during fiscal year 1994: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this head, $257,320,000 shall be for the development or acquisition cost of public housing for Indian families, including amounts for housing under the mutual help homeownership opportunity program under section 202 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437bb); and $400,000,000 shall be for the development or acquisition cost of public housing, of which up to one-half of one percent shall be available for technical assistance and inspection of public housing agencies by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this head, $3,100,000,000 shall be for modernization of existing public housing projects pursuant to section 14 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437l), including up to two-fifths of one percent for the inspection of modernization units and provision of management and technical assistance by the Secretary for troubled public housing agencies and Indian housing authorities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this head, $1,381,518,000 shall be for rental assistance under the section 8 existing housing certificate program (42 U.S.C. 1437f) and the housing voucher program under section 8(o): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this head, $8,400,000 shall be available for fees under section 23(h) for the family self-sufficiency program (42 U.S.C. 1437u): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this head, $1,228,997,000 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, and $599,559,000 shall be for assistance for State or local units of government, 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 Emergency Low-Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987, as amended: *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), 8(o), and 8(e)(2) shall be established or increased in accordance with the authorization for such fees in section 8(q) of the Act: *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 be rescinded, or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this head, $125,000,000 shall be for housing opportunities for persons with AIDS under title VIII, subtitle D of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, $150,000,000 shall be for the lead-based paint hazard reduction program as authorized under sections 1011 and 1053 of the Residential Lead-Based Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, and $30,000,000 shall be for service coordinators in pubilc housing pursuant to section 9(a)(1)(b)(ii) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

Of the total amount provided under this head, $1,023,350,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance, and amendments to contracts for project rental assistance, for supportive housing for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959: *Provided further*, That $15,855,000 shall be for service coordinators pursuant to section 202(q) of the Housing Act of 1959.

Of the total amount provided under this head, $445,373,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act; and for project rental assistance, and amendments to contracts for project rental assistance, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 SUBSIDY CONTRACTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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, $5,558,106,000, 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 to the extent the amount in this appropriation is insufficient to fund all expiring section 8 contracts, the Secretary may transfer to and merge with this appropriation such amounts from the "Annual contributions for assisted housing" appropriation as the Secretary shall determine, and amounts earmarked in the foregoing account may be reduced accordingly, at the Secretary's discretion: *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.

Further, for the foregoing purposes, $800,000,000, to become available for obligation on October 1, 1994, and to remain available for obligation until expended.

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 1994 by not more than $2,000,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts: *Provided*, That up to $45,515,000 of recaptured section 236 budget authority resulting from the prepayment of mortgages subsidized under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–1) shall be rescinded in fiscal year 1994: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the recaptures and rescission during fiscal year 1994 are less than $45,515,000, the total funding provided under the head "Annual contributions for assisted housing" and the budget authority provided under that head for assistance in connection with mortgage prepayments shall be reduced accordingly.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

(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 1994 by not more than $1,544,646 of uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts.

CONGREGATE SERVICES

For contracts with and payments to public housing agencies and nonprofit corporations for congregate services programs, $6,267,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995, in accordance with the provisions of the Congregate Services Act of 1978, as amended.

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), $2,620,808,000.

SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

For the revitalization of distressed public housing projects program, authorized by section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, $483,240,000, to remain available until expended.

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, $265,000,000, to remain available until expended.

YOUTHBUILD PROGRAM

For youthbuild program activities authorized by subtitle D of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, $48,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorizations in sections 402(b) (1), (2), or (3) of such Act shall be available for the foregoing appropriation.

NATIONAL CITIES IN SCHOOLS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

For the national cities in schools community development program, as authorized under section 930 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–550), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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), section 106(d), section 106(e), and section 106(f) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, $12,000,000.

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, $35,747,000, and all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 1993, 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 1994, 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.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

FHA-MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 1994, 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 $64,564,645,000.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed loan program, $262,810,000, to be derived from the FHA-mutual mortgage insurance guaranteed loans receipt account, of which not to exceed $256,682,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for salaries and expenses; and of which not to exceed $6,128,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for the Office of Inspector General.

FHA—GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $147,371,000, as authorized by the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715z–3(b) and 1735c(f)): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal any part of which is to be guaranteed of not to exceed $13,436,205,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed loan programs, $192,252,000, of which $188,190,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for salaries and expenses; and of which $4,062,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for the Office of Inspector General.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDES TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 1994, new commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed $85,000,000,000.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed mortgage-backed securities program, $8,038,000, to be derived from the GNMA—guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account, of which not to exceed $8,038,000 shall be transferred to 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, $151,350,000, to remain available until expended.

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROGRAM

For the supportive housing program, as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100–77), as amended, $319,968,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $50,000,000 may be used for a safe havens demonstration initiative, including activities authorized within subtitle D of such Act, and not to exceed $20,000,000 may be used for a rural homeless demonstration initiative, including activities authorized within subtitle G of such Act.

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), $107,835,000, to remain available until expended.

SHELTER PLUS CARE

For the shelter plus care program, as authorized by subtitle F of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100–77), as amended, $123,747,000, 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), $4,223,675,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That $42,236,750 shall be available for grants to Indian tribes pursuant to section 106(a)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), and $60,000,000 shall be available for "special purpose grants" pursuant to section 107 of such Act: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 20 per centum of any grant made with funds appropriated herein (other than a grant using funds under section 107(b)(3) of such Act or funds set aside in the following provisos) shall be expended for "Planning and Management Development" and "Administration" as defined in regulations promulgated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That $15,000,000 shall be made available from the total amount provided 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), including services for families that are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless: *Provided further*, That $5,000,000 shall be made available from the total amount provided to carry out a neighborhood development program under section 123 of said Act (42 U.S.C. 5318 note).

For additional amounts for "Community development grants", for authorized community development activities for use only in areas impacted by Hurricane Andrew, Hurricane Iniki and Typhoon Omar, $50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That the Secretary may waive entirely, or in any part, any requirement set forth in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, except any requirement relating to fair housing and nondiscrimination, the environment, and labor

standards, if the Secretary finds that such waiver will further the purposes of the use of this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] seek recognition?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Forgive me, Mr. Chairman. We just passed by community development block grants. I had an amendment to that section. The Chair will have to forgive me.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Indiana be kind enough to identify where his amendment occurs, giving the page of the bill, please, and the section?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is on page 30 of this bill, line 10, I believe.

□ 1440

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to returning to page 30, the community planning and development, community development grants section?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 30, line 10, strike "$4,223,675,000" and insert "$4,000,000,000".

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to cuts in the funding for housing programs.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 1993 VA, HUD, independent agencies appropriation bill.

But first, I want to personally thank Chairman NATCHER and ranking member MCDADE as well as Chairman STOKES and ranking member LEWIS of the VA–HUD Subcommittee for their cooperation with the authorization committee's request that several housing initiatives requested by HUD not be included in this bill.

This spirit of cooperation between authorizers and appropriators is very much appreciated. And, as the gentlemen know, the House will consider several of these housing initiatives later today on the Suspension Calendar.

With respect to this bill, I appreciate the difficult job the members of the Appropriations Committee face in trying to provide a fair distribution of very limited funds.

I commend the committee for the increased funding for the 202 Elderly Program, the 811 Disabled Program and the public housing development and modernization programs.

I also want to thank the committee for providing $150 million for the much needed Lead Paint Abatement Program and the $300 million for the distressed public housing effort.

However, I am disappointed that the committee did reduce funding for the Flexible Subsidy Program which is needed to help provide modernization for our low-income, privately owned apartment inventory.

I am deeply concerned that the committee also failed to recognize the great needs in the HUD-FHA Multifamily Property Disposition Program by providing only $93 million for the sale of these properties. One only needs to read the New York Times article of June 20 and the June 23 edition of the Washington Post to know we have a major potential problem in this program.

For the committee to make an unjustified $50 million increase in funding for the policy, development and research account while underfunding the Multifamily Property Disposition Program is misguided.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I am disappointed that the committee would continue to underfund one of the most promising housing initiatives to come along in years. I am, of course, referring to the Home Investment Partnership Program which was reduced by $400 million.

There is something very wrong when the needs of our low- and moderate-income citizens for affordable housing and for homeless assistance are placed behind the desires of a few who want to build a space station of highly questionable value, one fraught with cost overruns and dogged by controversy.

The committee refuses to come down to earth. It has yet again funded outer space at the expense of other programs here at home, such as housing which is in desperate need.

It is ironic that at the time of greatest need by our communities, the committee would turn its back on one program that our States, cities, and counties wholeheartedly support.

As one of the earliest proponents of the HOME block-grant concept I feel such as program will provide a bold new approach to meeting the housing needs of our citizens. But that can happen only with proper funding levels.

What is provided in this appropriation bill, while better than last year, needs to be greatly increased.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman I, apologize because we were going through the bill so rapidly that we missed the language we wanted to amend.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment contains $4.223 billion for community development block grants. This is up from $4 billion in fiscal year 1993, or it is an increase of $223 million.

While many of these projects are worthy projects, right now we are facing a real problem with the deficit in this country, and the debt is virtually out of control. It is $4.35 trillion, up from just $1 trillion 10 years ago, so we have to pick areas where we can make cuts in spending so that we can get this budget problem under control.

When the President's economic stimulus package came to the floor he proposed an increase in community development block grant money as part of his jobs package, and during that debate I pointed out to my colleagues that we had a tremendous number of pork barrel projects in that supposed jobs bill. Some of the projects were swimming pools, renovation of the Orpheum Theater in Phoenix, AZ, for $3.5 million. We had a soccer field improvement for $250,000 for Belle Gardens, FL. We had the Highland Historical District revitalization plan program for $100,000. We had $2.2 million for a youth sports complex in Merced, CA. While these may be laudable objectives for local governments, it is something we felt, many of us in this House, that we should not be using Federal taxpayer dollars for. Soccer fields in California and swimming pools in Florida or parking garages in Chicago, those should be funded for the most part by local tax dollars, because those are projects which should be decided upon by the city councils and the mayors and Governors of those cities and States.

Since we have this fiscal exercise we are facing right now, it is my opinion that we should not be increasing community development block grant money over what we spent last year. Four billion dollars is enough, $4 billion in Federal subsidies for local projects is enough. We do not need another $223 million, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for our amendment which would cut $223 million in spending that I do not think is necessary at this time.

We should prioritize projects. We should know what the money is going for, and $4 billion this fiscal year is enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] whether or not he insists on his point of order.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. His amendment would reduce the funding for HUD's Community Development Grant Program by $223,675,000 to $4 billion. This reduces the amount to the fiscal year 1993 appropriation level.

Mr. Chairman, we should not reduce the appropriation for CDBG. This is one of—if not the—most important programs for the cities and countiesin this bill. I think it would be difficult for Members to explain to their local government officials why they voted for a 5.3-percent reduction in this program.

Mr. Chairman, the 1994 VA–HUD bill is within its 602(b) allocation. We have already reduced the administration's request for the bill by approximately $1.3 billion. We should not be reducing this bill further.

I would also remind the Members that the President requested $2.5 billion for CDBG as part of his economic

stimulus proposal. Those funds are vitally needed by local governments. Unfortunately, that bill is stuck in the other body.

Mr. Chairman, these funds are desperately needed by our cities and counties to provide for necessary services. A reduction in CDBG funding will mean a reduction in services at the local government level.

I urge Members to vote "no" on the Burton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 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 call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 275]

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watt
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1505

The CHAIRMAN. Three hundred eighty-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 237, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—154

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Bonilla
Brewster
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Castle
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Sarpalius
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—237

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Bacchus (FL)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Byrne
Calvert
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings
Hayes

Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Reed
Reynolds
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Watt
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—48

Applegate
Armey
Baesler
Becerra
Berman
Blute
Boehner
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Clayton
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Engel
Faleomavaega (AS)
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Hamburg
Harman
Henry
Hunter
Istook
Kennedy
LaRocco
Lehman
Mann
Manton
McKinney
McMillan
Mfume
Neal (MA)
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Portman
Rangel
Richardson
Sangmeister
Serrano
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Stearns
Sundquist
Torricelli
Unsoeld
Vento
Washington
Waters
Waxman

□ 1515

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Stearns for, with Mr. Rangel against.

Messrs. HUTCHINSON, ZELIFF, and SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Page 31, strike lines 9 through 20.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is quite straightforward. It simply strikes $50 million from the appropriations for community development block grants.

Bear in mind that we have spent in fiscal year 1993 $4 billion on this program. The funding level recommended for fiscal year 1994 is $4,273,000,000. That represents a 7-percent increase.

The $50 million cut from this funding level which I propose today would simply bring the funding down to the level recommended by President Clinton. He did not ask for this extra $50 million. We should reduce the bill by that amount.

It has been suggested that the $50 million would speak specifically to hurricane relief. This clearly is a top priority, Mr. Chairman, and one that can easily be funded by the remaining $4,223,000,000 left in this bill. That kind of emergency need for communities ought to be at the top of the list when we allocate CDBG dollars. We do not need a special line item of extra money beyond the President's request to deal with this problem.

Again, this is simply a $50 million cut. It will leave the CDBG program with about a 6-percent increase. In my judgment that is more than perhaps we need, but it is a cut that should be supported by this House and it is a cut that will bring us down to the funding level requested by President Clinton.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would want all the Members of the House to understand the gentleman's amendment.

Of the funds recommended for CDBG in this bill, $50 million is for use in areas affected by disasters—Hurricanes Andrew and Iniki, and Typhoon Omar.

I would also point out that the 1993 supplemental appropriations bill—which we are getting ready to go to conference on—also contains funds requested for CDBG activities in disaster areas.

The reason we have included funds in the 1994 bill is because we are not sure of the outcome for those funds in the supplemental. It may be that the areas from which the offsets are being taken are not acceptable. In any instance, if the funds are not provided in the 1993 supplemental appropriations bill, then we will need to provide the monies in the 1994 bill, which is now before the House. What we are looking for here is some flexibility to deal with the uncertainties of the conference matter that I have just referenced.

Mr. Chairman, let me make it very clear. There is no uncertainty about the need for additional CDBG funds. As anyone who has been to south Florida knows, or has seen pictures of the devastation on television, there is definitely a need for these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members of the House to defeat the gentleman's amendment.

□ 1520

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

While the chairman does make a good point, that some of these funds will be used for humanitarian purposes, a lot of the funds are going to be used for other purposes, such as golf courses, beachfront parking garages, a cemetery, gym replacement, swimming pool renovations, movie theater renovations to the tune of $3½ million in the southwestern part of the United States.

All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that, while there are humanitarian funds in here, and should be used for such, there are other areas where we can make economy so we can prioritize spending and save the taxpayers some dollars.

Now the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] is offering a modest $50 million cut. That will still leave $173 million in increases for community development block grant programs this next year.

Now get this: That is $4.173 billion that will still be allocated for this purpose, and so I just like to say that I think this is a modest cut, it is a step in the right direction, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] yielding to me.

I want to stipulate that I understand the situation in south Florida. My two oldest sons and I traveled there with a church group, and we helped the cleanup there, and there is a need, but in his own response the chairman acknowledged that in a separate appropriation measure that need is being addressed, and I stressed in my opening remarks on this amendment that within the $4.2 billion that we will be appropriating for next year certainly it seems to me that that kind of emergency relief ought to rank well above many of the other projects such as those mentioned by the gentleman from Indiana, and again I would urge my amendment.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I would just want to respond to the gentleman from Minnesota's comments because at this juncture we do not know what is going to occur with reference to the supplemental. What we are trying to do is to be able to look a little bit ahead here and be able to have the kind of flexibility I would think the House would want us to have in order to be able to provide for disasters in areas such as south Florida.

But I can assure both gentlemen that what we are trying to do is take care of

south Florida and other disasters, and this $50 million has nothing to do with the list of items that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] read off. All of that applied to another supplemental and things that were occurring at that time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if I might conclude, let me just say that there is $4.173 billion still left in the fund for this year. That money can be in conference allocated any way the conference wants to allocate it. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] has offered a $50 million very modest cut in this program. I think it is a step in the right direction, and I would urge everybody in the House to support it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I might mention to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], that I rise reluctantly to oppose this amendment. As the gentleman knows, I did not oppose his own amendment a few moments ago in which he was addressing generally community development block grants, but this amendment is very specific, and it is important for Members to know that.

The chairman has discussed the reality that we have a supplemental in the process at this moment. There are funds in that supplemental designated for south Florida. But that process is not complete yet, as the chairman indicated.

If one way or another the compromise that takes place in the supplemental, those funds should drop out, then this language and this designation will be necessary. It says, "Specifically for additional amounts for Community Development Block Grants, for authorized community development activities, for use only in areas impacted by Hurricane Andrew, Hurricane Iniki, and Typhoon Omar." It is $50 million. The amendment is very specific.

Now, if we should see the supplemental pass successfully and this language is in it, then a conference will address the question one more time. But the Members should know that this amendment will be very specific relative to that disastrous circumstance and have a devastating effect upon the people in Florida potentially, and, because of that, I reluctantly urge a "no" vote.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is this is going to go to the Senate, then it is going to go to conference committee, and, if this House today cuts the $50 million out of there, would not the conferees still make provision for the people in Florida who are suffering from the hurricane damage?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must tell the gentleman that we have some concern about what might happen in the supplemental at this moment. Because of that, this language is here. I certainly would prefer to address the question in conference when we know what is happening with the supplemental.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, if the gentleman would further yield, we all know how conference committees work around here, and I believe very strongly that the conferees, both the other body and this body, would not forget people in south Florida if we cut this $50 million out of there.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 194, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—202

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Bonilla
Brewster
Browder
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
Derrick
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kyl
Lancaster
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Machtley
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Valentine
Volkmer
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Barcia
Beilenson
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Byrne
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Costello
Coyne
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDade
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sharp
Shaw
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Watt
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—43

Andrews (ME)
Armey
Baesler
Becerra
Bentley
Berman
Blute
Boehner
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Engel
Faleomavaega (AS)
Ford (TN)
Hamburg
Harman
Henry
Hunter
Istook
Kennedy
LaRocco
Lehman
Mann
Manton
McMillan
Neal (MA)
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Portman
Richardson

Sangmeister	Sundquist	Washington
Serrano	Torricelli	Waters
Skeen	Unsoeld	Waxman
Stearns	Vento	

□ 1545

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Armey for, with Mr. Berman against.

Mr. Sangmeister for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Stearns for, with Mr. Vento against.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina and Mr. TOWNS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CRAMER and Mr. VOLKMER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, today, during consideration of the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill, I was unavoidably detained at the Cincinnati Airport due to mechanical difficulties with an aircraft. Consequently, I missed three rollcall votes. Had I been here, I would have voted "no" on the rule—rollcall No. 274—and would have supported both the Burton amendment to reduce appropriations for community development block grants by $223 million to fiscal year 1993 levels—rollcall No. 276—and the Penny amendment to reduce appropriations for community development block grants by $50 million to the President's request—rollcall No. 277.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

During fiscal year 1994, new commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5401), shall not exceed $2,054,000,000.

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, $85,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

The text of the amendments en bloc is as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 32, line 10, strike "$85,000,000" and insert "$65,000,000".

Page 58, line 16, strike "$5,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 208, the amendments en bloc may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment and are not subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], we are going to try to be as brief as we can on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not increase spending. It simply transfers spending.

My amendment would restore funding for the Selective Service System that is being abolished in this bill by zeroing out all of the funds except for shutdown costs.

My amendment would reduce the funding level of the HUD Office of Policy Development and Research from $85 million to $65 million and would restore the $20 million to the Selective Service System, as requested.

Mr. Chairman, we are attempting to restore the funds that were requested by President Clinton to maintain the Selective Service System.

Mr. Chairman, even with this money restored, the Selective Service System would have a budget reduction of over 10 percent. That is more than any other department or agency this year.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of the Selective Service System keep saying that the mission of the agency is no longer necessary because the cold war is over and the Berlin Wall has come down.

Yet, the ability to mobilize and draft people quickly, is not entirely about the cold war.

My colleagues, we needed to draft people during the Korean war and the Vietnam war, and those were not wars with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, the top military people in this country believe we must maintain the capability to mobilize quickly, especially at a time of dramatic reductions in the size of our military forces. My colleagues know what we are going through right now.

I would also point out that peacetime registration is a program which falls under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee and in last year's Defense authorization bill, they requested a report on whether or not we need to keep peacetime registration.

Mr. Chairman, the Joint Chiefs, and the Department of the Army, the service which has historically taken in 97 percent of all inductees, have weighed in strongly in support of keeping peacetime registration. If we rush to terminate the entire Selective Service System before we receive this report and before the authorizing committee has acted, we will put President Clinton in an extremely awkward embarrassing position.

If we terminate funding for the Selective Service System without making the necessary changes in the military Selective Service Act, the law of the land, President Clinton will need to pardon thousands of young men who have violated the draft law, where there no longer is a department or agency to administer or enforce it. Think about that.

□ 1550

Mr. Chairman, ever since draft registration was reinstated back when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan millions of young Americans have lived up to their obligation as United States citizens, they have obeyed the law, and have registered for the draft.

Ninety seven percent of them obeyed the law, while the other 3 percent got off scot-free, and to now say were going to pardon them and make them eligible for all the Federal benefits like Pell grants and college loans and grants, is a slap in the face to all patriotic Americans but particularly to those loyal patriotic young men who lived up to their obligation and obeyed the law.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration supports my amendment. They did not ask to have the system abolished. They specifically asked to maintain the Selective Service System.

Terminating Selective Service through the Appropriations Committee circumvents the normal committee process, Mr. Chairman.

In fact, when an amendment to end peacetime registration was offered in the Committee on Armed Services last year, it was overwhelmingly defeated. We can defeat it again today, and we can defeat the attempt today by passing the Solomon amendment.

The American Legion, Amvets, the Noncommissioned Officers Association, the Fleet Reserve Association, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars support my amendment. These organizations have a membership of over 10 million Americans.

Let me just restate what is obvious to most of us, and we all know it, the reduced threat of a large-scale conventional conflict in Europe does not negate the importance of peacetime registration. Threats to national security and world peace can occur at any moment. We all know what happened just this past weekend.

Indeed, armed conflict is currently in progress in over a dozen locations, such as Somalia, Yugoslavia and Cambodia, and in many Republics of the former Soviet Union and only God knows what is going to be the outcome in that situation, Mr. Chairman.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me just say that the last effort to terminate peacetime registration of this body was quickly put on hold as the Persian Gulf conflict erupted, and we all remember that. As the size of our military is reduced from weapons systems to base closings, it becomes even more essential to retain our ability to reconstitute our military forces rapidly to meet any threat to this Nation.

My amendment would simply do this, Mr. Chairman. Last year, on this same bill, there was an attempt to knock out the entire funding. Only 96 Members on both sides of the aisle voted for that amendment, and 310 voted against. The House voted down that amendment.

This year we can do the same thing by voting for the Solomon amendment that would simply maintain the current level of funding minus 10 percent until the Committee on Armed Services can act as the authorizing committee. Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Solomon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the most important reason for dismantling Selective Service lies in the events of recent history. I do not refer to the end of the cold war, but I refer to the successful conclusion of Operation Desert Storm. Our All-Volunteer Armed Forces have been deployed in many conflicts throughout the world since 1973, but never at the scale and intensity that occurred during the war with Iraq. More than 500,000 men and women were put into that theater; an additional 750,000 in the Reserves could have been deployed without requesting or requiring conscription, even of relatively hard to obtain medical personnel.

The success of that operation demonstrates that the American military can, as it is presently constituted, succeed in the most likely type of engagement for the foreseeable future: the low-intensity conflict that requires a minimum of force through units of well-trained, disciplined, experienced troops. This differs markedly from the mass conscript armies of World War I and World War II.

A major land war with the Warsaw Pact would have required conscription, but it never took place. The Warsaw Pact no longer exists. We are left with low-scale conflicts, like the tragedy in Bosnia, but the point is that if Bosnia were to require American intervention, it would not be accomplished through a large, inexperienced army of draftees.

I think it is important for us to respond to the comment made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], which was made at the Committee on Rules, that President Clinton and the Joint Chiefs of Staff support continuation of registration and selective service.

I would like for the House to note that the statement of administration policy states that, "The administration supports the committee bill and will work with the House to address our concerns." It then makes no mention of Selective Service as one of its concerns. It is important for us to realize that section 447 of the Department of Defense authorization requested that the DOD prepare a report regarding the continued requirement for registration under the Selective Service System. The report, due to the President no later than April 20, 1993, has still not been completed.

I understand that the reason that the Department has not been able to comply with the requirement is because it is deeply divided over the need for any continuation of Selective Service. The Joint Chiefs of staff have not issued a statement recently regarding the need for registration, and President Clinton has not issued any statement regarding the need for Selective Service.

The gentleman also mentioned pardons. I think everyone ought to understand, Mr. Chairman, this bill does not pardon anyone who has violated the law in the past. There is no reference at all in this bill to pardons. I think Congress should be able to terminate funding for the Selective Service at any time and deal with the pardon question separately.

The bottom line is that we are currently spending $25 million a year for a service that is not needed or required, and if we ever need Selective Service again, we can reconstitute it in the amount of time that we normally could, without threat to the security of the United States.

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

Mr. STOKES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from Ohio, as he knows, but the gentleman has said that the President has not requested these funds. In other words, he did request them in his budget. He asked for the full funding, not 90 percent, like I am asking for. He asked for it in his budget. I think the budget chairman would verify that, standing next to the gentleman.

I would also tell the gentleman that that list of all those names of these patriotic young people that have lived up to their obligations is a list that is used by all of our recruiters all over this Nation in order to identify young men that might be interested in the military, and offer them a good, honorable career in our military. With the cutbacks we have today, we need those lists worse than ever.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Ohio for this provision of the bill. Let me make a couple of points.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has expired.

(On request of Mr. SABO and by unanimous consent, Mr. STOKES was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. STOKES. I am glad to yield further to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I had the honor of serving with the gentleman from Ohio in 1979 when registration was reinstituted, and I was involved in opposing that at that point. Just so we can recollect history, as I recall, registration was restarted by action of the Committee on Appropriations in 1979 in terms of providing funding. So to terminate funding today is to terminate it in the same fashion as the program was restarted in 1979.

Mr. STOKES. It would be my opinion that the gentleman's recollection is correct.

Mr. SABO. I suppose one of the things that happens to us is, we lose files, and I do not have my files from 1979, but I recall, what existed then exists today, that if this country were ever faced with such an emergency that a draft were to be required again, that it would take significant time to put facilities in place, to get trainers in place, to train the draftees.

□ 1600

As I recall, the first priority is to train Reserve and Guard units. Is that not accurate? Frankly, from our experience in Desert Storm, that would take a considerable period of time.

Mr. STOKES. In replying to the gentleman I would say the Department of Defense cannot effectively use inductees. The Selective Service believes it can deliver 100,000 inductees 28 days after mobilization.

After the fiscal year 1994 budget hearings on our bill, the committee noted that at the end of the Gulf war, 6 months after mobilization, thousands of reserve troops still awaited training, and conscripts would wait even longer.

Mr. SABO. As I recall from my research back many years ago, the experience also was that at times of real emergency we had a large number of volunteers, and clearly volunteer training would also come before one went to the conscript. And the fact was that there was ample time to put a draft registration system in place to do the drafting necessary for clearly what would have to be a major consensus to reinstate it. And to have this system in place, while it is not large dollars in terms of the totality of our Federal budget, clearly it is $20-some million that we spent for no good purpose today, and clearly it can be better spent for other purposes within the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee.

So I commend the gentleman for making this decision. I know the politics of it. This is an issue that can get oversimplified.

The reality is that registration was reestablished in 1979 primarily for symbolic reasons in response to the Soviet

invasion of Afghanistan and had nothing to do with basically making our country ready to deal with a major military operation. So I think the gentleman is doing the right thing and making the right choices in a committee that has many very tough choices to make. So I commend the gentleman from Ohio and would urge the House to defeat the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for his excellent statement on this point. I would just add with reference to the gentleman from New York's comments regarding the President's request, it is true the President did request the funds, but he did not object when we removed the funds from the bill, and there was no comment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Solomon amendment.

Today we have a system of an All-volunteer Force. The Selective Service registration merely allows us to register qualified personnel in case they are called up during a national emergency.

I have great respect for the chairman of the Budget Committee and the chairman of this Appropriations Subcommittee, but it is more than symbolic registration. Take for example recently when we were faced with the possibility of going into Bosnia against the Serbian nation. If that happened and all of Eastern Europe entered into that, it would be more than Desert Storm where we had replacement of Reserves that were not called up. we would need a system to call up those 100,000 people in order to support lives.

It will save American lives due to time constraints that would be required to reestablish this. Every veterans group in America supports this amendment. It supports the All-Volunteer Force. and for those who are against conscripting of Americans, this is not a way of life. It merely supports that system in time of national need.

Some believe that we should not conscript, but I would say to them that it is not a practice, it is only a tool which recruiters can use to look at the people they need in terms of a national emergency. It will save lives, it will save dollars, and it will keep America prepared.

It also gives recruiters the opportunity to go in to different groups such as minorities and offer them a good job, and that is a job in the United States services, if they ask for it outside of times of national emergency.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to support the Solomon amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have felt for a number of years that the Selective Service System is a phenomenal waste of money. I opposed it in 1980 or whenever we decided to put it in. It does nothing. It is symbolic.

Imagine a bunch of clunks who get paid $30 million a year to register 2 million people. That is a list of names and that is 15 bucks a name. Get the driver's license. At least then it would not be a sexist sort of an operation.

It does nothing. You have a list of names and you still have to pass a law to bring them in. I cannot believe we need this. It is of the order of the $600 toilet seats. Why would we spend $30 million a year to get a list of names of the young men who turn 18? It eludes me.

But that is all it does. It has passed its time. It is a symbolic waste of money. It does a dishonor to the volunteers in our services and should be put away immediately as a phenomenal waste of money, as a vestigial leftover from World War II. It should be put in the graveyards with the rusted jeeps, and we should get on with the volunteer service which serves us well, and serves us expeditiously, and put this $30 million to better use, if not deficit reduction.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the Solomon amendment to the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1994. This amendment would restore $20 million to the Selective Service System by shifting funding from the policy office, allowing the system to maintain its important function.

While our Nation has not had to rely upon a draft for 30 years, it is important that, considering the instability of today's world, we maintain the capability of a Selective Service System. The Selective Service System requires that every male citizen register within 30 days of his 18th birthday, thereby providing our Nation with a vast manpower reserve. And the Selective Service System estimates than 97 percent or our young men comply with the current law requiring registration.

Additionally, the expense of reinstating the Selective Service System in the future would be much greater than the year-to-year cost of maintaining the program.

I urge accordingly, colleagues to join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and support this time-tested system.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, would my distinguished friend from New York perhaps clear up the mystery? What do we receive for the $20 million that we put in, not the $30 million we have been spending, other than a list of names?

Mr. GILMAN. That list, if the gentleman will permit me to respond, that list of names is the reserve that we would need to call upon in the event of an emergency. If we were to start from scratch in the event of a hostility that dragged us into an all-out warfare, we would then first have to establish a whole new Selective Service System.

Mr. STARK. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. STARK. All we need is a list of names of those young men, and I hope young women who are over 18. Drivers' license lists, school registration lists, Social Security lists. Does the gentleman means to tell me that for $20 million a year we cannot find a list of people in this country over 18? The phone book would be a better buy.

Mr. GILMAN. It would be much more costly to first establish a brandnew list in the event that we were dragged into all-out hostile action.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a big deal of how much it costs for these names. Actually now only a very minuscule part of the whole $25 million budget is spent on registration itself. The rest is on the mobilization, keeping 11,000 volunteers out in the field working. That is why we need the lists.

But the main thing is this: If we are going to be cutting our defense budget, if we are going to be closing bases all over this country, we have hundreds of thousands of young men and women today who have been in the military for 5, 7, or 8 years, and they no longer can depend on this career.

□ 1610

Now they are going to be cashiered out. Many of them are leaving of their own volition. It is going to leave us with a nonprofessional group of people, and that is why we need to be able to attract these people.

We need these lists if we are going to be able to maintain the all-volunteer military at the level that we have that we used in Desert Storm when, because of that capability, they saved literally thousands of lives because they were good at what they did.

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

I would just like to conclude by saying that we must bear in mind that we can be drawn into a worldwide conflict at any time with the instability around the world, and we must be able to react quickly. The Selective Service System helps us maintain that capability.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Every year the arguments for peacetime registration become a little bit more ludicrous.

A program that was begun to signal our displeasure with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has outlived not only the invasion but now the Soviet Union itself. Yet we are still going to spend $29 million this year on a cold war symbol to register 18-year-olds to prepare for a military draft that will never happen.

Some have revived the old argument that draft registration at only $29 million is cheap insurance in an era of military cuts. While this argument has some superficial appeal, it is fundamentally wrong. No one would buy an insurance policy that protects them against a nonexistent threat or that would not pay off if it was ever needed. American taxpayers should not either.

There is no reasonable threat out there that would trigger a military draft. Even the Pentagon, never shy about justifying marginal programs, has a tough time coming up with even a fanciful scenario that would require a draft. In the "1994–99 Defense Planning Guidance Scenario Set," a classified planning document that has since become public, the Defense Department tried to imagine the worst threats the United States might face, and how we would respond. Six of the seven scenarios showed the United States prevailing over any conceivable adversary months before any potential draftee would be ready for combat. The final scenario, for which the Pentagon said a draft might be considered, involved a reunified, rearmed Soviet Union and was not even considered a possibility until well after the turn of the century.

It is hard to imagine a more convincing demonstration of the absurdity of peacetime draft registration than war with Iraq. This country mobilized 500,000 trained soldiers, sent them and their equipment halfway around the world, and defeated the fourth largest army in the world. All of this occurred without any serious discussion of a military draft; Secretary Cheney even went out of his way to rule out the possibility of a draft.

Even if there were a threat out there, draft registration does not offer any advantage whatsoever; if anything, it gives a false sense of security. In 1980, in a report suppressed for political reasons, Selective Service estimated that registration would make only a 4-day difference in the system's ability to deliver the first untrained inductees to the Armed Forces. Remember, this is a 4-day difference for draftees who still need months of classification, assignment, training, and transport for combat readiness. Conscripts will play no role whatsoever in an immediate response for any military emergency that might confront our Nation.

It becomes even more dubious to link these two when you realize that mobilization targets Selective Service says it can meet are based on planned increases in training facilities in 1980 that never happened.

With reductions in troop levels and closing of bases, the training capacity is decreased even further. The first priority for these bases, as pointed out so ably by the chairman, these limited training slots will go to activated Reserve units and members of the individual Ready Reserve for any general mobilization.

During the gulf war with 6 months for mobilization, many reservists were still waiting for training when the war ended.

Finally, the patriotism argument: Draft registration ignores the patriotic duty of everyone except for 18-year-old males. The $29 million single-sex one-time-only piece of paper civics lesson, $29 million, does not promote patriotism in this country. It is only targeted at young men at age 18. What a waste.

Let us end this farce. The cold war is over. Let us use the money on something useful.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of a debate that I participated in in 1981 in the Oval Office with Ronald Reagan; actually, it was a debate between myself and Ed Meese in front of Ronald Reagan, and it was my early days of working in the White House. It was one of the first times I had actually gone into the Oval Office.

I had written a speech for the President and submitted it to the President, and in that speech, the subject of the draft was looked at.

Actually Ed Meese disagreed with me on my position on the draft, and so into the Oval Office we went. I was in a sense of awe that I was going to participate in a debate in the Oval Office about a policy so important as military conscription, and during that debate Mr. Meese made his arguments that we were gearing up, that we had to expand the capabilities of our military in order to deter war with the Soviet Union, and if we were going to end the threat of communism, we had to have a strong military force.

I countered with the idea that a peacetime draft is contrary to American tradition, and the reason that Americans have always, always relied on volunteers during peacetime was that that is what made America strong, going back to our fundamental principles of individual liberty and limited government.

Well, as the debate went back and forth, Mr. Meese did suggest that we did face a crisis, and what I suggested to the President was that during a crisis it is much more important for us to honor the men in the military by increasing their pay, be making military service an honor and patriotic symbol of service rather than having the uniform as a symbol of servitude, which is what accompanies a draft and conscription.

At the end of that debate, Ronald Reagan looked over to me, and I had no idea of what he would say, and then he looked back at Ed Meese, and he said, "Well, Ed, it is contrary to American tradition," and that is the reason, during the Reagan administration, we did not reinstitute conscription, because Ronald Reagan, like conservatives before him, like Barry Goldwater back in 1964 and 1970, have always opposed conscription during peacetime, because it is contrary to American tradition.

We in the United States do believe that America should play a strong and powerful role for good in the world. That does not mean you violate your fundamental principles of liberty and justice here through a military conscription which is much more consistent with the totalitarian powers of Europe in which people fled than it is with the Founders of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

A draft blurs the distinction between free societies and unfree societies. But let me note, and I am putting this in the RECORD, that these are statements by Barry Goldwater Sr., I might add, and during the last debate it was mistaken that Barry Goldwater, Sr., did not oppose the draft. This is a quote from his book, "Conscience of a Majority," back in 1970 when Barry Goldwater was the standard-bearer of the conservative movement opposing conscription.

Ronald Reagan, as we all know, opposed conscription, as well. But let us leave it on this thought: If we do oppose conscription and we do oppose this waste of money, we also must support an all-volunteer military, which is what Goldwater and Reagan did. The reason we beat the Soviets, the reason there is no Soviet Union is because we supported a strong volunteer military.

I would hope that those of you who are opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will also join me in opposing any efforts to freeze the COLA's on the cost-of-living increases for those people in the military and those people who have retired from the military; especially active-duty people should not see their pay frozen.

So today if you end up opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], you should also be just as aggressive in supporting what is necessary to have an All-Volunteer Army, and that is to have a well-trained, a well-respected, and a well-appreciated military force.

So with that, I would ask my colleagues to join with me in opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], but I would like to close by saying it is very

difficult for me to be on the other side of this argument, because he is a man I dearly respect, and I appreciate his leadership on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask at the appropriate time when we return to debate in the House unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD this quote from "The Conscience of a Majority," by Barry Goldwater.

Another source of irritation among the youth of this nation which I believe should be removed as quickly as possible is the present law requiring military conscription of young able-bodied American males. In this I have always felt that the only proper and lasting method would be elimination of the draft and the creation of an all-volunteer armed force. I have long felt that young Americans who have been subjected to a permanent and mandatory military system since 1948 have a legitimate cause for complaint. Over the years, too many promising young Americans have had their lives disrupted, complicated and confused by a military draft system which to them made very little sense. In this I am proud of the fact that I was among the first public officials in this country to urge measures to provide this nation with a professional, all-volunteer military force to defend our people and our strategic national interest. And it was at my insistence that the Republican National Platform of 1964 pledged to reevaluate the nation's armed forces manpower procurement programs "with the goal of replacing involuntary inductions as soon as possible by an efficient voluntary system, offering real career incentives."

Above and beyond everything else, this is a moral matter. The fundamental right of man is the right to life. The use of force against that right—as in the draft law—is clearly wrong. It would be wrong to assume that free men have to be forced to fight for their country. In essence, this is the message that came through loud and clear in the latest study of the subject.

The value of the recent Gates Commission Report on conscription lies in the fact that it investigated thoroughly the major arguments against a professional, all-volunteer army and disposed of them completely. It emphasized that the difference between an all-volunteer force and a mixed force of conscripts and volunteers, such as exists today, is limited to that minority who would not serve unless conscripted and who would not volunteer in the absence of conscription. It stands to reason that this minority does not constitute the most effective element in our military system. The commission also pointed out:

"An all-volunteer force will attract men who are not now conscripted and who do not now volunteer but who will do so when military service imposes less of a financial penalty than it currently does.

"Contrary to much dramatic argument, the reality is that an all-volunteer force will be manned largely by the same kind of individuals as today's armed forces. The men who serve will be quite similar in patriotism, political attitudes, effectiveness, and susceptibility to civilian control. The draft does not guarantee the quality of our armed forces, and neither will voluntarism. There are no simple solutions or short cuts in dealing with the complex problem that must always concern us as free people."

□ 1620

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very, very important to point out this is probably one of the most reasonable moves I have ever seen the Committee on Appropriations, make, and I certainly hope people vote against the amendment and support what the Committee on Appropriations was doing.

What are they trying to do here? The committee was saying that every year they are being asked for $30 million to run an institution we never have used. We have never used this whole Selective Service System for anything for years and years and years. This is a relic of the past.

If you vote to put this money into sustain this relic of the past, we really ought to put it in the Smithsonian Institution because no one can see a reason why we are going to use it in the future either.

Why don't we use the Selective Service System? Well, one reason is we have a terrific volunteer army that is working very, very well. The volunteer in the military has shown up with much higher quality and every other thing.

Second, what you need in the service, if you have to have a surge capacity and if you have to have to add a lot of people rapidly, is that you need trained people, you need trained people who know how to fly airplanes, who are doctors, who are nurses. You need those kinds of people.

The list of 18-year-olds does not give you that information. We also know that today there is all sorts of other forms of alternative lists out there, through school records or through Social Security or through drivers license registration; all those are out there. They can also be used if you ever needed this type of thing.

But to maintain this whole infrastructure, to spend all this money at a time when we desperately need money to try to preserve the morale of our voluntary forces, who have been there and are now being downsized, makes no sense.

So I certainly hope people turn down this amendment today because I really think it makes an incredible amount of sense to save this money and, if at all possible, utilize it to help the people who have been out there, really in action, really defending this country. Why should we penalize them to maintain something we have not used and we do not intend to use and that there are all sorts of substitutes for if we did need it? And if you really were going to do Selective Service, you ought to register the train people, to call them up, because that is what we really need.

So this is something that does not fit, it is out of date, and it is a perfect thing for our people to be getting rid of. I salute the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for doing it. It took a lot of guts, but they did the right thing, and we should support them by voting "no" on the Solomon amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I have always been against the draft. I can remember World War II vividly. I was 8 to 12 years of age. It was a world of heroes. It almost seems mythical now compared to what has transpired in recent history. I have always attached Korea to World War II because it happened only 5 years later. As a matter of fact, the war just started in Korea on the 25th of June. Today is the anniversary of the killing of Archduke Francis Ferdinand at Saravejo; that is what caused the draft to come about. Ten million people of Europe's finest were slaughtered, and that killing was sustained by a draft.

Today, June 28, is the day. On June 28, 1914, a teenager kills an archduke and his wife and starts a process that kills between 10 and 11 million people. A war that was initially propelled by a call to voluntarism, a call to noblesse oblige for the finest young men in Great Britain and France and the countries of the allied nations. And then to sustain that killing rate, they turned to a draft.

So I think, in retrospect, even though I was a very young man, not yet a teenager, that I opposed the draft in World War II. Everyone that I respected was a volunteer: every pilot, every marine, every submariner, every special-forces person, everybody who ever went beyond what was required of them. Every individual raised his hand and said, "I will volunteer, I will go;" that was not a person that was conscripted by the draft.

But why in my mind is registering for service different from a draft that I do not like and that I do not think we will ever need again? Because it does tell you something about your Nation. It tells you about those young men who are ready to serve if, to use Mrs. SCHROEDER's words, a surge requirement is there.

I remember where I registered for the draft, the corner of Sepulveda and Santa Monica. The woman said, "Ah, 6 feet, red hair, blue eyes, 1–A; what are you, the All-American boy?" No, Ma'am, I'm not an Eagle Scout." Of course, that stuck in my memory. That was the proudest day in my life when I could register.

I joined the Air Force a year later as a 19-year-old because I wanted to fly the most dangerous, fastest plane this country could make. And I was soon combat-ready, and my country never used me to kill another mother's child. I think that is ideal, to volunteer to do something dangerous, to try to be the very best and then never have to be called.

But when your President has five stars on each shoulder and drives Hitler to suicide, I guess you do not have to get involved in combat, when your Republican President is named Dwight Eisenhower.

But this registering is different; it is much different. And don't tell me that people who refuse to stand up and be part of a pool can now go back and get loans and be a parasite on our society all their lives. The Federal Government must be able to say, "Hey, no money for you, buster, you didn't register, on that remote possibility that your country ever needed you."

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point something out to the Members because you would think, "JERRY SOLOMON is recommending that we spend more money." That just is not the case. The money is coming—I have had a number of Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle coming over and asking, "Where are you getting the money from?"

Well, it comes from the Office of Policy Development and Research that got bumped up—I should say pumped up—from $25 million to $85 million.

Now, just to show you what happened: We have a HUD account for HUD's research office, which is $48.5 million over the 1994 authorized amount. It is $48 million over. It is $50 million over the President's request; $50 million more than the President requested. And it is $60 million over what the VA/HUD subcommittee recommended in the first place.

So, we are not offering to spend more money, we are asking you the question: "Is the money better spent, the $20 million we are referring to, is it better spent on some egghead thinking over here at the HUD office, or is it better spent over here on the Selective Service System?" Which is better, gentleman? Cast your votes.

□ 1630

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Solomon amendment. I stand in very strong support of the Solomon amendment.

I really think the all-volunteer system has worked well, but the Selective Service System has always been there to provide an inexpensive insurance policy in the event of a national emergency. I feel very strongly that we should keep this policy in force.

Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous precedent we are about to set here today. Once we kill the Selective Service System, it would be 2 or 3 years or longer to start up again if this country were faced with a major crisis. We would not have the ability to quickly respond as we do now.

Selective Service registration is quick and easy and the compliance rate among 18 year olds has always been 98 to 99 percent.

Mr. Chairman, these young men have come through for us. They have seen their patriotic duty and they have gone to the post office and they have registered. Ninety-nine percent of them have registered. It is no problem to them to go and show a little patriotism on their part.

I would hope we would be very, very careful and not eliminate this system.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that President Clinton did not ask that the Selective Service System be shut down. In fact, he requested $29 million for its operation in fiscal year 1994.

The program has done well. It does not cost a lot of money. It certainly is an insurance policy for what could happen to us.

This world is crazy out there. Only a couple days ago we fired missiles into another country. So I think we ought to be very careful what we do this afternoon. We should support this amendment and see that we continue to run the Selective Service System.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Solomon amendment.

It was August 1940, when this body by one vote saved the Selective Service System.

We do not know, Mr. Chairman, what the future holds. This is a type of insurance for us.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Forces Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services, I think it is incumbent upon us to do the best that we can should the kaleidoscope of the future turn unfortunate for our country, we will have this in place. It is insurance desperately needed.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the Solomon amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out since the gentleman brought up about 1940 that the key vote was cast by Mr. McCormack. He later became Speaker of the House. He was very proud of that vote that he saved the draft. He saved the Selective Service System and we were prepared when World War II hit.

Mr. McCormack told us over and over again in this House that he made the key vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment and to comment on some of what we have heard. We have heard today that there is no need to maintain a Selective Service System which we have not used in over 20 years and which we have no plans to use.

I agree with that. I have always personally opposed the draft because I do not think it is the right of Government to require people to serve their Government except voluntarily or except in cases of dire national emergency. In the case of dire national emergency in 1940, war raged in Europe. War raged in Asia. War raged around the world and totalitarian regimes were carrying out threats against the United States and everybody else. Britain stood on her knees. It was obviously a threatening time. We had virtually no Army. We had a very small Navy. The draft was necessary then and it was a day of honor in this House when it was saved.

Today what is our situation? We stand astride the world today. The Soviet Union does not exist. There is no military power anywhere near us. We can field half a million men and women without a draft. We just showed that. We can beat anybody ten times over without using nuclear weapons, thank God, and there is no prospect of this changing in the foreseeable future.

As was said by a number of other speakers, when we need to enhance our existing troops, we call up the Reserves and the National Guard. That is what we have them for. There is no foreseeable need to a military draft.

Mr. Chairman, we have been staying in this Chamber here for the last couple weeks hearing all the rhetoric about cutting unnecessary expenditures and the $4.3 trillion national debt, and here we stand with an annual expenditure of close to $30 million for no purpose whatsoever, and the defenders of continuing yet, the supporters of this amendment say, "Well, maybe we can conjure up some speculative circumstances under which maybe we will need this."

Maybe we will not. Probably we will not. Definitely we will not, and if we ever do, we can reestablish it in plenty of time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will my friend, the gentleman from New York, yield?

Mr. NADLER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. May I just ask the gentleman one question. What if the gentleman is wrong and I am right? There is no more America, right?

Vote for the Solomon amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] can point to the threat that would justify that supposition, then I will yield to that.

Those threats do not arise overnight. When Hitlerite Germany restores itself and the Soviet Union restores itself, then we have time to look at it.

Right now the point is you look at the threats that are out there. You look at the possible development of

those threats. You look at what we can do without the draft, and there is no way of imagining any reasonable set of circumstances under which we will need the draft.

The proof of the pudding is that we have had it for the last 20 years and all we have done is waste $30 million every year. We have never exercised it.

So for all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, and especially because, frankly, the existence of a draft except in times of national emergency is an affront to our traditions of liberty, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this discussion, although I did not plan to participate in it, reminds me of discussions that took place right after World War I. That was the war to end all wars. If you have studied history, you know that the allies decided that the best way to protect the world from a further conflict of that magnitude was to disarm, to do away with all weapons.

Great Britain was sinking its ships, cutting back on its military power. They were certain that if you did away with all weapons you would not have any more war.

There was a treaty that was signed at the end of World War I, called the Treaty of Versailles and Germany was forced to sign it and in that treaty they were not supposed to ever have more than 100,000 men in their military.

Well, a fellow named Adolf Hitler came along. He violated the Treaty of Versailles, but everybody looked the other way and instead of having a hundred thousand men in his military, he had a cadre to train millions of men and young people in his military and he used this 100,000-man army he had to be a cadre to train all these others.

The point I am trying to make is you must be prepared. The Boy Scout motto is, "Be prepared." The United States of America if we are going to survive as a nation and be a leader in the free world, we must be prepared.

Now, one of the reasons that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has proposed this amendment is because one way to be prepared is to have a Selective Service that lets us know where the people are that we might need in time of national emergency, because make no mistake about it, there will be more wars and there will be some pretty big ones. The Bible says there will always be wars and rumors of wars. That is just as true today as the day that the writer wrote it. So we must be prepared.

So Mr. Chairman, I just say to my colleagues that when we are talking about wasting billions and trillions of dollars around this place, to spend $25 or $30 million to make sure we are prepared in the event a war takes place in the future, we can mobilize our troops, is money well spent.

I suggest to my colleagues that we ought to all support the Solomon amendment.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Solomon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that the time was long past when we would be here on the floor debating a public policy that clearly discriminates between the sexes in the most blatant way, because the language that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has been riding to glory on for years around here always specifies males.

Some of us were hoping we were going to get that behind us. Apparently we are not.

Now, I have to disagree with some of my friends over here who have spoken against the Solomon amendment in this respect. They described it as if it was a simple boondoggle that wastes $30 million a year and really does not do any harm because it just pays a lot of bureaucrats with no purpose and nothing to accomplish a pretty good living for finding out how many kids are over 18 years old.

□ 1640

But it is much more than that, my colleagues, much more.

All during the 1980's we listened to the Reagan administration tell us on the Committee on Education and Labor that there was fraud and abuse involved in the student aid programs, and when we came here to the floor in 1985, I believe it was, with the higher education bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] got up, and beat his chest and talked about his past in the Marine Corps. He said that nobody should get student aid if they did not register for the draft. He stampeded this place, and my colleagues adopted his amendment.

Now let me tell my colleagues how harmless that has been. The inspector general reported to my committee in 1989 that from April 1, 1989, to September, 6 months of 1989, the following sampling of fraud in obtaining student aid was presented to me as evidence of the fact that they were doing their job. One of the categories was false claims in Selective Service registration are prosecuted. This period OIG investigative efforts resulted in the conviction and sentencing of two individuals who obtained SFA funds after having falsely claimed on their student aid applications to have registered with the Selective Service System. These cases are described briefly below, and so as not to further injure the young man, I use a pseudonym of Robert Smith. He plead guilty to two counts of making false statements on student financial aid documents. Smith, while attending Bennington College in Bennington, VT, and Harvard Graduate School of Design falsely claimed on SFA documents that he had registered with the Selective Service. Smith was sentenced in Federal district court, Boston, MA, to 1 year in prison and was ordered to perform 100 hours of community service and pay $1,561 in restitution. That was the amount of the loans he got, $1,500.

Another: Carl Jones. He was sentenced in Federal district court in Burlington, VT, to 18 months unsupervised probation and ordered to make restitution of over $5,000 in Federal student aid. While attending Johnson State College, Johnson, VT, Mr. Jones falsely certified that he was registered with the Selective Service.

When we went back in a 6-month period, as late as 1989, this was almost a 10-year-old law then, and they found two of them, and they had the time, the U.S. Justice Department, to track them down, take them to court, convict them.

Now, not only are we wasting $30 million a year, but we are wasting valuable time and resources of our law enforcement people tracking down people who make a mistake in their application on whether they are or are not properly registered and trying to put them in jail for receiving an opportunity to borrow money to go to college.

This is not a harmless little boondoggle that leaves behind nothing but wasted money in its wake. It also leaves behind wasted lives in its wake, and I urge my colleagues to vote this time against the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, this is a Nation of citizen soldiers, and the world watches us whenever there is a crisis to see whether we have the capability to meet that crisis and where the American people are willing to meet that crisis, and this Selective Service System to signals to the world that at least 97 to 98 percent of our young people, by registering for the draft, are willing to back up the policies of the United States by serving in uniform of the United States.

It is a very important message that we send, not just to our young people, because I think it is a morale booster, but I think it is something that builds character and patriotism in this country. But it also sends a message to our allies and our adversaries around the globe that America is ready, willing, and able to meet our responsibilities.

My colleagues, it would be a major mistake to defund the Selective Service System.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield a moment to the gentleman from New York [Mr.

SOLOMON], my friend, to respond to the last speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for yielding to me, and, as my colleagues know, when it comes to issues like this that are controversial, which get a little bit emotional, I have tried to keep it on a nice even plane, and I have done that. I made no aspersions about our President, about any Member of the other side of the aisle, because we really need to debate this issue.

Then I hear my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], stand up, and he infers that I am antiwoman because I do not support drafting women in the military. He talks about me beating my chest and talking about my previous service in the Marine Corps.

My colleagues, I do not know where all this is coming from. I have a great deal of respect for our women. We do not have to draft our women. They are the most patriotic young women today, and if my colleagues had been to just about every military base in this country like I have, they would know this: They would be so proud of the people that we have there today, and that is what I am bothered about.

But, as my colleagues know, my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], made a statement about we have spent our time running around, chasing these little nobodies that are in violation of some little infraction. I ask my colleagues, "Do you know what the law of the land is?" The law of the land says that there are currently thousands of young men in violation of the law, the Military Selective Service Act, for failing to register. This is what the law is, and this is a felony punishable by up to 5 years in prison and/or a fine of $250,000.

As my colleagues know, I kind of resent the inferences that we are trying to just put people on the spot. That is not true at all. As my colleagues know, I have got the voting record here from last year, and my colleagues should know the vast majority, by 2 to 1 on their side of the aisle, including the gentleman from Michigan, voted for my position. That is not a stampede. That means the overwhelming majority of this body was representing the overwhelming majority of the feeling of the American people.

So, let us be a little careful, let us keep it on the higher plane, and I would urge support of my amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, my leatherneck father, God rest his soul, would be proud of the enthusiasm of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Solomon amendment. Mr. Chairman, faced with a tight budget allocation, the VA–HUD Appropriations Subcommittee decided to all but shut down funding for the Selective Service System during fiscal year 1994. The elimination of the Selective Service System makes sense on both budget and policy grounds.

On budget grounds, the committee was faced with some tough choices; this is one of the tough choices—necessary to reduce the Federal budget deficit. A lot of speeches are given here day after day about reducing Government spending and closing Government agencies. Unfortunately, most of those speeches are generic. Faced with the actual choices, the rhetoric does not come as easy, and these same proponents often fail to vote in favor of specific reductions. Well, this committee deserves credit for facing up to the tough choices and deciding to eliminate this agency in order to fund priorities elsewhere in this appropriations bill. That is pay-as-you-go budgeting as it was meant to be.

On policy grounds, the Selective Service System is clearly a relic of a time when the military needed to be prepared to fight a prolonged conventional war. As the committee in its report points out, the gulf war proved that the military could amass the manpower needed for war while keeping 750,000 troops available to be mobilized for other purposes. The callup for the gulf war demonstrated our Guard and Reserve Forces are ready and able to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to oppose the Solomon amendment and to support the committee's decision to eliminate the Selective Service. It's the right thing to do on both budget and policy grounds.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to Representative SOLOMON's amendment to continue the Selective Service System.

The Selective Service System is a relic of the cold war. To continue it in the 1990's is a waste of taxpayer dollars. Quite simply, there is no need for peacetime draft registration. The Selective Service has reported that it would take at least 30 days to prepare facilities for training new draftees. With draft registration in place, draftees would be available 2 weeks before the military is even ready to train them; without draft registration, draftees would still be available before training camps were ready to open. Forcing all young men to sign up for the draft in peacetime does not ensure that we maintain a readiness advantage.

America's largest military effort since the end of the cold war, Operation Desert Storm, illustrates the fact that draft registration makes no sense today. This country mobilized over half a million servicemen and servicewomen and their supplies to defeat the fifth largest army in the world. All of this happened with no serious discussion of a new military draft. With this experience in mind, it is hard to imagine a scenario in today's world that would require the use of the Selective Service System.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the responsible distribution of Government funds and to oppose this amendment to continue the Selective Service System.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 207, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—202

Andrews (NJ)	Gingrich	Orton
Andrews (TX)	Goodlatte	Oxley
Bachus (AL)	Goodling	Packard
Baesler	Gordon	Pallone
Baker (CA)	Goss	Paxon
Baker (LA)	Grams	Payne (VA)
Ballenger	Grandy	Petri
Barca	Greenwood	Pickett
Barcia	Gunderson	Pickle
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Barton	Hancock	Porter
Bateman	Hansen	Portman
Bentley	Harman	Poshard
Bereuter	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Bevill	Hayes	Quillen
Bilbray	Hefley	Quinn
Billirakis	Herger	Ramstad
Bishop	Hochbrueckner	Ravenel
Bliley	Houghton	Reed
Boehlert	Hoyer	Regula
Bonilla	Hughes	Ridge
Brooks	Hunter	Roberts
Browder	Hutchinson	Roemer
Bryant	Hutto	Rogers
Bunning	Hyde	Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Burton	Inglis	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Inhofe	Roth
Calvert	Jefferson	Roukema
Canady	Johnson (GA)	Rowland
Castle	Johnson (SD)	Saxton
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Collins (GA)	Kim	Schiff
Combest	King	Shaw
Condit	Kingston	Shepherd
Cooper	Klink	Shuster
Costello	Kolbe	Skelton
Cramer	Kyl	Smith (IA)
Crane	Lancaster	Smith (MI)
Crapo	Laughlin	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	Lazio	Smith (OR)
Darden	Levy	Smith (TX)
Deal	Lightfoot	Snowe
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Solomon
Dickey	Lipinski	Spence
Doolittle	Livingston	Spratt
Dornan	Lloyd	Stenholm
Dreier	Machtley	Stump
Duncan	Manzullo	Stupak
Dunn	Mazzoli	Talent
Emerson	McCandless	Tanner
English (OK)	McCollum	Tauzin
Everett	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Ewing	McCurdy	Tejeda
Fawell	McHale	Thomas (CA)
Fields (LA)	McHugh	Thurman
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Torkildsen
Fingerhut	McNulty	Volkmer
Fish	Menendez	Vucanovich
Fowler	Meyers	Walsh
Franks (CT)	Mica	Weldon
Franks (NJ)	Michel	Whitten
Gallegly	Molinari	Wilson
Gallo	Montgomery	Wise
Gekas	Moorhead	Wolf
Geren	Moran	Young (AK)
Gibbons	Morella	Young (FL)
Gillmor	Murtha	
Gilman	Myers	

NOES—207

Abercrombie	Borski	Clayton
Ackerman	Boucher	Clement
Allard	Brewster	Clinger
Andrews (ME)	Brown (CA)	Clyburn
Applegate	Brown (FL)	Coleman
Archer	Brown (OH)	Collins (IL)
Bacchus (FL)	Byrne	Collins (MI)
Barlow	Camp	Cox
Barrett (NE)	Cantwell	Coyne
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Danner
Bellenson	Carr	de la Garza
Blackwell	Chapman	de Lugo (VI)
Bonior	Clay	DeFazio

DeLauro	Klein	Rohrabacher
DeLay	Klug	Rose
Dellums	Knollenberg	Rostenkowski
Derrick	Kopetski	Roybal-Allard
Deutsch	Kreidler	Royce
Dicks	LaFalce	Rush
Dingell	Lambert	Sabo
Dixon	Lantos	Sanders
Dooley	Leach	Santorum
Durbin	Levin	Sarpalius
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Sawyer
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (FL)	Schenk
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Schroeder
English (AZ)	Long	Schumer
Eshoo	Lowey	Scott
Evans	Maloney	Sensenbrenner
Farr	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Serrano
Fazio	Markey	Sharp
Filner	Martinez	Shays
Flake	Matsui	Skaggs
Foglietta	McCloskey	Slattery
Ford (MI)	McDade	Slaughter
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Stark
Frost	McKeon	Stokes
Furse	McKinney	Strickland
Gejdenson	Meek	Studds
Gephardt	Mfume	Swett
Gilchrest	Miller (CA)	Swift
Glickman	Miller (FL)	Synar
Gonzalez	Mineta	Taylor (NC)
Green	Minge	Thomas (WY)
Gutierrez	Mink	Thompson
Hall (OH)	Moakley	Thornton
Hamilton	Mollohan	Torres
Hastings	Murphy	Torricelli
Hefner	Nadler	Towns
Hilliard	Natcher	Traficant
Hinchey	Neal (MA)	Tucker
Hoagland	Neal (NC)	Underwood (GU)
Hobson	Norton (DC)	Upton
Hoekstra	Nussle	Valentine
Hoke	Oberstar	Velazquez
Holden	Obey	Visclosky
Horn	Olver	Walker
Huffington	Ortiz	Waters
Inslee	Owens	Watt
Jacobs	Pastor	Waxman
Johnson (CT)	Pelosi	Wheat
Johnson, E.B.	Penny	Williams
Johnston	Peterson (FL)	Woolsey
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Wyden
Kaptur	Pomeroy	Wynn
Kasich	Price (NC)	Yates
Kennedy	Rahall	Zeliff
Kennelly	Rangel	Zimmer
Kildee	Reynolds	
Kleczka		

NOT VOTING—30

Armey	Hamburg	Richardson
Becerra	Henry	Sangmeister
Berman	Istook	Sisisky
Blute	LaRocco	Skeen
Boehner	Lehman	Stearns
Callahan	Mann	Sundquist
Conyers	Manton	Unsoeld
Coppersmith	McMillan	Vento
Faleomavaega (AS)	Meehan	Washington
Ford (TN)	Parker	
	Payne (NJ)	

□ 1707

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Armey for, with Mr. Meehan against.

Mr. Stearns for, with Mr. Skeen against.

Mr. CAMP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Messrs. HOBSON, RAHALL, and ARCHER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BEVILL changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments en bloc were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained in Cincinnati today due to plane trouble and missed the first five votes of the day. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 274, "aye" on rollcall No. 276, "aye" on rollcall No. 277, and "aye" on rollcall No. 278. I also would have voted "present" during the quorum call which was rollcall No. 275.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

The text of the amendments en bloc is as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. BEREUTER: Page 32, line 10, strike "$85,000,000" and insert "$83,000,000".

Page 32, after line 11, insert the following:

INDIAN HOUSING

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND

For the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) of guaranteed loans authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 3739), $2,000,000. Such funds shall be available to subsidize guarantees of total loan principal in an amount not to exceed $50,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 208, the amendments en bloc may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment and are not subject to a demand for division of the question.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to the VA-HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill would transfer $2 million within the bill to fund a fiscally responsible demonstration program already authorized by Congress to provide home loan guarantees for Indian families seeking, for the first time ever, to buy their own homes on Indian reservations rather than live in Government-provided public housing. I ask, can we in good conscience appropriate $3.1 billion for Public Housing Modernization, not to mention a proposed $2.1 billion for a space station and a proposed $1.6 billion for the superconducting super collider, and still fail to appropriate a mere $2 million to fund this loan guarantee program?

The Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program, originally proposed by this Member and authorized by Congress for fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1994 in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, addressed the fact that conventional loans are not available to native people seeking to buy or construct homes on reservation trust lands. Since the authorization expires after fiscal year 1994, it is important that we fund this home loan guarantee program this year.

My amendment would transfer $2 million from the policy research and development fund, which received a funding level of $85 million in the fiscal year 1994 VA-HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill. This is a very reasonable place to cut since this $85 million funding level represents an incredible increase of $50 million over the President's budget request and $60 million over last year's appropriation.

This Member would also like to point out that HUD Secretary Cisneros has expressed support for the program and has indicated that a $2 million appropriation will allow $50 million in loan guarantees to be made. Despite the Secretary's intent HUD inadvertently failed to request the $2 million. Thus, the subcommittee did not know of his intended request nor appropriate funds in H.R. 2491 for the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program.

Can Congress justify tripling last year's appropriations on policy research and development? Can we justify failing to fund the intended $2 million for this program when Indian families are living in houses without plumbing or heating, or worse, are going homeless? Do we wish to restrict Indian's housing choices only to units of expensive public housing? The first Americans also deserve to share in the American dream of home ownership.

Transferring $2 million from existing funding in the bill to the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program is the right thing to do. It is an authorized, innovative pilot loan guarantee program which can be a cost-effective way for the United States to meet its legal and moral obligation to native people to provide safe, decent and affordable housing. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to transfer $2 million for the authorized Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program.

□ 1710

Mr. Chairman, it is better, it is less expensive than buying, purchasing, and constructing public housing. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I am pleased to yield to the Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I have had an opportunity to see the gentleman's amendment, and the committee agrees with the gentleman. His amendment is acceptable to the committee.

We have also discussed the matter with the ranking minority member and we understand it is agreeable to him.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the chairman for that confirmation.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, we have no reservation. We appreciate the gentlamen's amendment.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the ranking member of the subcommittee on the authorizing committee.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and I want to commend him. I am grateful that the chairman of the committee and the ranking member have accepted it. It is a very wisely conceived amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I especially want to commend the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Nebraska, for his steadfast support of Indian housing. Certainly he is the most knowledgeable and outspoken Member of the House when it comes to Native American issues.

Mr. Chairman, it was last year that we established this program for the first time, and I want to thank the gentleman for his farsightedness here, and in seeking this amendment. It is well devised. It takes nothing away from other essential programs, and I commend the gentleman. I am happy to support him.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bereuter amendment to transfer $2 million from the policy, research account to the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program.

As the ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee, I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska for his steadfast support of Indian housing.

The gentleman is by far the most knowledgeable and outspoken member of the committee when it comes to native American issues, especially housing needs.

The Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program was authorized last year in the 1992 Housing and Community Development Act.

The program was created to address the unfortunate fact that conventional mortgage loans were simply not available to native Americans seeking, in some cases for the very first time, to buy or construct their own homes on reservations or trust lands.

Unfortunately, when the HUD budget for fiscal year 1994 was submitted to the Congress, a funding request for his program was inadvertently omitted. Despite Secretary Cisnero's support for the program, the Appropriations Committee failed to provide any funds.

This amendment would transfer $2 million from the HUD policy development and research account which received an unexplained increase of $50 million over the administration's request.

I cannot conceive of any initiatives currently going on in HUD, or anticipated, which can justify this kind of increase. I fear, it is being set up as a discretionary fund for unauthorized special purpose programs.

If that is the case, then we should delete the entire increase. But at the very least we should support this amendment which will help our native American families become homeowners.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentlewoman for her kind words, and I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for his support as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

The amendments en bloc were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAMS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAMS: Page 32, line 11, insert after the period the following new sentence:

The amount otherwise provided under this heading is hereby further reduced by $48,000,000.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Chairman, during full committee markup the Committee on Appropriations increased funding for HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research by $16 million over the VA–HUD subcommittee's request. According to the committee's report, this account funds programs of research, studies, testing, and demonstrations related to the HUD mission. Additional funding will permit the Department to fund high-priority research studies and demonstrations, but it leaves no specifics in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this funding is $60 million over last year's funding, $60 million over the subcommittee's recommendations, and it is $50 million over the President's and HUD's own request.

My amendment would reduce the funding down to $35 million. That is the same level requested by the administration, and $35 million is the amount HUD says it needs for these programs. It is still a 40-percent increase over last year's spending.

Mr. Chairman, again, this VA–HUD bill does not have a specific earmark for special proposed grants. The $60 million increase could be used as a place holder in conference to dish out money for special projects that the full House would not have a chance to vote on. This is the kind of closed door, smoke-filled room process that the American voters are sick and tired of seeing. There are also some other potential appearance problems if the funds are left to the Secretary's discretion.

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind Members of the House what happened the last time a HUD Secretary had discretionary funds available to him, and while I have tremendous respect for this Secretary and his integrity, appearances are often more dangerous than reality. In fact, we should take heed of the Lantos report on the HUD scandals, which was issued by the Committee on Government Operations. HUD funding decisions should be based on merit and on competition, and free of politics and discretion on the part of the Secretary.

In addition, just as it was wrong for HUD to award housing funds for political reasons, so, too, Congress should not earmark funding for housing projects in appropriation bills. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] is right on this, and I urge my colleagues to rise and support this amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, as we put a bill of this type together, what we have to do is try to look down the road and see what we may be facing in conference. We know that there are three programs currently unauthorized that we will have to deal with in conference. One is national service, another is community investment, and the third is community development banks.

In order to have some flexibility in conference, what we have done in some accounts is to park money that, in conference, we will be able to remove to fund some of the other programs that we know are going to be authorized, that are currently unauthorized. But we wanted to be able to act responsibly, so when we come back to the House from conference we will have the funds there that give us the flexibility to fund these different programs. That is basically why we had to increase this account. We would urge the House to support the purpose that these moneys are intended to meet.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was take by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 194, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—220

Allard	Calvert	Duncan
Andrews (TX)	Camp	Dunn
Applegate	Canady	Edwards (TX)
Archer	Cantwell	Emerson
Armey	Castle	English (OK)
Bachus (AL)	Clement	Everett
Baker (CA)	Clinger	Ewing
Baker (LA)	Coble	Fawell
Ballenger	Collins (GA)	Fields (TX)
Barca	Combest	Fingerhut
Barrett (NE)	Condit	Fish
Bartlett	Cooper	Fowler
Barton	Costello	Franks (CT)
Bateman	Cox	Franks (NJ)
Bentley	Crane	Frost
Bilbray	Crapo	Gallegly
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Gekas
Bliley	Deal	Geren
Boehlert	DeFazio	Gillmor
Boehner	DeLay	Gilman
Bonilla	Deutsch	Gingrich
Brewster	Dickey	Glickman
Browder	Dicks	Goodlatte
Bunning	Doolittle	Goodling
Burton	Dornan	Goss
Buyer	Dreier	Grams

Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lancaster
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Lloyd
Machtley
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Swett
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Valentine
Volkmer
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bellenson
Bereuter
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cardin
Carr
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Hoyer
Hughes
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—25

Becerra
Berman
Blute
Callahan
Chapman
Conyers
Coppersmith
Diaz-Balart
Faleomavaega (AS)
Ford (TN)
Hamburg
Henry
Istook
LaRocco
Manton
McMillan
Meehan
Moran
Payne (NJ)
Richardson
Sangmeister
Skeen
Sundquist
Unsoeld
Vento

□ 1737

Mr. KLINK changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. WILLIAMS, WISE, BREWSTER, and DICKS, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. EDWARDS of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, $25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That $20,481,000 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 TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and nonadministrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $7,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $918,463,000, of which $444,872,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, and $8,038,000 shall be provided from funds of the Government National Mortgage Association.

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, $46,305,000, of which $10,190,000 shall be transferred from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Federal Housing Enterprise Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, $5,742,000, to remain available until expended, from the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Fund: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be collected by the Director as authorized by section 1316 (a) and (b)(2) of such Act, and deposited in the Fund under section 1316(f): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the last sentence in section 1316(e) of such Act, the amount of this first annual assessment shall not be reduced by any part of the amount of the initial special assessment under section 1316(e).

□ 1740

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOLBE: Page 34, after line 6, insert the following:

REVISION OF AMOUNTS FOR HUD

The amounts otherwise provided by this title are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Policy Development and Research—Research and Technology", and increasing the amount made available for "Housing Programs—Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere Grants (HOPE Grants)", by $10,000,000.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been read has been changed as a result of the passage of the last amendment; instead of the $60 million or the $48 million, we are now down to $10 million which remains in this account. This would take money from the research and development account of the Policy Development and Research Division of HUD, and put it back into the HOPE Program. HOPE, as I think most of my colleagues know, is a program for home ownership for low-income people. It takes public housing programs and makes it possible for low-income families to own their own homes.

In a very real sense, this is a symbolic gesture, but I think the symbolism is important. This $10 million will make available some housing for home ownership for individuals who would otherwise not have it.

Let me begin by pointing out that this account, the research and technology account, was increased originally by 240 percent over the amount of last year's funding and 143 percent over the amount requested by the administration.

Those figures, obviously, are different now with the passage of the last amendment. But the point still remains that no justification has been given for the added dollars in this account. This money is not required to go through any kind of competitive process in order to be spent; there is no review process, no merit checks, no paper trail. Simply put, this is money for the Secretary to hand out arbitrarily at will to whomever he chooses.

I think we can use this money far better by making it available for home ownership for a handful of people who might otherwise be denied this opportunity.

So, the amendment which I offer today in a bipartisan spirit of myself, Congressman BLACKWELL, and Congressman ANDREWS is an extraordinarily important amendment.

Let me just review with you where we stand on the HOPE Program. Unfortunately, my review is not good news. There has been a relentless attack on what is a good program.

The attack on HOPE began with the budget request that is only 10 percent, or $109 million for next year, $240 million less than the fiscal year 1993 appropriation.

Next, $165 million of the reduced amount was offered for rescission in the House version of the pending stimulus bill.

Finally, in the coup de grace, the bill before us takes $55 million from HOPE for NASA. The result, if you put together all of these proposals, is that HOPE is actually at a negative balance of about $4 million.

The cutbacks are going to prevent the Federal Government from making good on all ongoing commitments so that low-income Americans can realize their dream of ownership.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is the American dream to be able to own your home, and I think that dream ought to apply to those who are low-income people as well as those who are middle-class or wealthy. Those families have had that dream available to them for a long time. That is the idea of the HOPE Program, to let others, not so wealthy, less fortunate, own their home.

Today there are over 500 projects in the pipeline, many of them waiting for the promised implementation grants. They have gone through the planning grants, the housing has been repaired, the training has been done, the appraisals have been done. They are now actually ready to purchase their homes. But, without the funds, they will be denied that opportunity.

In the HOPE I Program alone, counting the $165 million rescission, not the $55 million cut being considered today, only 5,000 homes out of 34,000 applicants waiting for implementation grants are going to be able to receive the money to purchase their own home. That is less than 15 percent of those who are currently in the pipeline ready to buy their own home.

It has been said there are unobligated funds; yes, there are unobligated funds. But not because of a lack of applicants. These funds are unobligated because the bureaucracy makes it a long and difficult process for approval.

There are notices of funding accounts sitting on the desk of the Secretary for hundreds, even thousands, of these applications so that they can go forward.

If the argument on unobligated funds is going to be made, I would point out that there are many unobligated, many millions of dollars of unobligated funds in the HOME Program. Yet we are increasing the HOME Program.

So that argument does not fly here today. It is not a reflection of a lack of interest in HOPE, the interest is far greater than the dollars available to us. It is one of bureaucratic inefficiency.

According to the HUD program office for the HOPE I Program, 34,056 units or homes are already in the pipeline. That is, they received the planning grants. If fiscal year 1993 funding is not touched, only 29 percent of those will be able to be helped. With the rescission I talked about earlier only about 13 percent, or 5,000, will be further funded. With the further reductions made here today, the amount would be far less than that.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members—perhaps in the course of the debate I will have an opportunity to discuss some particular case studies of the HOPE Program and its successes. For now, I would simply urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this amendment, and return a few dollars to the HOPE Program so that low-income people will have the opportunity to own their own homes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]. This amendment would increase funds for the HOPE Program with an offsetting decrease from the research account. This amendment appears to also be a partial offset for the rescission of 1993 and 1992 HOPE funds also carried in this bill.

HOPE is a lower priority program in this administration. HOPE 1 was certainly a high-priority program of the past administration, but priorities have changed.

The Department is in the process of terminating the HOPE 1 and HOPE 2 Programs. In a letter dated May 27, the Secretary informed the subcommittee of his intention to phase out the HOPE 1 and the HOPE 2 Programs. He said and I quote,

> The 1993 Budget originally proposed a combination of planning grants and implementation grants but the Department now proposes to award implementation grants only in 1993. This change in the commitment of funds in 1993 is consistent with the Administration's proposal to reduce funding for the HOPE program in 1994. * * * This decision to reduce HOPE funding in 1994 was not made without careful consideration. This decision reflects a proposed redistribution of HUD budgetary resources to enable increased funding for higher priorities, including investing additional resources in rental assistance, public housing, community development and homeless assistance.

The Secretary goes on to say that:

> Moreover, the HOPE program and its underlying concept of converting public housing to homeownership does raise serious issues and concerns which are well known to your Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's action is in line with the administration's position. In fact, the administration has proposed a $100 million rescission of HOPE funds as an offset in the 1993 supplemental appropriations bill. We should not be adding funds for the HOPE 1 and HOPE 2 Programs.

The number of public housing units in the country should not be reduced. There are literally hundreds of thousands of families on waiting lists for public housing in this country. Selling public housing units as would be done in the HOPE 1 Program reduces the number of families that could be assisted in the future. It makes little sense to reduce the number of public housing units that are available to provide assistance to low-income families.

Funds will still be available for the HOPE 1 and HOPE 2 Programs. There are large unobligated balances in the HOPE Program. A total of $472 million has been provided for HOPE 1 and HOPE 2 in the 1992 and 1993 appropriations bills. Of that amount, $105 million has been reserved. That leaves an unreserved balance in this program of $367 million. The proposed rescission of $250 million will leave $117 million available—$66 million in HOPE 1 and $51 million in HOPE 2. The point is all of the HOPE 1 and HOPE 2 funds are not being rescinded. Substantial sums of money will still be available. In addition, the bill also contains the requested $109 million appropriation for the HOPE Program in 1994.

Let me summarize why Members should vote against the amendment. HOPE 1 is a lower priority program. The administration is phasing it out. The sum of $117 million would still be available from the 1993 and 1992 appropriations for the HOPE 1 and HOPE 2 Programs. Finally, with the tremendous waiting lists to get into public housing, it makes no sense to be selling those units.

I urge Members to vote "no" on the Kolbe amendment.

□ 1750

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kolbe amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my first tour of this institution was in the 102d Congress in which Secretary Jack Kemp worked the HOPE Program. The reason that he wanted the HOPE Program to succeed was that it did not phase out HOPE. Public housing has failed. It has been a disaster. If we take a look at the concerns of phasing out public housing, absolutely yes, Mr. Chairman, I would phase out every piece of public housing and insert private ownership. Instead of empowering government to provide for the minorities and the people who cannot afford it, let us empower people with their own homes.

In my first term here, I went on a drug bust. In that drug bust there was

an Hispanic San Diego police officer. We busted some druggers. The very house that he grew up in next door had drug sellers in it.

I asked him how he was able to succeed and not become one of those drug sellers?

And he said, "DUKE, I was able to do that first of all because my family had values. Second, we saved every penny and we were able to own our own home and create those values."

If you take someone who owns their own home and someone writes graffiti on it, they are going to keep that person from doing it. They do not do that in public housing. You end up with a drug seller next to you, and you are going to kick him out if you own your own home. That does not exist in public housing.

You want to reduce public housing units? Absolutely yes. Let us put it in the hands of the people.

The President said he wants to empower people. That is what the HOPE Program does. It does not do away with HOPE, like the chairman's objection to this amendment.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. The points that he made I think are very valid ones.

I want to respond to one thing that the chairman of the subcommittee made when he said about taking these homes out of the stream not available for public housing.

We are not talking about mobile homes. These are homes that are not going anywhere. They remain in the inner-city communities and they remain with the resale restrictions on them.

The only difference is that the residents are the owners, instead of the low-income housing corporation, the public housing program of the city. It is the people who own them and that is what we ought to be trying to do.

Let me just point out. The gentleman said that the subcommittee's work is in keeping with where the President of the United States is. Let me just point out what the President of the United States said during the campaign in a speech at Georgetown University in 1991:

> We have to start indigenous economic development and housing strategies in these inner-city areas. There are all kinds of housing programs at work empowering people. I think the Congress made a mistake in not passing more of Jack Kemp's housing initiatives to do more for low-income working people, to give them the right to own their own homes and secure their own neighborhoods.

Finally, let me just mention the case study that I was talking about, the Abbottsford Homes, a 700-low rise housing development in Philadelphia, PA, that has been managed by residents since May 1991 in the community represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL], who is a cosponsor of this amendment.

Before resident management, the sites had estimated 3,000 residents lived within the public housing development described by the accounting firm of Cox and Associates as "one of the most deplorable ones in the country." Trash and debris filled the yards. Weeds and broken unpainted fences outlined grafitti-covered buildings.

However, and again quoting from the Cox accounting analysis, "since the inception of the TMC, residents began taking immediate control of their property."

Tenants mended fences, mowed the lawns, kept their yards litter-free, reduced over 70 percent of the grafitti and had the streets paved at no cost. Residents have been shown to be efficient managers of the site, lowering vacancy rates from 21 percent to 10 percent, increasing rent collections from 70 to 85 percent, implementing a screening process by current residents of prospective tenants to get at the problem that my colleague, the gentleman from California was talking about. These efforts have yielded over $800,000 in cost savings which are re-invested for rehabilitation and community services since taking control in May 1991, whereas the severely mismanaged Philadelphia Public Housing Authority, on the other hand, was taken over by HUD in 1992.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding to me.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's statement that he just made referencing my earlier remarks, I am sure the gentleman would agree——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(At the request of Mr. KOLBE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CUNNINGHAM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman agrees that every time you sell a public housing unit, you reduce our public housing stock by a unit.

Now, the fact is under the law you are required to replace every unit that is sold on a one-to-one basis. But most of the units are being replaced not by public housing stock because very few new homes are being built for people who live in public housing. What they are doing is replacing it out of section 8 stock. So consequently, we are taking away from existing stock for people who have to live in public housing.

□ 1800

But I think people ought to also understand that not a single person has a unit that they own yet and that we have spent millions of dollars.

There are 231 planning grants for 32,404 units and 18 implementation grants now encompassing 1,103 units.

So that we understand where this is, nobody yet has a house. All but three of these groups have received funding for replacement housing in the form of public housing development funding, section 8 assistance on CIAP funding. In addition to the three grantees that have not received replacement funding, three grantees applied only for a portion of their replacement housing needs and will have to apply for more replacement in upcoming NOFA rounds. Four of the grantees anticipate selling units within the next 6 months. Eight are to sell units within the next 2 years. The remaining six developments involve a larger number of units and will complete sales within the next 5 years.

We have already spent somewhere in the neighborhood of $31 million. There is no telling how much we are going to spend over the next 5 years—if the new administration went along with this program—yet nobody owns a unit.

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, on last Thursday I was visited by a group of housing tenants from across the country, and they were very angry because a few weeks ago we removed money from the HOPE Program, and I observed to them the arguments that I heard regarding this program, and how it was a fraud, and how it did not help poor people, and they told me that it just is not true. They told me that this program helps them and, "Mr. Blackwell, if you will come around the country and visit some of our neighborhoods, you will see that we are being helped."

Mr. Chairman, I keep hearing this argument that the program is a bad program, but in all of this country all of the programs are bad because everywhere we go there is nothing but dilapidated housing for poor people.

So why are we concerned with this program? Anything, any money spent for poor people, is well spent because we do not spend enough.

So, I do not know where the expertise is when it comes to the HOPE Program.

Certainly I respect the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], and those who are against this program. But there is a lot of disrespect due to those people who allow these kinds of conditions to exist in the first place.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 10) 31

We are people living like animals throughout this country, in cesspools, worse than in Third World countries, and so any money that we spend is money well spent, and so I would suggest that we continue this program.

They tell me that 500 and some projects that are now being worked on, let us give them a chance. I understand that the program has not been given a chance to work. I know that we need housing for poor people. It does not matter to me how they pay for it.

In Israel for the Ethiopian Jews they are appropriating $110,000, giving them $85,000 while they give them the mortgage for the rest. So why not help poor people in this country?

I am sick and tried of seeing people suffer. I come from a poor neighborhood.

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL] for yielding to me.

Is this amendment one that reduces money for public housing?

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is a program that will add an additional $10 million to money that we already have to continue the HOPE program. This is the way it was explained to me, and, if that is what it is, I believe that we should continue it.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, if the gentleman would yield to me to ask the distinguished chairman from Ohio a question, I would ask him, "Are you in agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania in the well?"

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

Mr. BLACKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman in the well is a cosponsor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. BLACKWELL. That is right.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Kolbe-Blackwell amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. And that amendment adds money to public housing or detracts?

Mr. STOKES. No, that amendment puts $10 million more back into the HOPE I and HOPE II Programs.

Mr. CONYERS. I see, and my distinguished friend and chairman is opposed to that regretfully.

Mr. STOKES. I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield very briefly?

Mr. BLACKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Just very quickly, so we understand, so the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] understands, the $10 million comes from the research and technology account of policy, development and research in HUD. This is not public housing, so it really adds it into. It is additional money in public housing as opposed to having it in the research account.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL] for having yielded to me.

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

Mr. BLACKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware that for the last 9 years the government under Reagan and Bush did not build a single public housing unit, and now the gentleman is saying to me that he wants to sell these old, dilapidated housing units to people who are on welfare, people who are on food stamps, people who do not have jobs, people who cannot pay the rent hardly. He wants to now give them these old, dilapidated buildings some 30, 40, 50 years old.

I ask the gentleman, "Is that what you want to do?"

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to give them housing that we have rehabilitated. I want to give them decent housing.

The gentleman admits that they are dilapidated and they are living in those houses. I am saying that the tenant captains, 40 strong, came to my office last Thursday and said, "This is a good program. Give it a chance to work." I think we ought to do that.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to the VA/HUD appropriations bill. I still believe in a program called HOPE—the Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere. I agree with the statements of a speaker at Georgetown University in 1991 who said,

> I think the Congress made a mistake in not passing more of Jack Kemp's housing initiatives to do more for low income working people, to give them the right to own their own homes and secure their own neighborhoods.

The speaker was Bill Clinton, the man from HOPE.

This program started by Jack Kemp, when he was Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, extends the American dream of owning your own home to low-income families and is a positive model of how Government can encourage and empower low-income individuals and families to take charge of their lives and work together in their communities to get out from under the oppression of Government dependency.

The HOPE Program signaled a fundamental change in Federal housing policy direction. It gave low-income families a personal stake in the well-being of their communities and an opportunity to escape welfare dependency. This marked a change from traditional Federal housing policies which favor subsidies to the housing industry over direct assistance to low income families. In short, this program moved to eliminate the middleman who profit from the low-income housing market and empower and encourage low-income families to take part in the American dream of owning your own home. Thus far it has helped over 50,000 families through over 570 local projects since its inception in 1992.

Home ownership and resident management encourages increased care and preventative maintenance because the residents themselves have a vested interest in their homes and communities. We know that home ownership and community development in turn increases citizen vigilance in protecting their communities from crime, drug abuse, and violence. Not only will mothers and fathers own their own homes; their neighborhoods would have the promise of being safer and more hopeful places to raise their children. Again, I say, let's keep this hope alive.

The funding currently in the budget doesn't even cover funding for projects already in the pipeline. This amendment represents a modest and reasonable increase to fulfill commitments we have already held out to thousands of low-income families. There are 456 current HOPE planning grants, representing 53,300 units, which will need implementation grants within the next 2 years. These communities have formed tenant management organizations, have arranged for State and local HOPE matching funds and are ready and waiting to use their own toil and sweat to revitalize their communities. The current funding would decimate the program to a funding level where less than 10 percent of the low-income participants presently in the program would receive the necessary funding to complete their home ownership conversions and we will have wasted funding already extended for planning grants, that essentially will have gone to raising and then dashing the hopes of thousands of low-income individuals. We should not be shutting the door of opportunity for those who have placed their hopes in previous commitments made by this body.

Is it any wonder our inner cities suffer from turmoil and a sense of despair and hopelessness when we refuse to follow through on policies such as the HOPE Program that provide a way out? This body should not dash the hopes of thousands of hard working low-income individuals ready and willing to work for their share of the American dream. HOPE supporters come from both sides of the aisle—it was originally established in 1991 as a bipartisan effort by Congressman JIM KOLBE and then Congressman Mike Espy. If this body still believes in a place called HOPE I would

urge my colleagues to support this transfer of funding back into the HOPE home ownership program. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following information:

According to the HUD Program Office for the HOPE I program, 34,056 units (homes) are already in the pipeline (i.e., they have already received planning grants).

If the FY 1993 funding (which includes a 1992 carry-over) is not touched, HUD can only fund 29% (of the 34,056 units).

With the rescission of $164.5 million, HUD can only fund about 5,000 units or about 13%.

The above information makes clear that this rescission will in fact renege on commitments made to people preparing in good faith to receive their implementation grant funding.

This is unfair and erodes what little faith remains in federal government promises.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the concept for selling housing to the poorest in our society was conceived as an attempt to divert the real intentions of the Reagan-Bush administrations and to relieve the Government of the responsibility of taking care of these housing projects.

Here we are, the Federal Government, with all of the massive resources that we have, and we cannot keep these projects in repair. We cannot keep the electricity on, we cannot keep the water running, we cannot keep the roofs repaired, and we talk about selling these units to the poorest people that we have.

Mr. Chairman, it is a scam, it is a fraud, it is a disgrace really. We should stop this talk about home ownership. There will never be any real home ownership under this provision of law or the proposal that is being advanced today. We are talking about co-ops. We are talking about 10,000 people living in one single unit, buying the unit, and then 50 percent of those units are vacant now. So, that leaves the 50 percent of the people that we will sell the units to for $1, perhaps paying the co-op fees for all of these kinds of problems that exists.

In my district now we have the famous Carr Square Village that this administration, the past administration, has in the pipeline $36 million to remodel it, over a hundred thousand dollars a unit, destroyed 274 units, and then give it to people who are poor and say, It's yours. Now you keep it up.

Tell me how they are going to keep it up.

□ 1810

First of all, if we got over $100,000 per unit, we ought to build two units for poor people and let them own it. We ought to give them the FHA houses we reclaimed, void units. We should not be selling these massive inhumane structures that we have. Let me say to Members that this is a scheme and a scam.

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and brother from Missouri for yielding to me. Is it not correct that HOPE I and II will be eliminated under the plan of the committee that has brought this appropriation to the floor, but HOPE III through VI will continue to exist?

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, HOPE III through VI will continue to exist. I think there is some money in the pipeline for HOPE I and II, and I do not know if the committee bill would totally stop all of that. But the new Secretary of HUD is opposed to converting these units at $120,000 or $130,000 per unit and then selling them to the poorest people in society.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I support his position entirely.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is incomprehensible to think that those who can barely afford food, clothing, medical care, transportation, and other basic necessities, can afford the expenses of home ownership, and I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] that he has, I think, expressed the type of sentiment that needs to be expressed here.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the product of public housing. My brother Carl and I grew up in public housing in Cleveland, OH. We grew up in a family with a widowed mother who was a domestic, who made $8 a day and car fare. She was also on public welfare because she could not raise two boys and be able to give them decent housing, being a domestic worker and being on public assistance.

But my mother, in her wildest dreams, hoped she would be able to educate her boys and some day they would be able to be somebody. But she also did not want to spend the rest of her life and the boys' lives living in public housing. She aspired for something better.

People in public housing are the poorest of the poor. They are the people, all of whom basically are dependent upon welfare, who are untrained, who are uneducated. No one aspires to buy a home in that setting. One aspires to do what my mother did, and that is move out to the part of town where her boys had a backyard and front lawn and where they had a decent environment in which to live.

That is what we want for these people, and that is where the gentleman is right when he says this is a total scam.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Kolbe amendment to restore $10 million in funds for the HOPE Program and to support the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL].

We have had our battles on this floor over this program. Those of us who support HOPE believe that low-income Americans deserve the chance to own their own homes, just like rich people and middle-clsss people. Legislators from both sides of the aisle, from Jack Kemp to Mike Espy, reached common ground on this issue.

As a matter of fact, during the last Presidential campaign, it was then-candidate Bill Clinton who stopped in Detroit at a HOPE Program, and there he said that if elected, he would seek to expand tenant management and tenant ownership. He even tapped Mike Espy to write those proposals into the Democratic platform, where they have remained until this day.

So we went forward with the program, and tenant groups all across the country lined up to participate in HOPE. As a matter of fact, this past January we had almost 300 of them at a national conference on HOPE and empowerment issues right here in Washington.

All told, more than 450 groups received HOPE planning grants during the last 2 years. More than 52,000 public housing residents have taken the first steps on the road to home ownership. Every one of these groups will need implementation grant funding within the next 2 years—and that is exactly the funding that was rescinded from the HOPE account, and a number of those proposals are in Pennsylvania.

Some would argue that its not worth doing the rehabilitation work on these units, that the people do not have the money to maintain their homes. I would say to those who make these claims: why not let the people have a chance?

Ethel Wise, who heads a tenants association of the 536 units Martin Luther King, Jr. Public Housing Project in south Philadelphia, has put it best. She said, "Poor people do not always unnecessarily want more money from the Government. They want to decide how the money is spent."

That is what this program is all about, and that is why Ethel Wise was a major applicant for this funding under this program.

These people like Ethel Wise, have put themselves on the line for the HOPE Program. They have started tenant management groups, they have arranged matching funds with the State and local government and the public

housing authority, they have surveyed their units to see which are eligible for conversion to home ownership. In many cases, they have started neighborhood watch patrols, and began volunteer summer programs for kids. In short, they have kept their part of the bargain. They want what all of us want—a chance to own their own home.

Now Secretary Cisneros has said that he supports part of the HOPE Program which deals with single family homes, the so-called HOPE III. I for one want to work with the Secretary. I would like to support increased funds for HOPE III. I want to support the priorities of this Secretary of HUD.

But we cannot abandon those low-income Americans who live in multiunit public housing complexes who are waiting for the next phase of this funding, and that is what this amendment is all about. All of them would rather be in single family homes, of course, but that is not reality. The reality of inner-city life is that people live in huge complexes, not neat little row homes. If these people want to own their own homes, we should give them a chance.

If you vote against this amendment, you are voting to turn your back on these people. These people, 52,000 of them, took this Congress at its word. We offered them a chance, and they took it. Now we are in the process of pulling the rug out from under them. Eight projects in the Philadelphia area alone we are going to pull the rug out from under.

Remember this: unless we support this amendment, only 5,000 families will be able to complete the HOPE Program and actually own their own homes. We owe it to them to continue the funding that this past administration and our friend and colleague Mike Espy fought so hard to secure funding for in this body.

I say, let us stand with these people who have worked so hard to realize the American dream. Support those people who need us the most, who came down to Washington to lobby for the continued funding for this program. Do the right thing. Support the Kolbe amendment.

As our former colleague and friend Mike Espy has said repeatedly in discussions on the merits of this program on the floor of this House, "Owning your own home is not a Republican idea; it is an American idea."

Mike Espy fought for this program, and we should continue the funding for those people relying on the funds for the next phase of the HOPE Program.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in great respect for the work of the committee, but I rise in strong support for the Kolbe amendment. I do not know every HOPE project in America, and I certainly do not know that every HOPE project in America will succeed. But I sure do know the record of failure of the status quo.

Representing the city of Camden, NJ, I sure do know there are children tonight living in conditions that we would not place our pets. I sure do know that billions after billions after billions of dollars have been pumped into those housing projects over the years, and that so much of that money has added that new position, furnished the office of that housing authority, found a new seminar, a new memo to write, and has not improved the quality of life for too many people in too many places across this country.

We have had a tired, empty, meaningless debate in this country about public housing, as those people have sat in squalor. We have had some people who have argued that government should do nothing. Frankly, left to their own devices, that is what most of the people in the Reagan and Bush administrations would have done, and they should be criticized.

Then we have had people who have said government must and can do everything. And they are wrong when they say that, because there is a track record of failure that says they are wrong.

Instead of arguing about how much more or how much less government should do, why do we not give an idea a chance, give an idea a chance that says let's see how much more people can do for themselves?

I do not know whether every one of these projects will succeed, but I do know this: if people have the determination and the initiative to form corporations and organizations and organize, if they have the wherewithal to do community policing and neighborhood watches, if they will fill out the forms and sit through the meetings and wade through the redtape, we owe them a chance.

□ 1820

The burden of proof is not on those who would contest the right to try a new idea. The burden of proof is on those who would defend the failed status quo that so many Americans are living in tonight.

We do not know that HOPE will work, but we do know that initiative started by people, whether they are black, brown, red, yellow or white, rich or poor, rural or urban, we know that initiative can work. And people should be given a chance to make it work.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Kolbe amendment, not because it is a sure thing, but doing nothing is a sure thing.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman a question. I am sure he is very aware that it is sad that our body is discussing two different programs to try to help poor people that need help in this country, and our housing needs help in this country, when, in fact, we are discussing a paucity of funds because the space station has taken money in a rescission from this particular program.

I just want to point that out to this body.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Reclaiming my time, I would be happy to point out that the funding for this program comes from research and development accounts in the amount of $10 million that, frankly, is not impacted. But I respect the gentleman's effort to work on the space station, with which I respectfully disagree.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the gentleman, because I agree with his general discussion, it is time we do something. But is the gentleman aware of the fact that programs three through six are still left. We are talking about some fine-tuning here. We are talking about eliminating or cutting back programs one and two. So it is not those who are for this program or against it. The vote is on, do we want to fine-tune it in the manner that has been recommended by the appropriations subcommittee or not?

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Reclaiming my time, I think we are sending a clear and unmistakable signal to people who organize under HOPE that they have no hope of going forward based on the rescission that this House did several weeks ago and based upon this bill, as it now stands.

I would respectfully disagree and ask that my colleagues strongly support the Kolbe amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kolbe-Blackwell amendment.

During the campaign, President Clinton, as has been pointed out, indicated his support for home ownership for the poor. He, in fact, as has also been pointed out, visited a HOPE project and expressed his desire to continue this privatization effort.

In addition, as has already been pointed out, Agricultural Secretary Mike Espy, our former colleague, was a leader in pushing HOPE through Congress, as has been previously mentioned.

During the last 3 years 34,000 families have been told by our Government that they will have an opportunity to buy their units through the HOPE Program. These families have received

planning grants and are awaiting implementation grants.

Does HUD have sufficient funds to follow through on the commitments made to these families? It apparently appears they do not.

It is estimated that if all the funds currently appropriated for HOPE were made available, only 13 percent of the 34,000 units in the pipeline would be privatized.

I believe that there is a concerted effort to kill HOPE and to deny 34,000 families the chance of home ownership. This is the latest example of our Government pulling the rug out from under those who are trying to rise above their poverty level and live the American dream.

Let's take a look at how this program is being slowly killed. The administration budget requested an appropriation of only $109 million for HOPE in 1994. This is $774 million less than previously authorized.

Even this $109 million is cut back by an additional $10 million by H.R. 2517. That is an item currently on today's suspension calendar. This $10 million is to be used to help fund a $150 million innovative homeless program. Numerous questions have been raised about the appropriateness of setting aside this much money in an unallocated fund.

All of these cutbacks follow a $165 million rescission of HOPE funds made earlier this year. This money is not being saved, it is just being spent on other programs, and some of these programs are not even in the HUD budget and will do nothing to help house the poor.

It seems to me that too many people have a vested interest in seeing the HOPE Program killed. Too many people have built up political capital on the politics of dependence.

To that I respond by quoting Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy: "Owning your home is not a Republican idea, it is not a Democratic idea, it is an American idea."

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would just like to make two points. The first just backs up what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] said. We are sitting here fighting over a little bit of money for this program rather than that program. The HUD Secretary's research grant is important too, because I agree with some of the comments from the gentleman from the other side. We do not know what works in housing.

But we are fighting over the crumbs and, if not for the space station, we would not be.

A $55 million rescission, all the money from HOPE was taken out to pay for the space station. I would remind my colleagues in the debate that is going to follow that we will continue to be fighting over crumbs.

I dare say, the vast majority of speakers who got up and said "Let us take HOPE and only $10 million of it" are going to vote for the space station.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is talking about $57 million for space station that creates jobs. In the President's stimulus package was $197 million for the study of religion in Sicily. How does that equate? We are talking about a HOPE Program where people can own their own home.

Mr. SCHUMER. Reclaiming my time, what I would say to the gentleman from California is very simply, this is in the VA, HUD, independent agencies budget. The rescission the gentleman talked about, whatever program he talked about, there are lots of wasteful programs in the Government. But it so happens, if my colleagues will look at the rescission, to fund the space station, line 14, HOPE rescission, minus $55 million.

I would remind my colleagues, we cannot have it both ways. We cannot have enough money for housing and enough money for veterans and enough money for other science in NASA and the space station. The space station gobbles up everything.

□ 1830

The reason we have been debating where to spend these crumbs, whether it be for housing or veterans or environment, is because this huge monster, the space station, is putting us in this position. I would like to see the $55 million come out of the space station. I would vote for that in a minute.

The second point I would make is this. Last year in the Housing Committee we crafted a compromise and it recognized that HOPE had a place in HOME and other new programs. I was on the floor saying we do not really know what works. That is true. We ought to be trying other things. The problem is, the way the HOPE Program is structured, it is so expensive that it costs more to give people the home ownership without making sure all their costs are covered.

Kimmy Gray was held up by Secretary Jack Kemp. If we totaled the subsidies in her project, do we know what they came to in every unit? They come to $136,000, more than any other housing program we know of, including building new public housing, which is something that I feel does not work.

Let us be realistic, here. The reason the poor do not have housing is, it is expensive to build a home, and they do not have much money. We can change the form of home ownership, and that may indeed preserve housing longer after it is built. I agree with that, and I am willing to try home ownership in certain instances.

I would say to the gentleman that the way the HOPE Program is structured, the costs are so enormous that it really is sort of a sham. Home ownership is not, HOPE is. We had a program called Nehemiah, which aimed at slightly higher than the lowest income people, that only cost the Federal Government, it cost the Federal Government a quarter of what HOPE cost. It was zeroed out.

What I would say to the folks over there is, one, remember the space station when they cast this vote; two, the cost of HOPE is so high that the only way to make it work, we are going to spend more per unit than on just about any other housing program. That is no way to run an airline.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Very quickly, I believe, on the second point, the cost of the subsidy that the gentleman referred to, if he looks at it, he will find it is actually a fairly inexpensive subsidy when he looks at the long-term costs of subsidizing somebody for a lifetime in public housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KOLBE and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHUMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, the second point, and I understand exactly what the gentleman is talking about on the space station, and I raised this question on the full committee, and I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, as the gentleman knows, the way debate is structured here on the floor, it is not possible to go into that. We are here trying to deal with the HUD account and put the money back into HOPE. It is a very small, symbolic amount. The issue here is home ownership.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, may I commend the gentleman on his impeccable logic, but I did not hear him say that he was against the amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I would state that I am against the amendment. If I could make the gentleman feel that good that easily all the time, I would be a happy man.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kolbe-Blackwell amendment. I would like to make a comment to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

We may be debating crumbs here, and certainly we are when we are talking about a $1.5 trillion budget or billions of dollars for the space station, and $10 million to be put into the HOPE Program. Then $10 million does seem to be like crumbs, but I do not view this debate as debating crumbs at this point on the topic of this particular debate. I view this debate as moving in a particular direction.

Mr. Chairman, whether it is crumbs or whether it is big money, this is a philosophical debate about human dignity and the priceless thing that people can acquire through home ownership. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of the Kolbe-Blackwell amendment to cut those few dollars, even though it is only $10 million to go from the HUD policy development and research account to be transferred into the HOPE Program. I think this debate is very, very important. The HOPE Program, created in 1990, provides grants for home ownership opportunities to low-income people.

Mr. Chairman, we have debated that, we have debated the numbers, but what I want to do right now is to challenge each Member of Congress, and I challenge them to go back to their districts and check out each municipality's housing authority, housing commission, executive directors, and see how they spend every dime of HUD money. Some of those public housing units spend the money wisely and uncompassionately, and some of those commissions do not. Those are the ones we want to check out. That is where the money is wasted.

Public housing is useful, but in many public housing facilities the money is wasted. We need to become here and now as sophisticated as our constituents are becoming. They no longer want to be kept locked in this cycle of hopelessness. People are pleading with us for the opportunity to purchase a home. We should not be an impediment to opportunity. We should help facilitate.

Yes, some of the HOPE money, it was a little more expensive for each unit than we would like. But let us accept our responsibility and fine tune those things. We should not act as if only we know best as far as home ownership is concerned. We should act to facilitate people who want to take the chance, who want the opportunity. Let us let them make that decision.

The money takes nothing away from public housing. It instead offers greater opportunity to provide safe, clean houses for more people. Giving someone dignity is a priceless gift that should be taken seriously by this House. Home ownership can give people dignity.

We have heard in this house the argument, if the roof leaks, who will fix it? Consider this, I would say to my colleagues. The mystery of human initiative most often reveals itself under the circumstances where responsibility and dignity are present. The roof will be fixed. Public housing will not be impacted. People can transition themselves from public housing to home ownership, where they can purchase a rental home from an absentee landlord to raise their family and have the children grow up with a sense of pride and a sense of dignity.

I think this is a philosophical discussion on this floor at this time that needs to be heard.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say, I would just make two points. When the gentleman talks on the broad tableau of human dignity, I agree with the gentleman. I am sympathetic to him. The problem is, this whole program has been poorly thought out and poorly constructed, and ends up being very expensive. There are other ways to get to home ownership. By taking the $10 million out of research and putting it into this program, which really does not work, I think it is a misallocation of resources.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I understand that, and it is our responsibility to find tune it. The Empowerment Network Update, June 9, 1993, a $52,000 average per unit replacement cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has again expired.

(On request of Mr. SCHUMER and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILCHREST was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, that is $52,000, I believe for the cost of the HOPE Program, but then there is public housing, modernization money, and all sorts of other money that go into that.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this is low-income housing by absentee landlords that can be purchased by the Federal Government in order to put people into housing that they can call their own.

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

Mr. GILCHREST. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask, does the gentleman know what the median income of people in public housing is?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has again expired.

(On request of Mr. CLAY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILCHREST was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, yes, I do. I will make a comment. I have as a goal as a Member of Congress to visit every single public housing project in my district. I have visited public housing projects that are abysmal, and ones that were not, and I know the median income is very, very, very low.

Mr. CLAY. If the gentleman will further yield, he asked the question, who is going to repair the roof. The median income of people in public housing is $6,000 a year. Who is going to repair the roof, I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I did not ask that question, someone on the House floor in the last debate asked that question.

I will say, human initiative is a mysterious thing, and if we give someone the opportunity to repair that house, they will be creative enough with themselves and their neighbors and their families to get that house repaired, to make sure the house does get repaired.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]. I speak as someone who has voted against this in the past, but I also speak as someone who has had the opportunity, if one can call it that, to live in the District of Columbia. I admire the people in the District of Columbia. My wife has been tutoring children and I have been working with children from Tyler School.

I just want to tell the Members, some of them do not live in the District. I have come 5,000 miles to be here in the Congress of the United States. We decided if we were going to come all that distance, we wanted to be a part of the community here in the District.

□ 1840

It may be people will say to me well, you are personalizing this. Well I do personalize. I personalize being here in the Congress. We are 435 individuals here. We all have our own agendas, and we all feel very passionately and strongly about the things that we care about.

And I hope that I am a big enough person, and I hope that I understand enough about my duties and responsibilities here to understand that if I made a vote one way before because I was persuaded of that, that I could be persuaded again if the circumstances warranted it.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL] and I have great respect for the gentleman from Arizona [Mr.

KOLBE]. And I think in this particular instance we have passed a program. It came out of a Republican administration that I have opposed on virtually every level. But I am not about to revert to a simple ideological bent and stand on a foundation which says that I am going to take away from people the opportunity to do for themselves if they wish to do it.

I ask you, Members of Congress, just go with me no more than six blocks from this building right now, tonight. We can walk there in 6 or 7 minutes. I will show you the Ellen Wilson housing that is closed down while people are sleeping on grates in front of the monuments to Lincoln and Washington and to the history of this country. It is closed down, boarded up, bricked up. People cannot live in it.

Come up to the Potomac Gardens where the kids that go to Tyler School right here in the Nation's Capital live, and each of you can duplicate it in each of your districts. Let those people have a chance. They have got bars around their houses. They have to have passes. They are not Members of Congress, and they are not wearing that little pass around their neck. That is to keep little children from being attacked, what one little girl in the projects calls the bad mens. Her mom cannot let her out on the street because of the bad mens, the dope dealers, and the thieves that are stealing the lives away from these children.

Now, I will tell you that this is a lousy—gee, I am falling into the rhetoric myself, peanuts, crumbs—a lousy little program, $100 million. This is scarcely anything. Give them a chance. It is $10 million for research. What the hell kind of research do you do to know that public housing has turned people into hopelessness? Take that $10 million, take the whole $85 million if you want. We have already reduced it, by the way. We could all feel good about that. So you can make this vote.

Just look at the rest of it in the HOME Program, $1.3 billion, the assisted housing program $9.2 billion, public housing projects $2.6 billion, $100 million more than requested. If you just took what we are going to do for public housing projects in this bill, and I do not dispute what the chairman is doing and I respect it. He and his subcommittee are coming up against one of the most difficult problems in this country, trying to make people understand that we need to invest in our inner cities, and invest in the people or we are going to have a whole generation of sociopaths out there who have no connection, who have no fidelity to a sense of community because they have never had the chance to develop it. And we can see it going on right here within 10 blocks of the Capitol.

It is immoral; it is a sin against our society to have a little girl that does not know what a cherry blossom is because she has never seen one and she lives 10 blocks from it. That is the kind of destruction that we are committing.

I do not know if this is the answer. I do not say that it is the answer, and I expect Mr. KOLBE and Mr. BLACKWELL do not say that it is the answer. But it is an answer, and anything that we can do in this Congress to advance the opportunities for the average man and woman in this society to make a better life for herself and himself and their children, then I think we should do it. At least give them the chance.

We are giving billions to all of the other programs. Let us let this little, almost symbolic, gesture take place today. Let us vote this $10 million. Let us give people the opportunity to bring true meaning to their lives.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the principle embodied in the Kolbe amendment, and I commend the gentleman for his very passionate appeal.

My remarks are not intended as any kind of judgment on the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] because he is a very able Member of this Congress. I speak to the principle of home ownership, and I do so by making reference to a project in my own city.

Like all of you, I go to these housing projects. From time to time we find that they are seriously flawed in their operation. I know of one project in my district. It has been riddled with drugs, with lawlessness, with violence. It is a problem for the city. The people of that project are literally housed within a perimeter that is not a prison, but they are inside the wall, so to speak, and they have a hard time getting out.

We need to advance the principle of home ownership. I am not sure that this amendment will solve the problem, but we ought to work toward that goal. I view it as a means of trying to save the community.

I am going to be making an appeal to HUD, and I am going to try to show that if we have a certain project and we can put homes around the perimeter of it, we can feather out into the neighborhood and stop the business of having a chasm or a bridge immediately at that project itself. That is a good objective.

I have had experts in public policy from the LBJ School of Public Affairs who feel very deeply that we must improve public housing, and we have to find some way for home ownership to advance that improvement. My city is seriously looking at the possibility of moving some houses to the perimeter of that housing unit. I am hoping when we close Bergstrom Air Force Base we can move some of those homes over. We are willing to consider buying some of those homes to put them around the housing unit so that it goes out into the community.

Communities that have public housing, as I have in my city, and my city of Austin, TX was one of the first to establish it when LBJ was President, have nurtured them, and tried to improve them. They have done so, but there is never enough money to satisfy all of the needs of a public housing project. They are always going to be bothered about water, or screens, or doors, or all kinds of problems. And I do not know that we can say realistically that somebody who lives in public housing has got enough money to buy a home. But I think my city and your city, if the Federal Government and other agencies will help us, can find how to get some new, remodeled homes sufficiently low enough in price that people can buy them. At least there is a chance, there is a hope to break out of this bondage, so to speak, and save the community.

For that reason I think the principle is sound. I do not speak to the details or the merits of this proposal, but I think it is an objective that we ought to work toward, to try to give people who live in public housing a chance there or elsewhere to buy a home in that neighborhood and become productive citizens.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. I thank my friend for yielding.

What the gentleman said is that we ought to be able to find a way to build some homes. That is the problem. They are not talking about building new homes, they are talking about selling these old homes to people who do not have income.

Most of the people who live in public housing are children, No. 1. Second, most of them are on some kind of relief or welfare.

Third, what you are doing with hundreds of thousands of people who are on waiting lists to go into public housing, is that now you are talking about taking these units out of public housing and not replacing them. The law calls for a one-for-one replacement if you take a unit out. But the people who want to promote this want to relieve the law or relieve that responsibility of replacement of one-for-one. So what you are doing is decreasing the number of public housing units.

Mr. PICKLE. In my city of Austin, TX, we are willing to put research and money and funding to help find a way to construct or remodel a home and move it into the neighborhood.

We have got to work toward appealing to the neighborhood to accept it. There is such a sharp division of residents outside of a housing unit and inside that we have to appeal to them to give us a chance for home ownership. And I think it is terribly important that we work toward that objective

and vote for the possibility of home ownership.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona.

The HOPE Program marks a turning point in American politics. Instead of giving handouts, HOPE gives a helping hand. This is a central tenet of being a new Democrat and this program deserves the support of both sides of the aisle. It is a program that rectifies some of the problems that have plagued public housing for decades.

It is no great secret that people, no matter what their background, give greater care and attention to property they own. The problem with public housing is the lack of a property interest. HOPE changes that.

HOPE is a program that deserves our support. It serves people who need our help. HOPE gets people out of public housing, into private ownership, and on their way to fulfilling the American Dream. It helps working people not only to obtain a home, but an equity interest in our society as well.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment to restore funding for hope.

Simply stated, the HOPE Program will not work. Ideally, it would be wonderful if all the people in this country who currently live in public housing could own their own homes or apartments. Realistically—at least at this point in time—that goal is neither feasible nor reasonable.

I believe we should work toward home ownership and empowerment whenever possible, but I do not believe we should sell public housing units to people who will be financially unable to deal with the responsibilities that accompany ownership. We should not sell units to people who will end up saddled in debt when they can't make their mortgage payments, or even pay for the simple upkeep of their new homes.

Additionally, the importance of maintaining our existing available housing stock is something which should not be overlooked in this debate. We cannot afford to sell public housing units which we, as a society, will not be able to replace, and that we cannot be assured will be kept up to certain specifications.

In conclusion, I believe we should advocate home ownership for all as an ultimate goal for our society. I do not, however, believe we are ready to implement that ideal in the form of a program under HUD. I again ask my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, while I understand the interest that this amendment has generated, I am still unclear of its significance. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development did not request the funding that would be added by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona. This fact causes me to wonder whether if we approve of this amendment, the funds appropriated will be spent.

I raise this question because $250 million in HOPE funding was previously appropriated for fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1993. Of this amount, $45 million was not spent in fiscal year 1992 and a whopping $205 million for fiscal year 1993 has not either. That fact certainly brings into question the need for an increase in funding. Further, it is my understanding that HOPE Programs III through VI are continued in H.R. 2491; $58 million for public housing homeownership, $12 million for homeownership in multifamily buildings, and $40 million for single-family homes. I, of course, will vote for this appropriation.

Mr. KOLBE's amendment is mischievous at best. He knows the administration does not support it and has not requested additional funding.

I would be more inclined to support the suggestion of Mr. CLAY: that we make the many homes owned by the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs available at a reasonable cost to the families and individuals who need decent housing.

Mr. Chairman, in this time when resources are so limited we must be careful that every dollar that we appropriate is spent wisely. While I understand and empathize with every American who wants to attain the American dream of homeownership, this amendment will not accomplish that worthy purpose. Therefore, I will vote against Kolbe, but I will vote in favor of the appropriations in H.R. 2491 for the HOPE Program.

□ 1850

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 199, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—214

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
DeLay
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Fish
Foglietta
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lambert
Lancaster
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Tucker
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Weldon
Wolf
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—199

Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lantos
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McInnis
McNulty
Meek
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Parker
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton

Thurman	Visclosky	Wilson
Torres	Volkmer	Wise
Torricelli	Waters	Woolsey
Towns	Watt	Wyden
Traficant	Waxman	Wynn
Underwood (GU)	Wheat	Yates
Valentine	Whitten	Young (AK)
Velazquez	Williams	

NOT VOTING—26

Becerra	Gingrich	Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Berman	Hamburg	Sangmeister
Blute	Henry	Skeen
Callahan	Istook	Sundquist
Chapman	LaRocco	Unsoeld
Coppersmith	McMillan	Vento
Diaz-Balart	Meehan	Young (FL)
Faleomavaega (AS)	Mfume	
Ford (TN)	Payne (NJ)	
	Richardson	

□ 1907

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mfume for, with Mr. Sangmeister against.

Mr. Skeen for, with Mr. Vento against.

Mr. SHARP changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. TUCKER, Ms. LAMBERT, and Mr. MINGE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries; $19,961,000, 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.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, including hire of passenger vehicles, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, $5,000,000.

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Commission on National and Community Service under subtitle G of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-610), $2,519,000.

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

For use in carrying out the programs, activities and initiatives under subtitles B through G of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-610), $105,000,000.

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, $42,286,000.

COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Veterans Appeals as authorized by 38 U.S.C. sections 7251-7292, $9,040,000, to be available without regard to section 509 of this Act, of which not to exceed $790,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995, shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth under this head in Public Law 102-229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; $12,738,000, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For research and development activities, including procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; and construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; $353,565,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That not more than $10,200,000 of these funds shall be available for operating expenses in support of research and development.

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

For abatement, control, and compliance activities, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; 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; $1,367,535,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That not more than $283,000,000 of these funds shall be available for operating expenses: *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): *Provided further*, That from funds appropriated under this heading, the Administrator may make grants to federally recognized Indian governments for the development of multimedia environmental programs.

PROGRAM AND RESEARCH OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel compensation and benefit costs and for travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; $859,170,000: *Provided*, 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).

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, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $44,595,000, of which $16,278,000 shall be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund trust fund and $669,100 shall be derived from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank trust fund: *Provided*, That not more than $37,400,000 of these funds shall be available for administrative expenses.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment for facilities of, or use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, $18,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project;

$1,416,100,000, consisting of $1,206,100,000 as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended by Public Law 101-508, and $210,000,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended by Public Law 101-508, plus sums recovered on behalf of the Hazardous Substance Superfund in excess of $251,954,000 during fiscal year 1994, 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 $64,036,000 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 1994: *Provided further*, That no more than $280,000,000 of these funds shall be available for administrative expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act may be made available for program management of Alternative Remedial Contracting Strategy (ARCS) contracts exceeding 11 percent of the total cost of such contract.

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, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $75,379,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than $7,400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $21,239,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than $7,650,000 of these funds shall be available for administrative expenses.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE/STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

For necessary expenses for capitalization grants for state revolving funds to support water infrastracture financing, and to carry out the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Water Quality Act of 1987, $2,477,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $420,000,000 shall not become available until March 31, 1994: *Provided*, That of the amount which becomes available on October 1, 1993, $1,852,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for state revolving funds; $25,000,000 shall be for making grants under section 104(b)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; $100,000,000 shall be for making grants under section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; $50,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Texas, which is to be matched by an equal amount of State funds from State sources, for the purpose of improving wastewater treatment in colonias in such State; $10,000,000 shall be for a grant to the State of New Mexico, which is to be matched by an equal amount of State funds from State sources, for the purpose of improving wastewater treatment in colonias in such State; and $20,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, and design and related activities in connection with sewage facilities in the vicinity of Nogales, Arizona, and Mexicali, Mexico, whose purpose is to control municipal sewage from Mexico, and for planning and design of other high priority international wastewater facilities in the area of the Mexican border, to become available only upon the successful conclusion of an appropriate minute of the International Boundary and Water Commission and an agreement with the affected United States border State of an appropriate State cost share.

□ 1910

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against part of the language in the Water Infrastructure/State Revolving Funds paragraph.

The language I refer to begins on page 43, line 7, after the words, "as amended;" through "State cost share" on line 25.

This language is in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. It is legislation on an appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, the rule did not protect this language. There is no authorization for funds to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for grants to the States of Texas and New Mexico for improving waste water treatment in colonias in such States.

Further, the language requires that these funds for Texas and New Mexico shall be matched by an equal amount of State funds from State sources. There is no requirement in law requiring an equal match. That language is legislative in nature and in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The language also would appropriate $20 million for planning activities in connection with sewage facilities in the vicinity of Nogales, AZ, and Mexicali, Mexico, to control municipal sewage from Mexico.

Again, there is no authorization for funds to be appropriated to EPA for grants for that purpose.

There is also language which conditions the availability of the funds upon the successful conclusion of an agreement with the International Boundary and Water Commission, an agreement with the effect of a U.S. border State of an appropriate State cost share.

Again there is no requirement in law specifically requiring such conditions on the availability of the funds. That language is also legislation and in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, there is no authorization for an appropriation of funds to the Environmental Protection Agency for grants to the colonias.

Further, the conditions specified in the language represents legislation in an appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member desire to be heard on the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, it was highlighted at about 12:30 this afternoon by the committee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], that he was forced to accept an amendment which they did not want. It is true that the amendment that was adopted in the full Appropriations Committee was adopted over the objection of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

I would say, however, I think the gentleman is right. I think that because we had State matching funds, this is indeed legislation on an appropriations bill.

The gentleman is wrong about the fact that it is not authorized, however.

As to legislating on an appropriations bill, I am willing to concede the point of order if that is the basis on which the Chair will make its ruling.

It will be my intention to offer an amendment, however, that would be in violation according to the gentleman of only one point, and that is that it is not authorized. On that point of order, I am willing to engage in a debate so that we could have the Parliamentarian make the determination about whether or not it is in fact authorized.

My amendment would only change those things which I believe he is correct on in terms of legislating. With that having been said, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede the point of order concerning legislation on an appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEILENSON). Does any other member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the point of order is conceded and sustained for the reason stated by the gentleman from Ohio, and the provision is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLEMAN

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLEMAN: Page 42, line 25, strike "$500,000,000" and insert "$420,000,000".

Page 43, line 7, strike the period and insert the following: "; $50,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Texas for the purpose of improving waste water treatment in colonias in such State; $10,000,000 shall be for a grant to the State of New Mexico for the purpose of improving waste water treatment in colonias in such State; and $20,000,000

shall be for architectural, engineering, and design and related activities in connection with sewage facilities in the vicinity of Nogales, Arizona, and Mexicali, Mexico, whose purpose is to control municipal sewage from Mexico.".

Mr. COLEMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues here this evening that my intention with respect to this amendment all along has been merely to provide for this administration, as the last administration did, the amount of moneys necessary to assist the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, in trying to deal with the waste water problems inherent along the United States-Mexico border. They have included pollution in the Rio Grande of raw sewage. They have included in communities in south and southwestern Texas, in Arizona, in New Mexico, and southern California, the great problem of trying to have enough facilities to deal with sewage treatment.

Waste water facilities are extremely important to a large segment of our population.

In my district alone, Mr. Chairman, 38,000 people live without running water or sewage facilities. Oftentimes what occurs, unfortunately, is the people, because there is no housing or not enough, they will get a piece of land, pay $10 down maybe and $10 every other month or so in order to build a hut that they can live in. Unfortunately, this land does not have water or sewers or dedicated roads. Instead, what it has is the ability for people to have a part of the American dream.

Many of these people, it is true, are first-generation Americans, but Americans they are.

This is not a fund that we can get money from foreign aid, as has been suggested by some of my colleagues on the committee.

I would say to everyone that indeed this kind of funding is necessary in order to help people not to have to live in the squalor they live in today.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members to come by and view a picture of a cesspool, an outhouse a few feet away from a water well that has been drilled 7 feet into the loose sand.

Unfortunately, the children who live in this colonia are essentially drinking their own waste.

In the San Elizario school district in my congressional district, they did a test of how many children, what percentage of children had either hepatitis-A or hepatitis-B. Guess what percentage it was? One hundred percent of the children in that school district had that disease.

□ 1920

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the cholera bacteria itself has been found on the other side of the river in Mexico, not far from this colonia. My colleagues and I may think that we have borders, but the truth is disease knows no border.

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that these funds have been requested. I have requested them through the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. I am told that we cannot get a bill on waste water treatment for fully another year. The problem has always been that we cannot have a bill to get the authorization, and yet the last administration requested $80 million, and we passed it in the Senate, and we got it from the conference. This year the House again has declined to be of assistance, but this time the full Committee on Appropriations voted for this amendment.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that so upset the chairman and the staff that they went and got a rule to make sure that my amendment was not protected. The problem with that idea simply is that we are not helping the people in America who need help the most. The kids in this colonia know the answer, the parents know the answer: Education. Most of these kids cannot go to the full day of school because they are sick.

I would suggest to everyone to do what some members of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation have done in the past and which some of my colleagues have done, and that is to visit these colonias.

By the way, this amendment does not add money to this bill. Instead, it merely takes out of that $500 million fund that the chairman and his committee created $80 million that was originally requested by President Bush and, yes, by President Clinton this year. Two Presidents know that this is the right approach.

And the Federal Government is not doing this alone. Indeed, the State of Texas is committed, through passing a bond issue statewide, to $150 million. All we are asking for is some assistance to help us do that, and so I would ask each and every Member here to please give us the opportunity to have a vote up or down on this amendment. I think it is important, and I think it is appropriate.

I know that the chairman is going to raise a point of order about it being authorized. I have with me the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture who passed the authorization bill for colonias legislation in the Rio Grande Pollution Control Act. Indeed, the chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, helped me when he was chairman of the Housing Subcommittee to see to it that we authorized in HUD the ability to see to it that the colonias finally had a fair break at CDBG grants, and they do now have that. There is plenty of authorization.

I hope to have a chance to debate the authorization point of order with my colleagues this evening, and, if I am permitted to have this amendment go forward, I hope my colleagues will support it because it is, after all, what we are here to do.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] insist on his point of order?

Mr. STOKES. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I make a point or order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, there is no authorization for funds to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for grants to the States of Texas and New Mexico for improving waste water treatment in colonias in such States. The language also would appropriate $20 million for planning activities in connection with sewage facilities in the vicinity of Nogales, Arizona/Mexicali, Mexico, to control municipal sewage from Mexico. There is no authorization for funds to be appropriated to EPA for grants for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, in anticipation of this matter coming before the House we asked EPA for an opinion. The EPA was asked its opinion as to whether it had authority to make these grants. The general counsel has indicated that the authority in the Rio Grande Pollution Correction Act of 1987 does not provide the EPA with authority to provide for grants for improving waste water treatment in colonias. Rather the role of the EPA is limited to consultation with the Department of State in its implementation activities.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, there has been some question as to whether the term "United States" could be construed to include the EPA. Once again it was the opinion of the general counsel's office that this act does not provide EPA authorization to fund these Colonias' activities.

It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that reluctantly I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] desire to be heard?

Mr. COLEMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, let me outline for my colleagues the authorization which exists in statute for the EPA to implement waste water projects in border

colonias because now that is the issue on which the Parliamentarian is being asked to rule.

The Rio Grande Pollution Correction Act of 1987 directed the State Department, the State Department because, when we are dealing with another country, that is who in our country usually does that, acting through the International Boundary and Water Commission, and, by the way, that is an agency also out of the State Department, and I quote now from the statute, and with the Environmental Protection Agency, and Mexico, to develop a plan to improve the border environment. It is authorized, quote, such sums as may be necessary for the United States to fund, unquote, its share of the cost of the plan. This is also in the statute: Its share of the cost of the plan, construction, operation and maintenance of the facilities recommended in the agreements concluded pursuant to section 2.

My colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the author of the 1987 Rio Grande Pollution Correction Act testified to the Committee on Rules that it was his intention that this act authorized the EPA to conduct those projects that were in the United States, including waste water projects in colonias on the United States side of the border.

Well, that is how it works. How could my colleagues construe the term "United States," and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, how can you conclude that the term "United States" does not include the Environmental Protection Agency? Do we expect the State Department to worry about the plans for construction, operation and maintenance of waste water facilities? I think not.

The EPA and the International Boundary Water Commission did negotiate with Mexico to develop a plan, and it identified waste water projects as a top priority and specifically cited the EPA's intention to do waste water projects in the colonias. There have been specific authorizations, not just the next statute, I would say to the chairman. There have been specific authorizations from the Farmers Home Administration, for HUD and the Corps of Engineers, to conduct waste water projects in the colonias. They have all had that authority, and it has been authorized by this Congress. To its credit this Congress has not turned its back on these children, nor these people, that live in squalor. Instead we have agreed that we would address these as best we could. They have argued in the committee, and they will argue, perhaps, here again tonight that it is not specific enough as to the projects.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] and I were discussing it at the Committee on Rules, we do not even have names for all the colonias that exist. It is very difficult to be site-specific. So, we used the term "colonias along the United States-Mexico border" knowing full well that the Environmental Protection Agency will determine which of those colonias do not have water and waste water treatment facilities.

Let me say once again that, having negotiated in the La Paz Agreement, having negotiated in the La Paz Agreement in 1983, and having reaffirmed it in the Monterrey, Mexico, accords, the past administration has done a good job in seeing to it that we would address these issues, and in each of those articles they cited the issue of waste water being a top priority and cited in those communiques that the Environmental Protection Agency would itself be the agency to do the work. To suggest that we somehow have to be more specific than that I think creates a great deal of problem.

I would, therefore, Mr. Chairman, respectfully urge the point of order be overruled concerning an authorization that has been made by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] give a number of treaties and statutes that authorized the colonias and the infrastructure for the colonias. We have heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] talk about the letter from the EPA.

Mr. Chairman, my inquiry is, what specific parliamentary rule requires that the project be authorized by a specific agency? Is there a rule that the Chairman can refer me to?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the basis of clause 2, rule XXI, which requires that appropriations be authorized by law, and will cover that point at that time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, one, it has been mentioned by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], that we presented this argument before the Committee on Rules as to intent, which is of such importance when there is a gray area. I would concede to the fact that we have a gray area here.

But, the Rio Grande Pollution Correction Act of 1987, Public Law 101-465, does authorize in fact, working through the State Department and the Environmental Protection Agency, any funds to provide for the cost of plants, construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities recommended in the agreement.

Now, I again go back to the words of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], that under the La Paz Agreement, that is the agreement that begins the process throughout the border, from Brownsville to Tijuana. That was further ratified in the Monterrey accords. But you cannot have, and this would be through the intent of the legislation which I and other of my colleagues have the honor of being authors, that you cannot specify an individual colonia, because many of them do not have names. They are just a bunch of shacks on the side of the river, as the picture that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] has shown in his explanation thereof.

I know, and I wholeheartedly approve of what has been said by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], our chairman, and I commend the gentleman for it, and I have told him of my respect and admiration for what he tried to do, that in this legislation, no moneys would be appropriated unless authorized. I agree with that. I support that.

The gray area is that here we say these were authorized under the Rio Grande correction bill, because there is going to be a hint that there is no specific agreement.

Yes, there is. There is the La Paz agreement. It does not specify this particular colonia, because many of them do not have names. They may not even be on an identifiable road. They may not even be in an identifiable area of town.

So we are in a situation where we come down to this. How, I know that we have to abide by the law. I know that we have to work under the rules. But we say, probably with a little stretch of the imagination, but the author of the legislation is telling this chamber very respectfully that the intent was to authorize, now and forever more, because it has no limitation therein, funds to provide for projects along this river on the Mexican border. And we say it is authorized because of the La Paz Agreement.

There is your agreement. The Monterey accord, there is your accord. The funds are meager.

Now, I do not know that we really would address this on the point of order, but we are talking about a need which is desperate. We are speaking about a process wherein citizens of this country of ours are living in worse conditions than the worst of Third World countries, for a multiplicity of reasons. For a multiplicity of reasons. Some of them might possibly be emanating from here. And we should not stop the process of trying to remedy this situation on a very stretched point of order on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] and all who have worked in this endeavor. I say that we are talking about life. We are talking about health.

We are even imposing on individual liberty. For when you do not have a place to sleep and a place to get water from, you are imposing on individual liberties.

I think that reading of this act and listening to the intent of the sponsor of this act would allow the Chair, very respectfully, even though it may be a little bit of a stretch because you cannot identify specific colonias, and I would hope that the Chairman would so rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the premise on rescinding the point of order is misplaced and isolated in the case of the international agreements and the other binational agreements.

Actually, I would like to appeal in persuading the Chairman to rule against this point of order on the basis that authorization does exist. In the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, as amended by the Housing and Community Development Act of last year, 1992, 104 statute, 4396, Public Law 101-625, November 28, 1990, which provides for community development block grant assistance for United States-Mexico border region. And then sets forth in the very first subsection (A) the aside for colonias.

The States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas shall each make available for activities assigned to meet the needs of the residents of colonias in a state relating to the water, sewage, and housing, the following percentage of the amounts allocated for the state under section 106(D) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 U.S.C., 5206, subsection (D). First, for the first fiscal year to which this section applies, 10 percent; second, succeeding fiscal years, for each of the succeeding fiscal years to which the section applies, a percentage not to exceed 10 percent, that is determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to be appropriate, after communication with representatives of the interests of the residents of colonias.

Then succeeding chapters defining the eligibility.

This authorization is still law. This is what I think is proper to govern in this case specifically. And from the standpoint of the housing and community development comprehensive statutes on the books. And on that basis I appeal for your determinations to rule against the propriety of the motion interjected to declare the amendment out of order because of insubstantial authority.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]?

□ 1940

The Chair would recite the following section to the gentleman from Ohio, if he might, and ask the gentleman if he thinks, in his opinion, there has been a sufficient and successful conclusion of agreements pursuant to this particular law. This is section 5 of Public Law 100-465, authorization of appropriations.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the United States to fund its share of the cost of the plant, construction, operation and maintenance of the facilities recommended in agreements concluded pursuant to section 2 and approved by the Government of the United States and Mexico.

The gentleman from Texas has argued that such authorization now exists. Can the gentleman respond at all to that particular point?

Mr. STOKES. I would say to the chairman that that, in my opinion, does not constitute an authorization for the purposes of this act and for this bill.

Under section 4, where it refers to consultations with the Administrator of Environmental Protection Agency and other authorities, the language actually says, "The Secretary of State shall consult with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and other concerned Federal, State and local government officials in implementing this act."

It would be our position that such language does not in and of itself constitute an authorization; to EPA, that is.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, the State Department is not in the water treatment business. The State Department does not construct dams. The State Department does not work on the U.S. side of the river. They only reach the agreement. They only negotiate. The individual agencies and departments are the ones that do the work.

In this case, the authorization clearly says that the State Department, in conjunction with the Environmental Protection Agency, "shall implement." And that is what our statement is, that the State Department does not in and of itself work in that area.

The International Boundary and Water Commission works in joint projects with Mexico. The individual agency, in this case, the Environmental Protection Agency, is the operative section of this legislation.

This legislation was not intended to authorize the Environmental Protection Agency. We could not authorize the Environmental Protection Agency under international law and under the laws of this country.

We have to authorize the State Department. But the State Department, in conjunction with the operating agency, would do the construction. And that is the authorization and that is the law.

I think that is what should be done this evening.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, the rule that was just given, I think the clear meaning of the rule should be determined in this case. I would suggest that the Chairman give his opinion on the rule just read.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEILENSON). The Chair is prepared to rule in this particular case, and would remind the gentleman from Texas that he has the burden of proof with respect to the authorization question.

Section 5 of the Rio Grande Pollution Correction Act of 1987 authorizes appropriations for the U.S. share of the cost of facilities recommended in certain agreements. And the Chair just recently read, as did the gentleman from Texas originally, the specific provisions of section 5 of the public law to which we refer.

Thus, under the terms of the act, a qualifying agreement is one that is concluded pursuant to section 2 of the act and approved by the Governments of the United States and Mexico. Section 2 of the act authorizes the Secretary of State, acting through the U.S. Commissioner to the International Boundary and Water Commission, to enter such agreement which should include five certain conditions to be spelled out in the agreement.

Section 2 of the act contemplates the inclusion in the agreement of a formula for the initial division between the United States and Mexico of the cost of any facilities recommended. Indeed, section 5 of the act depends upon the inclusion of such a cost-sharing provision.

The Chair finds that the terms of this authorizing legislation may not be satisfied by an agreement in principle, such as the one cited during argument on the point of order, which was entered into in 1983 prior to enactment of the cited law.

To support appropriations under the act, an agreement must address specific costs. Being apprised of no law or international agreement in existence pursuant to law authorizing the particular appropriations through EPA to the States carried in the amendment the Chair must sustain the point of order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry goes to the part of the ruling that maybe the Chair might be willing to read again or repeat, that had to do with a specific dollar amount appropriation. Is that what the Chairman said? Or a specific appropriation for a specific project?

I guess that is the issue I am having to ask a question on.

The CHAIRMAN. The basic point is that there is no specific authorization for appropriation through EPA to the States triggered by the agreement cited.

Mr. COLEMAN. The reason, of course, is that it depends, if I might, as a further parliamentary inquiry, simply say that, of course, depends, because the statute authorizing it says "the United States."

The Chairman is absolutely right. That is the problem.

I guess when we talk about the United States and we talk about the United States and Mexico border, I suspect that only a limited number of States would fall into that category. There is the reason that they did not set out a specific authorization or appropriation for those States, because I suppose it would be understood by the language used, meaning the United States, that it would apply to States along the United States-Mexico border.

As a further parliamentary inquiry, is the Chair ruling that, therefore, in any future authorization legislation to deal with the colonia wastewater treatment facilities, we need to set forth a Federal-State sharing agreement in that authorization language, No. 1? And No. 2, that when we do that, we do that unilaterally or we do it with or without an agreement with Mexico concerning the international river that separates the country of Mexico and the State of Texas?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not make an anticipatory ruling as to what other approach to this matter might possibly be in order by way of statute or international agreement.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I had the impression that the Chair's ruling was predicated upon a usual phrase in legislation, which ordinarily will read "such sums as may be authorized." In the legislation under consideration, it does not use that phrase. The legislation says this: "There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary," not that may be authorized but which may be necessary.

That is a full amount that may be used for that purpose, I suggest.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's ruling, the Chair would advise the gentleman, is not based on the open-ended nature of the authorization, but on the fact that the requirements and the conditions of law have not been shown to have been met.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliametary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I might, we had an issue that I thought I cited, but maybe I overlooked it. Of course, that was the Environmental Protection Agency border plan. And I know it is, while the Chair may say that it itself is not an authorization. I think it is worthy of pointing out that the increase of wastewater treatment was a priority to construct wastewater treatment systems and hookups in the U.S. colonias. Once again, that was done under the authority of Federal law and permitted.

I guess that problem becomes, the Chair's ruling seems to put colonias in a very interesting catch-22 situation, and that is, simply that these children and those citizens in those colonias seem to have no resource, if they cannot get a specific authorization for an unnamed gathering of citizens living in a community together.

I would ask a parliamentary inquiry, whether or not the Chair feels that ruling that was just made does not, in fact, do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Texas that he already ruled on this particular question and will not comment on the effect of the ruling on any other efforts, any other approaches to this particular issue.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair for his patience. I appreciate his endurance.

□ 1950

Mr. GONZALEZ. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to whether the Chairman took into consideration, in reaching the ambit of his decision with respect to the point of order, the point I raised, that the proper substantive legislation ruling in this matter is the Housing and Community Development Act of 1990, as amended by 1992, and therefore, would ask leave if the Chairman would inquire of the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee if under that umbrella of authorization he would not have sufficient authorization power to find the appropriated money necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the gentleman that he did in fact take the gentleman's argument into consideration. The Chair believes that the authorization cited for community development grants does not cover the projects through EPA provided in the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STOKES: On page 42, line 25, strike "$420,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000,000".

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, this is a conforming amendment, because language providing funds for the colonias was struck on a point of order. This amendment will add $80 million to the reserve for communities with unique circumstances or difficulty in meeting water quality standards once these projects are authorized. The colonias projects will be eligible for this reserve if they become authorized.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, that he succeeded in getting the $80 million that we moved out of the $500 million fund back into the $500 million fund with this amendment. There are those of us that think this is a good place to put the money, simply because there are many projects that need wastewater dollars. Of course, under the provisions of the bill as the gentleman wrote it, and by the way, that is kind of legislating on appropriations but it is protected under this rule, I would say to the gentleman that we understand that what happens here is that projects can apply for this money, or different areas of the country would be able to apply for this money from this fund for their wastewater projects, provided they get an authorization by March 31, 1994.

That would include mine, I would imagine. If I can find a piece of legislation going through the House before March 31, 1994, we can attach an authorization that we can somehow devise that spells it out in a way that permits colonias to somehow qualify. That means, I guess, it will have to be agency-specific and site-specific, based on the ruling we have just had.

The problem, of course, is that that delays for one more year these kinds of conditions, these conditions that I say to each and every Member here ought not to exist in America, particularly when we are given an opportunity to have a solution, as the full Committee on Appropriations gave us just last Thursday, or Wednesday.

I would say to the chairman, who wants to move this $80 million back to a big fund, and I understand that the Boston Harbor wants $100 million of it for cleanup, and I am sure up in Ohio, that State and others, there are moves to deal with the Great Lakes. We all have important projects, particularly when raw sewage is being dumped somewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I would just hope that we will work with the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] and the Committee on Public Works to try to push forward the wastewater legislation, even if it comes in a year's delay, for these children and for these citizens. I certainly would have no objection to putting this $80 million to work in some projects.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I am pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one of these projects was the New River project in the desert in southern California, where the most polluted river in North America, the New River, pours

into the United States, and the health of the people in that district, in that area, is very, very much in jeopardy. I would hope that the chairman would work to see to it that those folks are protected also.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his participation today on the course of this and in the past. I fully recognize that the Tijuana-San Diego problem is real. It is a project that has been authorized.

Unfortuantely, it, too, was not funded in this bill. I think that is a travesty.

Mr. Chairman, I would only hope that just because it is on the border does not mean that somehow we want to neglect these programs and these projects, because these affect American citizens as well, even if they do happen to live on the border.

One other thing, if I might, Mr. Chairman. That is, I really and truly want to thank a number of colleagues who did not even get a chance to speak tonight because of the point of order on the issue. That is the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. BONILLA, who was helpful in the committee, and Mr. DELAY. There are certainly a number of people that have offered their assistance, Mr. CUNNINGHAM and others. I want to say to them how much I appreciate all of their efforts.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wanted to respond to the gentleman's inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I said in the full committee, and I said again in the Committee on Rules, and I said in my general statement on the floor today, that I have no quarrel with the merits of the gentleman's argument. In fact, I commend the gentleman for the eloquent manner in which he has recommended and represented his constituents.

However, I have tried to be consistent. I have tried to bring to this floor a bill that was consistent in the sense of following the rules of the House and playing by the new rules that we were told that our subcommittees on appropriations had to abide by. I have tried to, in that sense, bring to the floor a bill that had no exceptions to it.

The gentleman mentioned Boston Harbor. I went before the Committee on Rules about this bill, and Boston Harbor does not have an authorized project. Boston Harbor has to be subjected to reserve. We have authorized those projects and funded those projects which were authorized.

We have also said to the gentleman from Texas that, if by March 31, 1994, he has been unable to get the authorization required, our committee will work with him to try and get an extension of time. I simply say to the gentleman that what we are trying to do here is, of course, play by the rules. My opposition has at no time been on the merits of this well-deserved and meritorious project.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Again, Mr. Chairman, let me repeat my respect and admiration to the distinguished chairman in what he tried to do. We have no quarrel with that. We commend him for that. We hope that all of the subcommittee would so act.

Mr. Chairman, however, I just wanted to, in the discussion on the point of order, say that we may have missed the point that I think should be on the record, that this amendment was adopted by the full Committee on Appropriations, by the full Committee on Appropriations, not accepting the recommendation of the distinguished chairman and his opposition to the amendment.

The point of order was interjected, to my knowledge, not at the request of the full Committee on Appropriations but rather by the distinguished chairman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I think that should be made clear to all the Members, that it was approved by the full Committee on Appropriations, that we did not clear the gray area, and that is unfortunate, because we thought and we still think that we were right. However, so was the ruling, and we will abide by it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FILNER: On page 43, line 7, after the words "as amended", insert the following: "; and $35,000,000 shall be for section 510 of the Water Quality Act of 1987".

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, which is introduced on behalf of myself, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. HUNTER, is very straightforward. It restores $35 million for section 510 of the Water Quality Act of 1987. Section 510 authorizes construction funds for a wastewater treatment plant in San Diego to treat the raw sewage flowing from the city of Tijuana, Mexico, into San Diego.

For over 30 years, raw sewage flows from south of the border have been a threat to the economy, public health, environment, surface water, public beaches, and water quality of the city of San Diego.

Mr. Chairman, each day, 15,000,000 gallons a day of raw sewage flows across my district. No other district in America has such a dubious distinction.

In 1991, the Governor of California issued a state of emergency regarding this situation.

Finally, the Federal Government, in cooperation with the Mexican Government, agreed to construct a wastewater treatment facility in California to address this serious problem. I want to emphasize that Mexico will reimburse the United States for the costs associated with this project.

Appropriations for this project have been provided since its original authorization in 1987 and the project is scheduled for completion in 1997.

This amendment partially restores the funding requested by the administration for the coming fiscal year to keep this essential project on track. It has the bipartisan support of Members from the San Diego area and the administration.

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FILNER. I yield to my distinguished colleague from San Diego.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan San Diego delegation amendment.

As Mr. FILNER has related, for over 30 years raw sewage has flowed across the Mexican border into what is now the congressional district of my good friend and colleague, Mr. FILNER. This raw sewage continues to flow and lands on the beaches and the waters and the neighborhoods of my district and the residents of Imperial Beach in San Diego County. This flow threatens the health and the environment of San Diego residents.

The city of San Diego agreed to treat this sewage, some 14 million gallons of raw sewage every day, but this treatment was always meant to be a temporary measure pending Federal assistance for the construction of an international treatment plant near the border in Mr. FILNER's district. This treatment plant, Mr. Chairman, is behind schedule, and funds are desperately needed to complete the project by the new completion date of 1998.

This amendment, which provides $35 million for construction costs, will continue the Federal Government's legal commitment to the construction of this plant and to the health of the border environment. As Mr. FILNER stated, this funding has been previously authorized. It has the support of the administration and the support of the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee.

I urge my colleagues to give their support to this amendment.

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

Mr. FILNER. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, this is an authorized project. It is one that is meritorious. I think both Mr. FILNER and Ms. SCHENK have made a strong case for this project. I have consulted with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California, Mr. LEWIS, and the subcommittee has no objection to the acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. FILNER. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I ask the House for support of this crucial amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to thank the chairman for accepting the amendment, and my colleagues, BOB FILNER, LYNN SCHENK, DUNCAN HUNTER, and RON PACKARD. Also I would like to thank Governor Wilson and Commissioner Ganaji for the work they have done on this project.

I rise as a cosponsor of this amendment to restore funding for a binational sewage treatment plant in San Diego, CA.

As many of you are aware, we in San Diego County face a unique and unpleasant situation. The Tijuana River begins in Mexico and flows northward through American territory. The Tijuana River Estuary, in the United States, empties into the Pacific Ocean in southern San Diego County.

For more than 30 years, raw sewage from Mexico has been dumped into the Tijuana River and thus, into United States waters. The situation has become worse in recent years due to explosive growth in Tijuana. Our beaches are often closed due to the pollution and there is a serious threat to the environment and to human health.

I emphasize that this is not a local problem.

The United States and Mexico are working jointly to address this issue by constructing a binational sewage treatment plant along the border. The amendment before us restores $35 million, or half of the administration's budget request, toward this binational plant.

This plant was authorized in 1987 after years of negotiation and effort. The city of San Diego has been treating Mexican sewage on a temporary basis, but this cannot continue indefinitely.

The Federal Government has rightfully taken responsibility for this matter and this amendment will ensure that that commitment continues to be met.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman STOKES and Congressman LEWIS for their efforts on this critical issue. I also want to express my thanks to my colleagues from San Diego, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. PACKARD, and Commissioner Ganaji, Gov. Pete Wilson, and President Salinas of Mexico.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is probably as bipartisan an amendment as I have seen in a long, long time. Our former colleague, Bill Lowery, talked to me some years ago, and RON PACKARD has been all over this. And now we have the two very fine new Members from San Diego to sponsor this amendment. I certainly would not object under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the VA–HUD appropriations bill today, I wish to commend the chairman of the VA–HUD Subcommittee, Congressman STOKES. He has shown exemplary leadership in crafting this legislation.

The chairman, our ranking member, JERRY LEWIS, and Congressman ESTEBAN TORRES were instrumental in convincing Chairman STOKES to accept this amendment earmarking section 510 money in the bill for the city of San Diego.

This money will be used to construct a sewage treatment facility to protect the health and welfare of U.S. citizens.

I also wish to thank the San Diego congressional delegation—Congressmen HUNTER, CUNNINGHAM, and FILNER, and Congresswoman SCHENK—for their hard work to secure this funding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STOKES: On page 43, line 2, strike "$1,852,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,817,000,000".

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment to bring into conformance the internal numbers in this paragraph. This amendment would offset $35,000,000 for section 510 of the Water Quality Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee, if he is willing.

Mr. STOKES. If the gentleman will yield, yes, I will engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. I thank the chairman. As the gentleman is aware, I have several amendments which I was prepared to offer before us today on this particular bill. I will not be offering these amendments, but I would like to seek the gentleman's assurance that the committee will be instructing the EPA to work with appropriate Federal agencies to expedite approval of the necessary permits which will allow continued reconstruction and improvement of a killer highway in my district. It is my understanding that the chairman will make every effort to include this or similar report language in the conference report of the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies, appropriations bill for 1994, which language would read:

With regard to ongoing highway construction projects, the EPA is instructed to work in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers and other federal agencies to expedite approval of necessary permits. Should additional information be considered necessary to augment any existing environmental impact statements, the Agency is instructed to move expeditiously to review all supplemental materials.

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

Mr. MCCANDLESS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. As the gentleman is aware, at the time of conference, both bodies must be in agreement on all issues. The gentleman from California has my assurance that I will make every effort to consider this language when this bill is conferenced with the other body.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $5,170,000: *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.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS) 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. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE VOTE ON HEFLEY AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2491, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any recorded vote on the Hefley amendment be laid over until after the space station

amendment to the bill (H.R. 2491), Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. I simply wish to state that I have no objection, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, would now be an appropriate time, or could the Chair inform me when the appropriate time would be, to ask when a revote on certain amendments would be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is not the appropriate time. That would come at the end of the bill when supported back to the House.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2010

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEILENSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through line 13, page 44.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, just because we should not take these things too seriously, I just wondered by way of inquiry, Mr. Chairman, by way of unanimous consent, is it possible for a Member who is the ranking member of one appropriations committee to ask or request to resume his responsibility before his former subcommittee, like the legislative branch instead of HUD and Independent Agencies Subcommittee? Something has to be better than this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that and I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY: Page 44, line 10, strike "$5,170,000" and insert "$4,200,000".

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will try to be very brief about this. I know we have a lot to do tonight.

What this does is it deletes $970,000 from the Office of Science and Technology Policy under the Executive Office of the President.

Now, I think the committee wanted to cut $1 million out of this program, but because of a miscalculation they have actually given this program a $1 million increase.

What I would like you to do, and I am going to ask for a vote unless it is accepted, and I would like for you to accept it, but I would like for you to consider this, if we have a vote after the space station, and it may be acceptable to you.

As reported in the April 16 edition of the Washington Post, Congress last authorized $4.2 million for this office. This was last year's, $4.2 million.

But a request was made or made its way through Appropriations that an additional $2 million be added to that as a one-time passthrough for the Consortium for the International Earth Science Information Network in Saginaw, MI. This is called CIESON, and we will talk about that more tonight later, but $2 million extra were put into the budget last year over and above the $4.2 million.

So when the committee began its work this year and the current administration began its work, it started with a figure of $6.2 million, counting that passthrough, and then they cut $1 million from that.

So in essence what it does, the result is $5.17 million figure that you see before you today which is, in essence, a $1 million increase over last year. I do not think they really meant to do that.

So what this amendment does is simply puts it back to where it was last year with no increase for this particular thing.

I think it is correct to say there was a mistake in the calculations. I would hope that the chairman would be willing to accept this.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the OSTP's funding in 1994 has been increased above 1993 because the OSTP has included a number of personnel on its payroll that, under the previous administration, were handled through nonreimbursable detailees, and President Clinton has already cut about $1.5 million by merging OSTP and the National Space Council.

The $5.19 million recommendation contains no funding for CIESIN and President Clinton has already reduced OSTP by 33 positions.

So I would oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. I am aware that it includes no funding for CIESIN this year. It included $2 million for CIESIN last year, and so the $1 million cut in this program actually is not a cut at all. It is a $1 million increase in this program.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the basic reason for the increase is because we are now funding people who were funded by other agencies during the last administration. So now OSTP is paying for it.

We are being up-front about it. I think that is what I want to say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this amendment will be postponed until further consideration of the bill in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DISASTER RELIEF

For necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), $292,000,000, 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 $25,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $95,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire and purchase of motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343); uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS–18; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency preparedness; transportation in connection with the continuity of Government programs to the same extent and in the same manner as permitted the Secretary of a Military Department under 10 U.S.C. 2632; and not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses: $164,239,000.

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, $4,350,000.

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, $212,960,000.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

There is hereby appropriated $130,000,000 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, $14,081,000 shall be transferred as needed to the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for administrative costs of the insurance and flood plain management programs and $48,092,000 shall be transferred as needed 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, 1995. In fiscal year 1994, no funds in excess of (1) $32,000,000 for operating expenses, (2) $252,366,000 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.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall promulgate through rulemaking a schedule of fees applicable to persons subject to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's radiological emergency preparedness regulations. The aggregate charges assessed pursuant to this section during fiscal year 1994 shall approximate, but not be less than, 100 per centum of the amounts anticipated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency to be obligated for its radiological emergency preparedness program for such fiscal year. The schedule of fees shall be fair and equitable, and shall reflect the full amount of direct and indirect costs incurred through the provision of regulatory services. Such fees will be assessed in a manner that reflects the use of agency resources for classes of regulated persons and the administrative costs of collecting such fees. Fees received pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts. Assessment and collection of such fees are only authorized during fiscal year 1994.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Information Center, including services by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,074,000, to be deposited into the Consumer Information Center Fund: *Provided*, That the appropriations, revenues and collections deposited into the fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Consumer Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of $7,500,000. Administrative expenses of the Consumer Information Center in fiscal year 1994 shall not exceed $2,415,000. Appropriations, revenues, and collections accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1994 in excess of $7,500,000 shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Consumer Affairs, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,159,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that Office may solicit, accept and deposit to this account, during fiscal year 1994, gifts for the purpose of defraying its costs of printing, publishing, and distributing consumer information and educational materials; may expend up to $1,100,000 of those gifts for those purposes, in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated; and the balance shall remain available for expenditure for such purposes to the extent authorized in subsequent appropriations Acts.

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, $910,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: *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, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; not to exceed $35,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase (not to exceed thirty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $7,475,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995, including not to exceed $2,100,000,000 for space station, of which (1) not to exceed $172,000,000 shall be for space station operations/utilization capability development and (2) not to exceed $99,000,000 shall be for space station supporting development: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used for space station engineering and integration contract activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used for space station technical and management information systems contract activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used for space station NASA headquarters level one support service contracts.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROEMER: Page 50, line 14, strike "$7,475,400,000" and insert "$6,200,400,000".

Page 50, line 15, strike ", including" and all that follows through "ment" on line 20.

□ 2020

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto may not exceed 2 hours.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] will be recognized for 1 hour and a Member opposed will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield 30 minutes of my time to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROEMER. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, back in Indiana we have a saying: "When you find yourself in a hole, the first rule is to quit digging." This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very simple, simple for the people of this country to understand; it is simple for the people of this body, and furthermore, last week it was very simple in that it was decided for the taxpayers of this country by one single vote.

What this amendment does, Mr. Chairman, simply put, is it cuts $1.2 billion from the space station. That is a clean cut. That money will go to the

deficit. We do not legislate on an appropriations bill. We are not designating this money toward a housing program or toward education or toward a host of other worthwhile projects.

This is a clean cut. Just as amendments are offered on the floor over the last few weeks, we are offering this amendment because of our deep concern for a deficit situation that is crippling our children's future and hurting the economic viability of this country.

Second, Mr. Chairman, what is funding for the space station doing to other programs? My deep respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]; he was quoted in last week's National Journal of Congressional Daily as saying this space station would cost NASA another $500 million, hurting other science and space programs.

In fact, the committee, Mr. Chairman, has made that determination. NASA has now cut $450 million from such programs, important programs as the space shuttle, structural spares, space communications, launch services, et cetera, et cetera. HUD has cut flexible subsidies in the HOPE program. Both programs are equaling $85 million.

We just had a debate about crumbs, as it would say, but $10 billion is a lot to me and a lot to the people of Indiana. That $10 million fight on the floor was over this space station eating up more and more of available funds.

Finally, in Space News, the headline talks about NASA technology package slashed by more than half because of the space station. That is why the Taxpayers Union supports this amendment, also Citizens Against Waste. And if you are tired of sending 300 Los Angeles cops into our schools, if you are tired about the deficit eating up our available funds, if you are tired about the status quo, if you are tired about NASA with a 76 percent average cost overrun, send them a message and vote for this Roemer/Zimmer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 30 minutes of my time be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there opposition to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us today includes $2.1 billion in fiscal year 1994 for a redesigned space station proposed by the President.

And, Mr. Chairman, I will support the President and vote for this new space station.

But I want to make clear that my support is contingent on a number of important factors.

This committee has for more than 8 years warned that the space station was headed for trouble.

It is interesting that the President has picked a simpler, smaller station based on a modular approach—because that is precisely what our committee recommended when this program was launched 8 or 9 years ago.

And why did we make that recommendation?

We made it because back in 1985 and 1986, we thought that the budget crisis would deepen, and the space station program that NASA proposed was not remotely affordable and would have been virtually impossible to launch.

From the very outset, this Committee—and this Committee alone—called for a modular concept—"A buy it by the yard approach."

So here we are today with another space station redesign that effectively uses the modular approach. And that is very gratifying.

In fact, the space station program has from day one been a management nightmare. To gain essential political support, NASA elected to discard the time tested concept of picking a "prime" contractor coupled with a lead center to ensure solid program control.

While that approach has been politically successful—it has built for NASA the ultimate box.

It has created an enormous overhead of support service contractors that has eroded the money needed to actually build the space station.

So, Mr. Chairman, the space station history is replete with problems that this Committee warned long ago were coming.

But that is all water over the dam. The real question before us is whether the President's proposal can work.

I have not been a supporter of the space station program. I felt that my predecessor was right in suggesting that given the budget crisis, the space station—with an annual funding rate exceeding $3.1 billion a year—would simply eat every other NASA program's lunch.

But I want to commend the President for his efforts in trying to slim down this very ambitious project. And, Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, I will support the President's space station proposal.

However, my support for station is contingent on implementing the management changes necessary to make the program work.

The fact is that while the space station has gradually been shrinking because the budget crisis has forced NASA to scale back the program—virtually thousands of support service contractors have stayed on the job.

Unless we get that problem solved—with this new Presidential recommendation—unless we break the rice bowls—this program cannot succeed.

That is the message we are trying to get across.

It is a message that NASA itself is sympathetic to—but has been unable to implement because it lives in that political box it created.

And above all, it is the message that the President's advisory panel, chaired by Dr. Charles Vest, president of M.I.T.—made in his report to the President.

We must break the rice bowls.

That means that NASA will have to pick a prime contractor—something it should have done years and years ago.

It means that over the next two or three years the program will have to lose 3,000 to 4,000 contractor jobs.

I voted for space station last week—and I will support the program today.

But my support is contingent on NASA accepting the Vest panel's recommendations and implementing the station management changes—not in a few months—not in a few weeks—but now.

I believe the space station program deserves another chance. NASA and the White House are committed to making management changes necessary for this program to work.

But those changes and some of the problems that I just discussed must be addressed in the next two to three months so that we can be assured that, once and for all, the program is on the right track.

If we collectively—all of us together—NASA, the Administration, and the Congress—do not have the political will to fix this program, then there is no way I can support it.

As I said, I think the space station deserves another chance. I don't want to see us close off this Nation's longstanding leadership in space.

□ 2030

So Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members tonight to vote for the space station.

In closing, let me just say that this has not been an easy decision for me to come to, nor has it been an easy vote for me to make, given my past position on the space station; but at this particular time in our history I happen to believe that our President who has gone through the difficulty of having us analyze and totally assess the space station in its present context and who has selected a new design, that being Option 8, and who has now submitted to the Congress his endorsement of that, I believe that we should support the President.

For that reason tonight, Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the space station.

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Roemer-Zimmer amendment, but I share the concerns of the chairman who just spoke. It is a tough, tough decision.

I support NASA. I support the Earth Program, and I support science and research.

I voted for the space station last year in hopes that I could detect as a lay person, as someone who represents my constituency, some great improvement in the program, something we could say we have done here. Unfortunately, I have not perceived that to be the case.

We spend $9 billion. That is a ton of money.

Again, to those of us who are not technically involved, there is not a great deal of evidence that we are making great progress in this area.

I see scientists on TV, I see respected scientists saying there is no new technology here, that we are continuing to do much as we have in the past.

I believe we need to make cuts. We cannot tax and not cut. We cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Roemer-Zimmer amendment. I am afraid we are in a condition where this amendment does not accomplish that which the authors have claimed.

I have heard it said before, that this is a clean amendment. I hear the claim that money saved will go to reduce the deficit. Even technically, that is not correct. Factually, it is not accurate.

This amendment does not affect the budget, for that would be legislating and I think the author knows that.

In turn, as long as we do not affect the budget amendment, then the 602(b)'s are not affected. So this money would then be in a pool to be re-distributed to other social programs somewhere in conference.

America's commitment to manned exploration of space began with President Kennedy and it has extended in nonpartisan fashion through each presidency right up to the Clinton administration. Each President; Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush has helped the American people realize that investment in space is a vision worthy of America's future.

No matter how many times we redesign it, the conclusion is always that we should continue. I commend the Vest Advisory Committee Report to each and every one of you.

That report offers the assessment—and it is positive—of our international partners. We have had the benefit of a $3-billion investment from them and the promise of more, if this Congress just has the courage to restore certainty to America's vision in space. To do otherwise is a basic violation of what amounts to internationally recognized agreements.

One can easily foresee a situation, if we fail to do the right thing today. I for one would hate to see our European, Canadian, and Japanese partners working with the Soviets exclusively.

Our society has been one that has functioned extremely well because of its ever-expanding horizon.

We are a country of pioneering spirit.

We cannot sacrifice this opportunity. In another time Christopher Columbus went to Queen Isabella and suggested that she should help him finance a little program. He would take a few ships across the ocean to find spices, and maybe find a new world, and produce a new vision as well as a new hope for mankind.

What if Queen Isabella had said, "You know, Chris, I think you've got a good idea, but frankly, that idea just isn't feasible right now. My budget can't afford it and some of my advisors say I should do it, and some say I shouldn't do it."

To say the least, it would have changed the history of mankind.

In this instance, we are talking about the future of America's science work in space and the future of mankind's hope for a much, much brighter tomorrow.

I would suggest to the gentlemen who are proposing this amendment that should they be successful, they will have wasted more money than they ever dreamed of saving in the process of another redesign.

In the meantime, we will have cut off a very significant piece of America's vision for tomorrow.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, NASA has led this Congress around by the nose for a decade on this issue, and it is time we get the ring out of our nose.

In 1984, we originally were told this would cost $8 billion. We have already spent $8 billion, and yet nothing has been built.

In 1993, the GAO estimated that this was going to cost $43 billion to build and $120 billion to operate.

Now we have a scaled-back plan, and we are told it is going to cost $10 billion over the next 5 years and about $50 billion to operate.

The agency is doing the same thing to us that they have done for 10 years. They low-ball the contract. They tell you it is going to cost one amount, they spread contracts over half the congressional districts in this country to get this thing to fly politically, even if it cannot fly scientifically, and so what they are going to do is keep stringing us along.

I think the time has come to put this on the shelf. The real cost of this baby is going to be about $100 billion. We could fund the National Science Foundation for 30 years with that.

□ 2040

We could fund EPA for 14 years. We could fund the Cancer Institute for 50 years.

Mr. Chairman, I get excited about the space program just like everybody else. I think it is terrifically imaginative. But the fact is I get a whole lot more excited about getting this economy under control and getting it functioning.

How many years does Congress have to stand by and be bamboozled by this agency before we finally stand up and say, "Enough is enough"? This project ought to be put on the shelf until we can afford it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to express my appreciation for the fine work of the House Appropriations Committee: The full committee headed by its distinguished chairman, BILL NATCHER, and the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, chaired by LOUIS STOKES, a political lion of courage and vision.

The total NASA budget was cut by $700 million, reduced from $15.3 billion to $14.5 billion. The space station budget remains at $2.1 billion for fiscal year 1994, but station spending will be reduced $6 billion over the next 5 years compared to planned expenditures for space station *Freedom*, and $18 billion over the lifetime of the program.

The space station represents the core of NASA's effort. It concentrates the hopes, the dreams, and the technological progress into this major scientific effort. It is a critical step to the future and I hope that the Members of this House will not follow the pied pipers of repudiation.

We should be ashamed to even think of repudiating our commitment to the Canadians, Europeans, and the Japanese who will have spent $3.9 billion by the end of this year, and committed $9 billion to this very same operation.

We should be ashamed to repudiate the thousands of people in almost every State in the Nation who have contributed toward this scientific effort.

We should be ashamed to repudiate our commitment to the scientific community to continue the effort—though difficult—to lead this Nation into the 21st century as a first-class, not a second-class, nation.

Let us not repudiate our commitment to our national interests, to our children and grandchildren.

Vote to support a space station for the future.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues that I always try to appeal to reason and to logic.

But the logic of this debate defies us all.

How in good conscience can we again vote more funds—in the amount of billions—$2.1 billion this year alone—on a program that has always been controversial, always of doubtful value. Truly—pie in the sky.

Bottom line: This amendment makes each of us in the Congress come down to earth and makes us directly confront the tradeoffs.

Bottom line: Each of us is voting either for space station, against housing, against vets, and against fuller funding for other proven science projects.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to terminate funding for the space station. While I was disappointed the House of Representatives failed to cut this wasteful program last week, when we considered this same amendment to the NASA authorization bill, I am optimistic the majority of the House will come to its senses today, and support the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

The American taxpayers are demanding that Congress make tough budget choices, before raising taxes. Last week, the space station was authorized at $1.9 billion for fiscal year 1994. Today, the House is being asked to commit $2.1 billion for the space station in fiscal year 1994.

Theory does not count today. If the House fails to adopt the Roemer-Zimmer amendment, $2.1 billion of hard-earned taxpayers' money will be wasted on the space station in 1994.

This is real money that is not available for other science programs, environmental protection, housing needs, emergency food and shelter programs, veterans programs, and—most of all—deficit reduction. We need the space station's $2.1 billion here on Earth.

The space station program is so fundamentally flawed that President Clinton's current design option only satisfies one of its eight original design objectives. NASA currently estimates the latest space station design will cost American taxpayers $10.5 billion over the next 5 years and roughly $30 billion to complete.

Moreover, each time NASA redesigns the space station its utility diminishes, its cost escalates, and it directs desperately needed funding away from other scientifically valid programs. The space station has always been of dubious scientific worth, and the scientific benefit to be derived from the current space station design is even more illusive.

The news for taxpayers gets worse, however. The space station's total development costs are expected to exceed $40 billion, and its estimated lifetime cost is likely to reach $120 billion. At such a price, the space station is clearly directing funding away from other science programs. But, most importantly, the space station is steering money away from deficit reduction.

And I would warn my colleagues, do not be taken in by pseudo-historical lectures and emotional appeals about our place in history. I taught history too and I could set forth historical parallels of prior civilizations that spent their heritage and were deluded by their leaders. Egyptians, Ottomans, and Romans all were victims of their own foolishness.

All the lofty arguments aside, the space station is a luxury pork project of dubious scientific value that the United States cannot afford when the Federal Government has accumulated a $4.3 trillion national debt.

Mr. Chairman, it seems ironic that proponents of the space station argue it is a gift for future generations. When, in reality, the space station's greatest gift to future generations is its contribution to our Nation's enormous Federal debt.

Mr. Chairman, let us stop this taxpayer ripoff right now, before more Federal dollars are wasted. I urge my colleagues to examine our Nation's priorities and to vote for fiscal responsibility in Government by supporting the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to terminate the space station.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, it is always difficult, particularly when it is getting late at night, to influence the vote on the floor, particularly the second time around. But I feel so deeply about space station and how important it is that I am hoping those maybe who are listening, who possibly are on the fence, will keep their thinking cap on, not their emotion cap on, as they cast this vote.

Let me just share with my colleagues a little bit of where I am coming from:

As my colleagues know, I have been around for a little bit in my life, and I have seen what it does, and science, if it is good science, does not usually end up in a laboratory report on a shelf gathering dust. It is useful. It has multiplication opportunities far beyond anything one would recognize at the time when the science is done.

Let me give my colleagues an example. I used to work for a company that did some work for the Space Age and for particular opportunities in the Space Age, and we developed some materials for this. Lo and behold, not only were they helpful for the Nation's program, but also they developed cooking ware which employed thousands, and thousands, and thousands of people.

My colleagues, this is not just a lonely example. It works its way through our lives if we have good, and fine and creative new science, and it translates into jobs.

My colleagues can talk about all the horror stories they want, of waste and things like that. But, as my colleagues know, science, like politics, is a very messy business. But it still is important, and it means risk, and it means leadership, and, if we do not have it, then we follow, and what we do is really compete with third rate countries on a volume and a price basis, and there is nothing in it for a technically involved nation such as ours.

Every so often, Mr. Chairman, something big comes along whether it is the Manhattan project or, in this particular case, the space station, and I say to my colleagues, as I mentioned the other day, if we could position ourselves being absolutely No. 1 in this brand new science, second, almost inevitably, there would be a whole series of byproduct jobs coming out, producing manufacturing work, producing export jobs, producing trade balances which we are reaching for, and at the same time we could cut the real cost, the people cost, by 30 percent. It would sound like a pretty good deal compared to all these other things we have been talking about.

My colleagues, I feel very strongly about this. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is not the way to go. The space station will have incalculable benefits, and I say to my colleagues, "I hope you will support it in this next vote."

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER], one of our freshmen.

□ 2050

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]. To effectively address the Nation's $300 billion deficit, we must cut spending.

Recently, there have been discussions of cutting funding for Medicare and Medicaid—programs that benefit the elderly and indigent. This is not where our cuts should occur. They should occur with programs like the space station, a program which is both scientifically and fiscally irresponsible.

Why do we need a space station??

We no longer need to beat the Russians.

We no longer plan human exploration of the Moon and Mars. Thus, studying the effect of weightlessness on astronauts is not a pressing scientific need.

Furthermore necessary experiments can be conducted by robots.

Mr. Chairman, in these tight budgetary times, we must carefully review every program on which we spend money. We cannot justify spending additional billions of dollars for the space station.

A vote for this amendment is a vote for fiscal responsibility and I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, because we have been over this ground before. But let us be clear about the vote tonight: if you vote against the space station, you vote to stop the space program dead in its tracks. There is no doubt about it in the minds of our trading partners as they prepare to move forward with America. If we say no tonight, they will look elsewhere, and they will surely move ahead of us in this race for our country's future.

Every President since John Kennedy and every Congress has stood together to move this space program forward. Let us not let history say that this Congress, this night, said no to the space program and stopped it dead. Let us move this country forward again. Let us keep the space program going. Let us build the space station.

Space station *Freedom* is in serious trouble today, and with it our entire manned space program.

After more than a quarter of a century of dazzling success and loyal national commitment, NASA is facing unprecedented pressure and intense public scrutiny, with space station *Freedom* at the center.

This strain comes at a time when our efforts to reduce the Federal budget deficit are the most serious and encompassing since I came to the Congress. While reaching a consensus on budget cuts will not be easy, this Congress has every chance to achieve real cuts and real savings in Federal spending.

With a $31 billion price tag, space station *Freedom* was an inviting target for these cuts. Now, although the station has been redesigned for a much lower price tag, there are those in this Congress who would scrap the project and send NASA—and our global lead in space exploration—into a tailspin.

We did not reach this point overnight. We got here from years of disinterest by previous administrations and the lack of a defined space policy. Recent Presidencies that even bothered to address America's space program seemed to do so only at anniversaries and commemorations. More often than not NASA was a peripheral issue that never received the commitment and focus it deserves. As a result, the agency has suffered a lack of direction and has often been embroiled in destructive infighting.

Progress in space means having a policy that outlines our goals in space and the timetable by which we will meet them. For my generation, it was President John F. Kennedy who inspired us and laid the foundation for our achievements in space. It is going to take the same type of leadership and drive to keep our space program alive.

Our country has a policy for imported auto parts and soybean price supports; why not something as important to our future as the U.S. space program? Laying out such a plan is the surest way to overcome NASA's present dilemmas and rid us of the irrationality of the current process.

Effective, progressive leadership in space does not rest solely on the President. It requires Members of Congress, NASA administrators, and private contractors to ally themselves together for the good of the entire space program. Congressional supporters should solidify their votes in both the House and Senate. NASA officials and contractors should streamline their management structure and hold a tougher line on expenditures. If we want a space station and a manned space program, then all instances of partisanship and pettiness must be put aside.

This is the time to make that decision. Spending 9 years and $8 billion on a program, then drastically downsizing or scrapping it, is not only the worst type of governmental waste, it also means tossing away our future discoveries in science, engineering, and medicine.

Already our level of investment in the space station—averaging less than 1 percent of our entire Federal budget per year—has paid rich dividends. For every dollar we spend on research, we get between $7 and $10 in return.

The space station is the platform of man's future in space. Though its mission has narrowed, its potential for reward has not. The weightless environment of space will provide an exceptional laboratory for science. In our future, man will make medical and scientific discoveries in space that we cannot yet imagine. Today, men and women are preparing to meet these opportunities: cancer research, advanced treatments for disease, biomechanical devices, and perfectly formed semiconductors.

These promising advancements do not stand alone. In the weightless environment of space, biological materials separate more completely and protein crystals grow larger and more perfectly, allowing us to develop new and purer forms of pharmaceuticals that can be used to treat diseases like emphysema, high blood pressure, AIDS, and cancer. Space physiology research can lead to treatment for osteoporosis, motion sicknesses, and diabetes. Research on the biotechnological and biomedical applications of cell, tissue, protein, and molecular processes can lead to new insights into how our bodies work, grow, and repair themselves.

It was newspaper columnist Walter Lippmann who wrote nearly 50 years ago that "the final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and the will to carry on * * *" Such was the measure of President Kennedy, and such could be the measure of ourselves today. Unless we grasp the reins and lead this country into the next century, we will be overtaken by others in the realm of space.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the space station and associate myself with the prior remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the exciting coming remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for our future. I rise in support of space station *Freedom*.

A vote today to terminate funding for the space station is not a vote to cut the budget. It is a vote to sacrifice our future.

We cannot move forward as a world leader in business, technology, or transportation without remaining a leader in space exploration. The only way to remain a leader in space is through station *Freedom*.

To those who seek to cut the budget, I urge you to join me later tonight in supporting reductions in a real pork program, the advanced solid rocket motor or ASRM for the space shuttle.

If you want to reduce the deficit, look to programs of the past such as ASRM. If you want to build strength for the future, then support space station *Freedom*.

Mr. Chairman, here again are a few key points. The cost of the space station alone does not reflect its true value.

The space station is the next necessary step in maintaining our commitment to manned space flight. Without the space station, the more ambitious goal of a manned flight to Mars will be impossible.

Important research on life sciences and the effect of weightlessness demand a permanent platform for long-term studies to proceed. These are paramount to any extended space voyage.

The production of pharmaceuticals and materials engineered in a weightless environment cannot occur without the space station.

The space station is international. Without the United States, international commitment will collapse; so the impact will not only be on our own space industry, but that of our allies as well.

NASA's redesign process has produced a lean, workable model for the international space station that will perform the tasks necessary to justify its building.

It is fitting and proper that the United States lead the rest of the world in confronting this exciting new challenge. Or is it the destiny of the Clinton era to be the one of diminished leadership and capabilities for the American Nation? Without a national commitment to conquering this frontier, the United States will necessarily be limited in its future leadership roles. Let us resolve to maintain this commitment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, both the Senate and the House have now passed budget proposals that will increase our public debt by $1 billion a day for the next 5 years. Are we sure as Congressmen and Congresswomen that we want to leave this kind of spending legacy to our children and grandchildren? When we make spending decisions, we must base them on our overall goals to accelerate our economy and reverse the decline in the

Americans' standard of living. In this regard, space station *Freedom* is indefensible and fiscally unjustified.

The money for the space station would be better spent to encourage science and research to develop new technologies that American companies can use to improve productivity and our competitive position with other countries of the world. Some speakers have suggested we could get a lot of research information from the space station. That may or may not be true, but that information will not improve American competitiveness. The fact is, we have already signed away America's rights to this information to other countries in intergovernmental agreements.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to put billions and billions of dollars into research, then I suggest that America should fund the kind of research efforts that Americans can use in America to improve our competitive edge, to expand our economy and to increase the number of good jobs that are available. Borrowing money to spend on space station *Freedom* is a luxury that we cannot afford at this time. Each year that we sink more money into this space station that even the scientists say is wasteful, makes it that much more difficult to reconsider. Let us get out cheaply while we can. Let us put this project on hold while it is still in the planning stages so this country can deal with our important priorities, one of which is the economy.

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the Roemer-Zimmer amendment. Time and time again, I listen to my colleagues tell us that we cannot afford a space station. Let me try to make it clear that what we cannot afford is the sacrifice of the most valuable research and development being done by our nation today. Research and development is the engine that drives our economy. It is upon the high-tech, forward looking jobs this research and development will produce that our nation will stand on in the decades to come.

Mr. Chairman, if a trucking company told you it was going to cut costs by not purchasing any more fuel, you would think it illogical. If a print shop tried to reduce overhead by failing to purchase ink, that too would be illogical. When we debate funding for the most far reaching, intensive research and development project in our nation today, when we throw over the side the very sustenance which will nurture tomorrow's economy, we, too, are acting illogical.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said that the cost overruns and mismanagement at NASA require us to kill the space station. I submit that it is this Congress that has led the space station program into the situation it finds itself. Coming year-in and year-out, year after year, trying to kill the space station and space program, causes NASA to have a lot of the problems that we currently find. We are, however, cleaning things up. This administration is cleaning things up starting with the management restructuring program that the Chairman so eloquently pointed out. It is not our fault, it is the fault of trying to slow down our commitment to this project and to the space program that causes so many of NASA's problems.

The gentlewoman from New Jersey was talking about the Romans. If I remember my history right, the Romans at the end of the empire spent all their money on consumer goods and spent money on the current day rather than investing in tomorrow. Mr. Chairman, that is what you are doing if you kill the space station. You are moving money from productive investments in the future to nonproductive social programs, as has been brought out by speaker after speaker here tonight that wants to kill the space station so they can reallocate the money for their spending programs.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming said, "I haven't seen any improvement." Well, the gentleman has not been listening to the debate. We have improved the space station. We have ratcheted down the design and the costs and created a streamlined management restructuring program. As a result of the Redesign process, NASA plans to make major management restructuring which they estimate will save $300 million per year. The Vest Committee believes savings from management changes could add up to anywhere between $700 million to $1 billion per year for NASA overall.

The gentleman from Michigan, and I love him, he does a great job, says we ought to spend our money on encouraging new technologies for our companies. Well, go talk to the computer companies of America. Go talk to the companies that are making microwaves. Go talk to the biotech companies, to the composite companies that are making product after product that comes directly from the space program as well as the new products they are anticipating will come from the space station. All of these companies will tell you that they look to the space station as the vehicle, not just as four men in orbit but to carry the technology development of their own industries—American industries—who need and deserve that edge.

Mr. Chairman, the real question we are debating here is do we kill our investment in the future called our space program by killing the space station, and take that money and move it into veterans benefits and housing programs. Because if you are voting for this amendment as deficit reduction, make no mistake about it; not a dime of the $2.1 billion will go to deficit reduction. That money will go to other programs. We all know it. Those of us who have been here for years understand it and there is no doubt that that is what will happen.

I would like to make one additional point. Although this amendment would not apply funds saved from killing space station to deficit reduction, for those Members who believe that we should kill space station in favor of deficit reduction, I urge you to think again. Compared to all the unnecessary activities undertaken by our government, America's space program is one which is unquestionably legitimate. As with many other government programs, it hasn't been without problems and NASA is addressing these problems but space station is a crucial project that provides unquestionable benefits now and in the future that will far outweigh the investment we've put in.

Vote for investing in the future; vote no on the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I will just say that we cast a number of votes last week where many Members in this body voted for canceling the liquid metal reactor, $31 million; the SP-100, $25 million; some voted to cancel the SSC, $620 million. I am sure their intentions were deficit reduction, and that is what the intention of this legislation is as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN], a freshman who has whipped on this and has been very helpful.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer amendment. It has been suggested that if you are against space station *Freedom*, you have not vision and you are against science. I think quite the opposite is true.

I oppose space station *Freedom* because I think it is in the best interest of our Nation's future and technology development and space exploration to rethink the Space Station program. We have already cut $450 million out of other critical NASA programs in order to accommodate space station *Freedom*. Continuing to throw good money after bad is not conducive to a competitive technological future. We simply cannot afford the luxury of continuing to fund the overpriced, poorly managed space station *Freedom* program at the expense of other programs, both in science and technology, as well as important economic development and social initiatives.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

□ 2100

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to be brief tonight. I feel like in some ways we are beating a dead horse.

I want to congratulate the chairman and say that the remarks that the gentleman made, as a new member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I know that our committee has put NASA's budget through the heat of fire. And we have held their feet to the fire.

We have looked at some of their management problems, and we understand we have got some room to work with them. This is not the time to walk away from the space station *Freedom* program.

The President is recommending this program, and I urge the Members to pay attention to this debate tonight.

Let us put our support behind the space station program and vote against this amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, at some point in our history, interplanetary travel and development may well be necessary.

Whether we have reached the point where prudence demands we take the next step toward living and working in space, and construct the space station, is the issue before us today.

I suggest to my colleagues that in these times of severe fiscal constraint, the question should turn on the needs of mankind and the contribution in the near and midterm expected of the space station.

Mr. Chairman, we already have a space station—the planet Earth. It is a fragile, finite sphere covered mostly by unexplored ocean depths.

An immediate need of mankind is a clean planet. Toward that end our attention should focus on a sustainable culture, one that promotes waste control, wise use of resources, and efficient technologies. A culture that lives in harmony with nature and practices the Earth Day slogan "Reduce, Reuse and Recycle."

Without dispute, advances in health research and care is a need of mankind, but, Mr. Chairman, we have heard from spokesmen for the National Institute of Health, the American Cancer Society, and the Arthritis Foundation—all to the effect that Earth-based medical research can accomplish what is contemplated in space.

For me the balance sheet of responsiveness to the needs of mankind dictates not proceeding with the space station at this time.

The dollars saved, whether $12 or $20 or $40 billion, even if not spent on promoting research at home—even if not used to address the need for a clean planet, would undeniably help by substituting for the deficit-reduction proposals that restrict investment in people, adversely affect the working elderly, increase the cost of living, and decrease the quality of life for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

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

I especially want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. I was thinking about what I was going to say this evening, speaking on behalf of space station. And then I thought, well, this will be very easy. I can just recycle the speech that I made last week, talk again about how if we defeat this program, the space station, and vote for the Zimmer-Roemer amendment, it will end manned space as we know it for the United States for at least the next two decades, that we will have repudiated foreign commitments.

We will have lost face. We will have lost faith, and we will have broken trust with our foreign partners.

I got to thinking about this. I thought, what do the people back home think about this debate over space station a second time? Is this as confusing to them as it is to me? Is this as confusing to them, as they watch this right now and they hear different Members stand up and speak on behalf of or against space station, when we just talked about this 5, 6 days ago, or if they pick up their papers tomorrow morning?

I thought, the problem is, this reflects exactly what is wrong with Congress. We decided this last week. We voted for it. We passed it. It happened. We won by five votes. We passed this space station. It is over.

Yet here we are again, in this body, together, going over the same thing. Do my colleagues not suppose that the people back home look at this and say, "What is going on here? How can this happen over and over?"

Not only that, but I have to tell my colleagues, it is going to happen twice more, when it comes back on the authorization side from conference, when it comes back on the appropriations side from conference.

We have passed it. I urge my colleagues to vote the way they did before. The most cynical thing that happens in these situations is Members who want to straddle the fence, vote one way on the authorization and then another on the appropriation, play both sides and have an explanation for both.

I urge my colleagues, each of them, vote against this amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA], a brand-new Member of this body who just came from a very difficult election.

Mr. BARCA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Roemer amendment to cut the $2.1 billion appropriation for the space station. While I am an ardent supporter of scientific research and am well aware of its educational value, I believe these tough economic times force us to scrutinize projects more carefully than we have in the past.

Items like the space station, while desirable and perhaps even useful, are beyond affordability. Increasingly, Congress must make these difficult decisions in an attempt to spend within our means. I do not believe the merits of the space station outweigh the importance of reducing our budget deficit. We simply cannot fund a program of this financial magnitude until we bring the deficit under control. We are not even sure how much this station will actually cost. NASA cannot keep a balanced budget and neither will we unless we make these types of tough decisions.

We do not need this program to spark our children's interest in science. Postponing completion of the space station will neither stifle our children's desire to explore new frontiers nor discourage their interest in space-related disciplines. We will be able to maintain our status as world leaders in science and technology and at the same time focus our efforts on those space programs which are most cost-effective and scientifically valuable.

The Roemer amendment advocates intelligent use of taxpayer dollars as well as sound space policy. By supporting this amendment we can demonstrate our commitment to manage scarce revenues effectively and gain the taxpayers confidence in our ability to bring about real deficit reduction. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the funding contained in this bill for the manned space station.

This funding represents an investment in our future. It is critical to our economy and to the growth of high technology industries in this country.

More than 30 years ago we started our space program. Over the years, our Nation has been recognized worldwide for the technology that we have developed as a result of this program.

We have witnessed many advances in medicine, lasers, computer technology and weather satellites as a direct result of the space program. We have made the world a better place to live through the discoveries made during the course of our space program.

The space station is the logical next step. We must move forward in our exploration of space and our development of scientific knowledge. We need to move forward with the space station

which will serve as the platform for new experiments.

Thirty years from now, the future of America may depend on what we do today. We must look to the future and we must prepare for it. We cannot afford to be shortsighted. We cannot afford to short-circuit the development of our scientific abilities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the funding for the space station.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Time and again during the space station debate, we have heard about keeping the dream alive and the inspiring vision of space exploration. We have head about dazzling exploration feats of America and other nations. And members have related their stirring childhood memories of seeing a rocket launch or a moon landing.

These statements have often been powerful and moving. But they are rooted in emotion—not logic. Proponents of the space station are forced to appeal to emotion because logical arguments will not carry the day for them—because clear, cold analysis proves that the space station we are debating is simply not worth the billions we have been asked to spend on it. So you have heard from Flash Gordon. Now listen to Mr. Spock.

Let us look at the arguments for building this space station and see why they are not logical.

The space station has been sold as a marvelous science laboratory. It is not. Last week this body voted to end funding for the superconducting super collider because we cannot afford it. The space station is much more expensive than the SSC and far less likely to provide major scientific discoveries. America's leading scientists and physicians have said that the space station cannot be justified on scientific or medical grounds. The space station will provide us with only one small lab that will accommodate just two researchers.

The space station program is also far more prone to cost overruns than the super collider. This year alone, NASA discovered more than one billion dollars in cost overruns.

The space station has been sold as a gateway to space. It is not.

When first proposed by President Reagan, the space station was going to be a multipurpose staging base for deep space exploration. It was going to have its own landing dock and launch pad. It was going to have a facility for repairing spacecraft and a warehouse for spare parts. It was even hoped that we could manufacture rocket fuel up there. Not one of those capabilities remains in the plans for America's space station.

This space station is no longer a gateway to space, it is a dead end. Its inexorable funding demands have taken money away from every other space exploration program. It has even caused the cancellation of our only effort to plan how we might return to the moon and explore Mars.

If we continue to build the space station, we will divert NASA's entire exploration budget—and most of its science budget as well—to a program that will not help us to explore anything.

The space station has been sold as the only way to save the American space program. It is not.

In fact, the opposite is true. Dozens of important, successful space programs have been sacrificed to feed the space station's insatiable appetite. Only last week this body cut $250 million from the rest of NASA's programs to help win votes for the space station. And the Appropriations Committee cut $365 million from other NASA programs, including the space shuttle, environmental satellites, space research and technology, commercial space initiatives and space science to bring space station funding up to the President's request.

Satellites being developed to tell us about the ozone layer and global climate change have been delayed. The satellite surveying Venus was turned off last year while in perfect working order because NASA could not afford to keep operating it. The mission to send a probe to one of Saturn's moons has been scaled back. Missions to survey the infrared and x-ray spectra of the universe have been repeatedly delayed. And we completely canceled the mission to locate and learn about comets and asteroids, despite the fact that two asteroids passed dangerously close to Earth in the last 3 months.

These are all missions that would teach us about the universe. They would expand our horizons. They would add to our knowledge. They would inspire our youth. Yet they are starving for funds because of our fixation with a hugely expensive piece of hardware designed to house four humans in low-earth orbit more than 30 years after we landed on the Moon. This will not assure public support for the space program. Instead it will guarantee public resentment and frustration.

This space station will not teach us about telecommunications. It will not create new industries. It will not tell us anything about our planet, and it will not help us to explore new ones. It will not teach us about the creation of the universe or how to manufacture new drugs.

The only way we can achieve our dreams is to face reality. Cold logic tells us that the space station will not do what its proponents promise. In fact, it will defer the dream of space exploration. Vote for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

□ 2110

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, last week when we debated this amendment I talked about the advances in manufacturing we have made as a direct result of building an object which must last 10 to 30 years in space. Since the amendment failed by only one vote and 64 freshmen supported it, I rise to urge the Members again to consider the ramifications for our manufacturing base of building the space station *Freedom*, and to give the Members a more specific understanding of the benefits that the space station project has already produced for American manufacturing.

Our first concrete advancement in manufacturing produced by the space station research program is what is called rapid prototyping techniques. This approach has reduced the time required to produce space parts by integrating design and manufacturing in a truly revolutionary way.

Using rapid prototyping, it is now possible to make metal castings of unique parts directly from the design without drawings or special tooling. That means a 24-week process can now be accomplished in 2.4 weeks. This is a major advancement that will have a great impact on the productivity and competitiveness of all U.S. manufacturers. Since manufacturing produces 22 percent of our GNP and since in the past we have been better at inventing products than at producing them cost-effectively, this is the kind of advancement that is critical to our continued economic strength.

Secondly, space station hardware requirements have forced manufacturers to invent new material joining techniques and processes that allow them to weld aluminum and titanium to fabricate small, complex heat exchangers consistently and with outstanding reliability. Both the new joining and welding processes and the miniaturization of heat exchangers have applications throughout manufacturing and will enable us to upgrade, miniaturize, and in other ways improve our products.

Lastly, manufacturing processes have been developed to apply and bond coatings to space hardware surfaces that inhibit the growth of microbiological organisms in space. These same techniques, applied to Earth hardware, can improve our indoor and outdoor air and water quality.

I urge Members to consider the beneficial impacts building space station *Freedom* will have on U.S. leadership in manufacturing and product design. I urge the Members to vote down this amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to a distinguished freshman, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], who did vote for us on our amendment last week.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that can honestly be said about the space station: the price tag is out of this world.

One hundred billion dollars for an orbiting motel for four astronauts when we spend a fraction of that on desperately needed affordable housing here on earth.

One hundred billion dollars for a Motel Six in space when we have an infant mortality rate in Harlem and here in the District of Columbia that rivals many third world countries.

In fact, the space station is squeezing out a number of other worthy NASA projects.

Many critical reports by the General Accounting Office and respected scientists tell us that we are using taxpayer dollars to build the biggest pork barrel ever shot into space.

Let us not put this decision off another year.

Let us concentrate on the real priorities of this country—putting people, not pork, first.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, in a fever pitch to attack debt and deficits, Congress is beginning to cannibalize America's future. Instead of rewriting the Tax Code, that penalizes achievement, discourages investment, rewards imports, we are now beginning to turn the focus on America's future.

I hear speech after speech in the House about all the money we have spent and are not going to spend, and nobody is more concerned about the domestic needs of America, but if we are going to solve the future domestic needs of America we will do so with high-technology opportunities.

We have invested $9 billion, Congress. We are getting to the point we are going to be cutting off our collective noses to spite our troubled faces. And I wonder what is the future for our country?

□ 2120

I want to commend Chairman STOKES who is a leader and has helped Ohio very much. And I agree that the managerial focus placed in this bill will help NASA.

But I would also like to say if we are going to be a leader we should continue the lead that we have taken. If we are going to develop high-technology jobs, we are not going to do it with waste water treatment plants alone, folks.

So I want to offer my support for the space station. Congress should continue the space station. There is a tremendous commercial return on the investment we have spent, and it is good for our country.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and I rise in strong support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment. This is, as I said last week, a tremendous bipartisan effort to do something about the problem that we have in this country, and that is that we are bankrupting the United States of America in this body.

I want to relate to Members, if I may, a series of events that caused me to solidify my position in this regard. I had a delegation visiting with me in my office that was in favor of the space station, and of course they were there to tell me that it was the best thing since sliced bread. They did not use those terms, but this is basically what they were telling me, that there were going to be tremendous advantages, that the industrial applications, the research applications were so wonderful that it was truly the best thing since sliced bread.

I walked over to the House here to vote, and I was a little bit wobbly-kneed, frankly, because this was a high-level delegation, and I was afraid that maybe they were right and maybe I was wrong. Then I was met here in the Chamber by a Member who asked me what my position was on the superconducting super collider. I was a little embarrassed, and he asked me how I was going to vote and I said well, I am against it. But I was a little bit embarrassed because frankly I was a little bit wobbly-kneed from the last delegation, and he asked me, "Well, are you beyond a pitch?" And I said no, go ahead and go shoot your best shot. And then he said the superconducting super collider is the best thing since sliced bread. It is going to revolutionize industry in this country. It has applications beyond the imagination. And I said well you know, that is interesting. I was just with somebody, a delegation that told me the same thing about the space station. And he said, "Oh, no, the space station, that thing is lousy. The thing that is really good is the superconducting super collider. It has got applications beyond belief."

I walked back to my office convinced that both have to be shelved, that both are in the same league, and that is very extensive projects, both of which it would be nice to pursue if we had plenty of money. But when you are $4 trillion in debt, you do not go spending that kind of money on speculative projects.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding me this time. I know that we want to keep the debate time down, but I do rise in opposition to this amendment.

Last week I noted on the floor that the constructive criticism of some of the space station's opponents. Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. ROEMER being prime among them, has actually helped improve the station. I also pointed out that bringing in our former enemies as true partners will actually make the space station program even more international than originally conceived.

But Mr. Chairman, let me point to the human and economic costs that I do not believe are being fully considered.

Mr. Chairman, the cold war is over. Highly trained Americans helped us win that twilight struggle. Millions of experienced engineers, technicians, machinists, scientists, the dedicated patriots who built and maintained our Nation's high-tech military might during those years are the same folks whose lives and mortgage payments are now on the line. The space station and the space program are the way to keep these folks usefully employed doing work that returns value to this Nation while our economy adjusts.

Mr. Chairman, the space station is defense conversion. It is not a jobs bill. I oppose make-work programs. Instead, this is an essential transition program for an industry that is vital to our Nation's economic well-being.

If we are to have a healthy and growing economy, we must have a competitive and efficient aerospace industry. And in order to have that, we must carefully plan the transition out of the cold war into a more peaceful world.

Will we instead throw these talented and educated individuals who built the peace into turmoil and into an unproductive abyss by canceling the space station and trash-canning our aerospace industry?

Mr. Chairman, we owe a debt to those who won the cold war and to generations to come. Aerospace has much more to contribute to the well-being of our country in the years ahead, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are one big family in this country, and we are one big family in big trouble. Let us look at it for a second.

We are a family that does not have enough income to pay our daily bills. We are borrowing now to feed our children. We are borrowing now to send them to school. We are borrowing now to pay the utilities. We are borrowing now, for God's sake, to pay the interest on the past borrowings of this Nation.

If we do our job perfectly well this year and cut the deficit in the next 5 years by $500 billion, we are still planning to add another $1 trillion of national debt over the next 5 years. We are borrowing ourselves into the hole.

The issue tonight is not whether the space station is a good idea. The issue is can we afford another wonderful $1 billion idea when we are sinking so deeply into debt.

I will tell Members what we cannot afford. We cannot afford to have 37 million Americans who do not have health insurance tonight. We cannot afford to have millions of Americans living in poverty and a system that bankrupts this country because we cannot seem to lift them out and to give them a job, and to rescue this country from economic chaos. We cannot afford to sink any deeper. We cannot afford the space station if we are going to solve the other problems America desperately is waiting for this Congress, this Nation to solve as a family.

We are a family in debt. We are a family in trouble. We cannot afford this major acquisition. We need to put it off until we can afford it, no matter how good it is, no matter how right it might be for our future.

We simply cannot afford it tonight, and tonight we have to make the right decision for this family: America.

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and would inquire of the Chair how much time each Member has remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] has 13½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has 18 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment to stop funding the space station.

Last week, the House considered this issue, but in a slightly different context. In a sense, we were voting on whether the station is a good idea—should we build a space station? Last week's vote was evidence of continued skepticism over the need for the station.

But today we must ask ourselves another question—can we afford it? With a national debt of $4 trillion that will grow by almost $300 billion this year, can we really afford the $100 billion it will probably cost to build and operate the space station?

Now, I know this is a tough vote for some of my colleagues. For some this might be an issue of NASA's direction, the viability of our aerospace industry, or maybe even jobs in their district. Those are all legitimate concerns.

But in the last couple of weeks or so we have taken votes on amendments to cut programs in the name of reducing the deficit. And almost everyone around here has come down to the House floor to talk about the importance of cutting spending.

When we voted to cut funding for former Speakers of the House and for former Presidents, those amendments took hours to debate and saved us less than $12 million. We cut $2 million from BATF and $4 million from the Customs Service. Time and time again, these and other measures were characterized as votes for fiscal responsibility and deficit reduction.

But those votes barely even nibbled away at the deficit.

Congress would have to pass 300 amendments the size of the U.S. Customs Service amendment every year for the next 20 or 30 years to equal the savings in this amendment. My question to you is, Do you really want to cut the deficit or are you just pretending? For those of you who are looking for real deficit reduction, a cut that matters this year and next year and for years to come, this is your chance.

Killing the worthless space station will save us more than $1 billion this year and tens of billions of dollars over the next 20 years.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, today my office received some information on jobs that the space station provides to New York State. According to NASA, $19.38 million in station contracts in New York provides 153 jobs. That is supposed to be a reason for me and my New York colleagues to support this boondoggle—153 jobs at a cost of a whopping $126,666 apiece to the taxpayer. If what we are looking for is a jobs program making effective use of the taxpayers' money, then that is a good reason to oppose the station, not support it.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and kill the space station.

□ 2130

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes to respond to a couple of remarks that were made earlier about health care and about Christopher Columbus and about some of the intentions of this amendment that might not go for deficit reduction.

First of all, if I recall my history correctly about Christopher Columbus and the decision by the king and queen to send Christopher Columbus on a voyage abroad, and thing they knew for certain was that the boat would float and that the boat worked. In our case, the space station, we have already spent $10 billion on the space station. Ronald Reagan said it would cost us $8 billion to build this, and we do not have a dime's worth of science or technology from it.

Furthermore, it has been reduced from eight scientific missions, including a mission to help us as a steppingstone to explore the Moon and Mars, it was supposed to help us with wayward and broken satellites, it was supposed to help us with the telescope, to reach out into the stars, and now it cannot do any of the those things. Yet we want to spend $100 billion on this particular project?

I do not think the king and queen would be telling Christopher Columbus to build a space station today.

Also, if I remember my history correctly, I think Spain experienced severe difficulties during the ensuing years. Their civilization and their economy experienced very, very tragic results.

Mr. Chairman, I say that we in this country are seeing our people go through very difficult decisions and consequences of not spending money in different areas and social areas of education. I am on the Education Committee. I am very concerned about that, not that this amendment would have one dime go for education. It is all for the deficit, but we are cutting money. We are cutting money for the Pell grant.

In response to some of the claims made about how this will be a magic wand and a panacea for our health care concerns in this country, we are not even adequately funding the National Institutes of Health for helping us with breast cancer, with prostate cancer, with problems of heart and lung disease. We fund one out of every four approved grants in NIH.

We should not be rolling the dice with $100 billion with this space station, that is of very, very dubious scientific value, when in fact NASA is doing some other wonderful things that are returning us good technology and good benefits and good scientific data.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

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

Last week when we had the vote on the space station, I went back to some of my constituents and talked about how I had voted to save $100 billion in the long run and tens of billions of dollars in the short run, when I voted against the space station. They looked at me, and they were not pleased. I asked them why. They could not tell me why other than they thought that somehow we would be deficient in science if we did not fund the station.

So I talked to them about conversations I have had with NASA employees who pointed out that the space station is gobbling up everything else at NASA, and that NASA cannot do all the other things it wants to do. We talked about some of the other scientific research programs that we need to do but cannot do because we have put so much into the space station. They understood and said we better stop building the station.

I rise to speak strongly in support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to end funding for the space station.

This is a debate about our future. It is a debate about the future of a little boy who McDonnell Douglas in this advertisement I'm holding wants to convince you, because he is in a space suit, that you should vote for the station. But when I look at this advertisement and this little boy, I come to a different conclusion. I think about his future, and I think about the $4.3 trillion debt we have today that he will have to pay. I think about the $1.7 trillion increase in our national debt in the next 5 years even with Presidential action, that he will have to pay. I think of the $6 trillion national debt in 5 years that he will have to pay.

What dream? What dream are we promising the individual?

I think of the $350 billion deficits that we have every year that he will have to pay.

What dream? What future?

I think of the $250 billion in interest on the national debt and I think of this child and his future.

What kind of dream are we talking about for this child? Do we need a space station to help this child? Is that the dream?

Today we had in Roll Call another McDonnell Douglas advertisement. It said "We thank the House of Representatives for keeping the dream alive." What dream? Whose dream? It is their dream. They make it. They want the business. They would like to have it funded, but we cannot afford it.

I hope some who voted for the space station last week will not vote to fund it tonight. I hope what they will do is think about this young child in the space suit and his future.

We cannot afford the space station. Over the years we have had debates on the balanced-budget amendment, which more than 50 percent of us have supported, and then we do not vote to cut spending.

This may be wonderful scientific project for some, if we could pay for it. We simply do not have the dollars to pay for it.

I urge my colleagues to think about what we will do next year. We will have the same debate on the space station. And we will realize it is more costly than we thought. And we will find that it has been changed again. And we will find that sometimes it will be warehoused in space with no one in it because we cannot pay for all of the things that we would like to do in it. It will become smaller and smaller and more and more expensive.

We cannot pay it because we have serious financial problems. We need to get our financial house in order. We should vote now rather than later to save tens of billions of dollars and stop funding the space station.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT], a distinguished freshman.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the debate tonight is over two things. It is over our Nation's deficit, and it is over failed technology.

First, the deficit this year, the Federal Government will collect $515 billion in personal income taxes from all Americans. That is how much the Government will collect from every citizen in this country.

Now, where is that money going? $295 billion you can take right off the top, because $295 billion is going to pay interest on the debt, not reduction of principal, but interest on the debt. Take another $146 billion, and that is going to go to Medicare. Take $80 billion, and that is going to go to Medicaid.

Those three things alone come up to $521 billion. That is more than this Government is going to collect this year in personal income taxes. So that is it. The money is gone.

There are, of course, other sources of money, but that money is going to go to pay for national defense, Head Start, and education programs.

The fact of the matter is that we simply do not have the resources in this country to pay for this technology, and it is a failed technology at that.

Ten years ago NASA came to this Congress and asked for $8 billion. If they had met their goal, we would not be standing here tonight talking about this issue. It would be done. But we are here.

□ 2140

But we are here, and some have suggested that we are beating a dead horse by talking about this issue. I would suggest, instead of beating a dead horse, we are funding a dead horse and we should stop it tonight.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER].

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Chairman, I come before you tonight as someone with over 20 years of experience with the aerospace industry, who has been there, who has been involved in aerospace and electronics.

Let me tell you something: You know, there are bad debts and there are good debts; bad debts are when you borrow money and when you spend it on operating expenses and frivolous things; good debts are when you borrow money and you invest it in your future. That is why rebuilding our roads and bridges and educating our children are so important to this Nation and our future. That is what we are talking about here tonight.

Now it is very easy to make a case that this is frivolous spending, that, "Look, there are no guarantees." Let me tell you something, there are no guarantees in life; you pay your money and you take your chances.

We do that every day.

The issue we have to settle tonight is: Is it worth investing the money in the space station on the comprehension that there will be future advances technologically that will help our Nation and provide the kinds of jobs that we want for us and our children?

Let me tell you, colleagues, we are losing the battle on basic technologies. We can no longer compete with many nations that are emerging in the industrial world today. We cannot compete with their wages.

Our future and the future of our country in terms of our trade lies in producing high-technology, advanced products, and you do not fall onto those accidentally. You do not say, "Well, let's invest in the next generation of computer chip," and you do it. You do the basic research, you discover things, you discover ideas, and then you capitalize on those by producing the product.

That is what will come with the space station. There are no guarantees that we will have a cure for cancer by developing the space station, but clearly this is the kind of thing we must do.

The fact of the matter is this is an investment in our future. Research is what it is all about. The great ideas do not happen accidentally, they happen because we take a risk, we take a chance, and we invest and take advantage of the opportunity.

That is how we make discoveries, and that is where the products come from. If you want the United States to compete, to be competitive in the world marketplace in the future, we certainly do need to continue this kind of program.

Is it risky? Yes. Are there guarantees? No. But let me tell you one thing: If we don't take the chance, if we don't invest, clearly we will miss many opportunities to produce the better mousetrap, to make the better product that we will sell to the world, and that is the future in high technology for us and for our children.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend a "no" vote on this amendment which will kill the space station.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to spend time debating the merits of the space station, the merits of the science associated with it. I recognize that research and development are important investments for this country.

I also recognize another fact: As a freshman, this is the first time that I am experiencing 2 weeks of voting on appropriations bills. I also recognize that it is much easier to put together a coalition to spend money than it is to put together a coalition to cut spending.

The end result, as we have seen, is that over the last number of years, we have built up a deficit of over $4 trillion. Each year we are running a deficit close to 20 percent of our total spending.

Mr. Chairman, the legacy and the dream that we leave to our children at the end of this appropriations process is another $250 billion of debt. That is something I cannot live with.

As a freshman Congressman going back to my district, a number of people asked me last week how I voted on the space station. Coming from an area that has a very strong economy, a lot of companies who invest in research and development, they understand the value of research and development. But those companies also understand the bottom line.

Mr. Chairman, I explained my reasoning to them. I said I cannot vote for the space station. I would love to invest in research and technology, but it is time that Congress starts setting its priorities and starts making the tough decisions, the tough calls to cut the space station. I think it is time, I think it is a program that can be cut, and I hope that through the remainder of this week the Congress continues to show the discipline to drive toward a balanced budget.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this has been a very long evening and in view of the fact that we had 3 hours of debate the other day that covered almost every conceivable angle of this topic, I have a number of my colleagues who wished to speak on the matter but who, instead, are going to seek recognition in response to their unanimous-consent requests. I will call on them and then I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment and in strong support of the space station.

Well, here we are again. Fighting to save the space station from the budget ax of our born-again fiscal conservatives. Just looking at the record of last week's vote has told me a lot about this debate.

It seems the majority of those who favored cutting the $2 billion for the station voted to increase food stamps this year by $7 billion.

To me, this illustrates the differences between supporters and opponents of the station. Different answers to the question: Do we spend our resources on programs that contribute to our economy, or do we continue more feel-good social programs?

To me the answer is clear. We must continue the space station which creates jobs, enhances our competitiveness, and continues America's destiny.

Oppose this shortsighted amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to share with you a letter I received from Buzz Aldrin, a man who knows, firsthand, what the possibilities of space and the space station can bring to the future of America. I hope you will take his comments into consideration when the funding for the space station is voted on today.

More than a generation ago Neil, Mike and I participated in electrifying activities that made humans proud to be alive. Apollo was a defining moment in Earth-bound history and initiated our exploration of space. Deployment of a redesigned space station continues the legacy of Apollo. As proposed by the President, the space station builds upon the contributions of thousands of individuals around the globe using previous investments in advancing technology. Although the redesigned space station is considerably scaled back from earlier concepts, it is now more modular in construction, and more adaptable to incorporate future innovations. A more flexible space complex now offers the opportunity to join with an experienced, past adversary as a new and very capable ally in establishing a lasting human presence in space.

Turning down a space station now disavows the achievements of the past, the dedications of the present, and robs a young future American generation of its inspiration and hope. History will critically weigh our current decisions. Let's not sacrifice future greatness for present short-term interests.

BUZZ ALDRIN.

Vote for the future of America, vote "yes" for space station.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment and in support of the space station.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to say enough is enough. We cannot afford this any more.

I have not been here long, but it seems like we in this institution are the appropriations equivalent of the bank that is too big to fail; that is, the project that is too big to kill; too many districts affected; too many jobs spread around the country and too much momentum.

So we cannot make the difficult decision: Bite the bullet, pull the plug, save the money, even though deteriorating scientific merit and deteriorating financial circumstances in this country require that we take this step.

What we have with the space station before us is the pale shadow of its original design. We are embarked here on an ill-advised death-with-honor course, slowly, slowly winding this project down to some indeterminate but insignificant conclusion.

In the meantime, spending a billion dollars-plus every year; we cannot afford it anymore.

I urge you to support the Roemer amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]. We cut this thing in committee $260 million; we cut it, 15 minutes before the vote last Thursday, $250 million; the President took $18 billion out of the out years. This program has been cut.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in strong opposition to the amendment being offered by Mr. ROEMER to kill the space station program. It was just last week that the House voted on this same issue, and my position is no secret. I strongly support the space station *Freedom* program, and believe that it will deliver important benefits to all Americans once it has been placed in orbit.

Space station supporters described many of those benefits last week and in previous debates. I'd like to mention just one: The potential for biomedical research that could help advance our understanding of some of the most troublesome terrestrial medical conditions. The space station is going to allow tremendous advances to be made that will benefit our citizens—the young and the old, female and male, our veterans.

But you don't have to take my word for it. The Space Subcommittee held a hearing last week in which nine distinguished researchers described medical research that will be made possible by the space station. And these researchers represent just a sample of those who believe that research conducted in space will lead to important medical breakthroughs here on Earth.

Let me share what just a few of them had to say last week:

Dr. Michael Debakey, the famed heart surgeon and cardiovascular researcher, testified that:

Better health care for our citizens is not at odds with a space station. As a physician, teacher, and explorer, I must emphasize that our space program and space station are not frivolous, because they may provide keys to solving some of the most vexing problems that affect our people. Health care is improved not only by such immediate proposals as providing more accessible care to our citizens, but also by promoting the research that will lead to far-reaching advances in the field.

His views were echoed by Dr. Charles Lemaistre, president of the M.D. Anderson

Cancer Center and former president of the American Cancer Society:

There is no scientist who is going to predict to you what cures are going to come from space * * * in that environment where we have a unique approach to weightlessness, toward purifying many of the agents that are already effective here on Earth, toward removing the toxicity of many of the cancer chemotherapeutic agents, there is opportunity there. It is that opportunity we all want to see made possible to biomedical research by the creation of space station *Freedom*.

Another researcher, Dr. Jeanne Becker, is a specialist in breast and ovarian tumors. She testified that:

Access to long-term tissue culture in a microgravity environment such as that provided by space station would be of great benefit. In particular, human primary breast carcinoma is extremely difficult to cultivate, and grows very slowly in tissue culture * * * like many of the new and innovative technologies, including gene therapy and immune-based treatments, space-based research must be continued and expanded in order to apply the benefits of this technology to the rapidly advancing area of health sciences.

I could quote expert after expert. I could describe the many ways that the space program already has helped to advance medical technology over the past 30 years. I could tell you how NASA technology has benefited the handicapped and our veterans in many, many ways. But I think the three eminent individuals I just quoted have summed up the importance of the space station quite clearly.

There is no question that we live in tough budgetary times. I believe that the space station is a fiscally prudent investment in our future—we can't afford not to build the space station.

I urge my colleagues to support the space station and defeat the Roemer amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Roemer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening in support of the future of our manned space exploration program. The space station is simply not the pork-barrell program it is being made out to be and deserves your support.

I ask any of you who have ever visited an elementary school in your district to admit that the mention of space exploration and the space station has left each child excited. Every school child in this country knows that the space station means the hope of science and the future of our understanding of our own world and the universe we live in.

Since every school kid knows these facts, here is what you should know about the space station.

The future of our work force depends on the high technology-high skilled jobs that the space station and the aerospace industry provide.

Between 70,000 and 100,000 jobs will be affected by your vote tonight.

The space station experiments could lead to cures for diabetes, cancer and major medical breakthroughs not even yet dreamed of on the confines of our small planet.

The total cost of this years appropriation is only the slightest fraction of our $1.5 trillion budget. For those who think they are making great strides to cut spending, I ask them to take a look at the overall budget to realize that the space station is no cash cow when compared to $1.5 trillion in total spending this year.

Short term economic realities have never served as the long term judgment of the value of great ambition. By voting in favor of the space station tonight you can reaffirm our commitment to science and learning. I ask that you base your decision on state-of-the-art science rather than state-of-the-moment politics.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, am I correct that I have the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is correct.

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

□ 2150

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, the vote tonight is going to be close. It was last week by only a single vote. Last week we heard a lot of the debate focusing on a lot of things like pigs in space, pork in a can, Jurassic Pork. We had a lot of fun, but tonight is the real night. This is the vote that really cuts the mustard, as they would say, the vote that we were elected to cast to make some tough choices here.

In the reconciliation bill that passed the House a couple weeks ago, it is my recollection that there was not a single program that was cut or eliminated. That was unfortunate, because the message that we should have gotten from our constituents, whether we were home this weekend or two weekends ago or all month, "When are you folks in Congress going to start doing something to cut the deficit, and that means some programs?"

Now, this would be a nice program to have. It benefits a lot of communities. It provides thousands of jobs; but, Mr. Chairman, I can remember the same arguments were raised in the other body when they were talking about the stimulus package at $90,000 a job, the bill fell apart.

I would urge my colleagues tonight when we look at all the arguments that have been made here tonight through the last couple hours, we hear all these arguments about how much the program has been cut year after year after year in the committee and on the floor, and yet the program still lives.

Mr. Chairman, a couple years from now they will be using those same arguments, "We spent $60 billion, let's spend the next 60. We spent $70 billion, let's spend the next 50."

Mr. Chairman, it is time for this program to end. It is time to focus our priorities on cutting spending first, and that means cutting the deficit tonight and making the tough choice.

I would urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who is also a very good whip.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as many of our colleagues have said, we support exploration in space, and in better fiscal times I would support the space station, but this is a luxury at $40 billion in cost and $78 billion in operating cost in the life of the project, a luxury that we simply cannot afford at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we remember that since 1969 many people in our country have said, "If we can put a man on the Moon, why can't we—" and the litany of "why can't we" follows. "Why can't we cure the common cold?" And the list goes on and on.

Did you ever think that one of the reasons why we could not is because of the opportunity cost involved in the manned space exploration? Again it is a luxury we cannot afford.

I have asked some of our colleagues why they voted for the space station in light of the needs of their districts, and they have said because of the jobs that will be coming to their districts.

I said, "Jobs that you have in your districts?"

"No, jobs that will be coming to our districts."

This is the scaled-back version, and there are more jobs reaching out to many more districts. It is very interesting to see the lobbying efforts on this.

Mr. Chairman, I also listened with interest as our colleagues last week talked about children playing with cardboard boxes, dreaming that they were space ships. I remember those days, too; however, my thoughts today are with children of this Nation for whom cardboard boxes are not toys, they are beds, and in some cases they are housing. For these children who dream not of space ships, but of hot meals, that is why it is really important, because of the 500,000 homeless children in America who need assistance.

We must cut the deficit. By supporting this amendment we will reduce the deficit, reduce the debt service.

Mr. Chairman, the children of America cannot wait. The heavens can wait.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time.

This morning first thing as I entered the office, there was a phone call from Tom McLaughlin. Tom is a friend of mine from Mankato, MN, and a leader in the veterans community in our State. He called because they had a veterans convention over the weekend. One of the main topics of discussion was what to do about VA health care funding in light of the fact that we are trying to accommodate a multi-billion-dollar space station in the same appropriations bill.

Clearly, veterans in my home State, and I am certain veterans across the country, understand that you cannot have room for both the space station and quality VA health care. The two do not fit and it becomes an even more difficult fit as the years go by and the costs for this space station climb.

I have heard discussion here today as well about concerns that other NASA projects might be scaled back or squeezed out as the space station gobbles up more and more of the available funds. Certainly within this bill we have housing and other urban development programs that will continue to feel the pinch as long as we continue to say yes to the space station.

The space station is big ticket science. Few would argue that it is the best science for the money. Few would argue that it is more important than some of the programs of housing and urban development here on earth that are so needed. Few would argue that it is more important than taking care of America's veterans in our VA health care facilities.

The choice comes down to a matter of priorities. For now and with the budget problems that we are experiencing now, the space station just does not fit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND], another distinguished freshman who has voted with us and worked hard on this.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, an old preacher once said that some people are so heavenly minded, they are of no earthly use. This reminds me of many of those who advocate for the space station.

They are often deaf to the earthly needs which surround all of us. They make emotional appeals emphasizing pride and vision. We need the space station, they say, so Americans can be proud of themselves. To not fund the space station, they say, indicates a lack of vision.

Mr. Chairman, I do not need a space station to be proud of America. The day we make health care available to every one of our citizens is the day I will feel proud of this country. The day that we truly begin caring for our kids, protecting working families and paying off our scandalous national debt—that is the day we will know that America has achieved a vision of what she can be.

Mr. Chairman, we do not need to be lectured about pride and vision, we need Members of this body courageous enough to make difficult choices between competing alternatives.

The question is: Can we now afford the space station? The answer is no.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I can understand the arguments made by those who have said we need to save money, but it is interesting that 8 out of the last 10 speakers who opposed the space station here on the floor, and who say we need to cut back and save money, are also cosponsors on a bill that is coming before this House very soon. H.R. 2010, President Clinton's proposal for the newest entitlement, costing $7.4 billion over the next 4 years, is known as the National Volunteer Service Act, a program that will provide taxpayer funds to the likes of people by the name of Rockefeller and Trump in the event that they volunteer their services for Federal pay.

H.R. 2010 is cosponsored by most of the people who have spoken in opposition to the space station, and if they have their way, we are going to be eating our seed corn in science in return for another entitlement.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON], a very brave and distinguished Member.

□ 2200

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I think conventional wisdom probably would define a Texan as someone who would be in favor of this. But that is not my definition.

When I came to Congress in 1990, I voted for the space station, and I voted for the superconducting super collider. Then that September, as a freshman Member of Congress, I had an opportunity to look at the deep problem this country was really having when we had the budget debate. I ended up voting against the budget agreement, but I had a much better understanding of the depth of the problem that we face as a Nation. So, I have been voting against the superconducting super collider and the space station ever since because, I say to my colleagues, "You can't talk out of both sides of your mouth down in Texas. You can't have it both ways."

Mr. Chairman, 80 percent of the people who were writing me say, "Cut spending first," so the question is: Would I be for the superconducting super collider and the space station if they were in Indiana, or if they were in some other State, or must I be for them just because they are in the State of Texas? If it is not a good program, it does not matter what part of the country it is in.

It is a wonderful program that we cannot afford. We cannot afford the space station now. We can put it on the shelf, we can wait 4 or 5 years. No one else is going to build it while we wait, while we get our fiscal house in order. Then we will take it off the shelf, dust it off 4 or 5 years from now, and we will go back to where we started, and we can build a space station when we can afford to look ourselves in the mirror in the morning, when our people have health care and we attend to the needs of our country.

The people who write to me saying, "Cut spending first," must understand that, as a Texan, I define a Texan as soneone who is proud enough and brave enough to step up to the line and say, "On behalf of Texas there is at least one Texan who is willing to cut spending first and is willing to start in Texas."

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Mr. KANJORSKI. Quickly, Mr. Chairman, I want to join my friend here, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]. Many people say we are first in space in the United States, and, therefore, we should stay with this effort. May I remind my brethren on the floor that the Soviet Union was first in space, and they are no more?

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining 2 minutes of time on my side.

Mr. Chairman, oftentimes, when we talk about this space station, Members of this body have eloquently quoted President Kennedy. Since the vote last week came down to one single vote, I would like to quote something that he said. He said, "The margin is narrow, but the responsibility is clear."

Mr. Chairman, today I would urge Members of this body that, as I have worked on this amendment for the last 2 years, since being elected a new Member back in 1990, Members have come up to me and said, "TIM, I will vote with you next year," or "TIM, I cannot stomach this again; I will be with you later," or "TIM, this is tough to justify for a $10,000 grant at my university, but I cannot vote with you yet."

I would urge my colleagues to think back to the excitement last Wednesday when we came within one vote of winning this fight. We sent tremors to NASA and a lighting bolt to change this country, and, if my colleagues are upset about the status quo vote for this amendment, if they are upset that we are spending millions of dollars every day on interest on the deficit, vote for this amendment. If my colleagues are upset about Pell grants going down, vote for this amendment.

I urge this body to take the responsible step and vote for this deficit reduction amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and then I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] commented a little while ago that it is more difficult to put together a coalition to oppose spending than it is to put together one that favors spending. We have a coalition, too. It is not a coalition that includes the President, or the Vice President, or the leadership of this House on either side of the aisle. But it is a coalition of people who believe that we have got to start spending our money more wisely and more prudently, and it is an unusual coalition. I do not know of any other coalition that includes both the National Taxpayers Union and the National Coalition for the Homeless, that includes Citizens Against Government Waste, which will be using this vote for its ratings, as well as the Low Income Housing Coalition. It includes Citizens for a Sound Economy as well as the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Our coalition to kill this project also includes the Planetary Society and the American Physical Society.

Mr. Chairman, what all these people have in common is the recognition of a simple fact, that this space station, despite the advocacy of so many powerful people in politics, so many powerful people in the aerospace industry, is not worth the money.

Dan Golden has done a heroic job of trying to meet the President's requirement to redesign the space station for less than $9 billion. He could not do it. The $10.5 billion that is the 5-year projection for this program is a phony number. I tell my fellow Republicans that it is as phony as any other number in the Clinton budget. It will not hold up. We cannot build the space station for that kind of money, and, even if we could, it would not be worth it because we are not buying the kind of program that we had hoped for when this program began.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to stop the debate. We have been debating it over and over, year by year, and the opposition has been growing as the truth is becoming more apparent. It is time to resolve this issue by voting for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment and killing the space station.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Roemer Amendment to cancel the space station program. Again and again we revisit this program—and opponents assert that canceling space station is the panacea of our deficit woes.

Well I see it very differently. There is only one reason that you could even consider voting against space station, that is if you are convinced that the United States has no future role to play in manned space.

The space station program is adapting to the fiscal pressures that afflict us. President Clinton mandated a 90-day redesign of space station so that the cost of this program could be reduced as significantly as possible, while still offering unprecedented capability in space based laboratories.

The space station before you today has been redesigned and its new cost estimates have been scrutinized by an independent blue ribbon advisory panel. This space station program will cost the taxpayers $4 billion less in development costs over the next 5 years—that is a 25-percent reduction cost.

Mr. ROEMER will quote GAO reports of a space station that will cost $120 billion to operate over the life of the program, but this is old and inaccurate data. The operational cost of space station for 10 years is $47 billion—which includes $11 billion which has already been spent on station and related programs to date.

President Clinton, with his support of a space station program, continues the longstanding bipartisan support that has surrounded the space station program for the past eight years.

Further, it is important to remember that the United States has not undertaken this endeavor alone.

The United States has entered into high-level intergovernmental agreements of treaty status with 11 countries of the European Space Agency, as well as with Japan, Canada, and Italy to develop space station. These partners are committed to spending $8 billion of their own money to continue man's presence in space.

In addition, the administration is currently negotiating with the Russians to determine areas for further international cooperation on space station. The program is truly a global one.

And finally, if you are worried about space station competing too severely with other domestic programs for scarce dollars, as a member of this subcommittee I can assure you that NASA is the agency that must sacrifice to continue funding the space station program. And the agency does so without complaint because the space station is the future of the manned space program.

Take a look at the bill and see how fairly the other agencies were treated. You will see that NASA is not eating everyone else's lunch.

The space station is a critical NASA program and one of the true tests of American leadership in a post-cold-war era. I urge you to defeat the Roemer amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, for the purpose of closing debate, to the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for up to 9½ minutes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], for giving me this great honor. I am not sure that I am really up to it, and I would wish that it would fall to some of my more eloquent colleagues. But I wish to make a few points which I think are important to us, and these charts will help to illustrate those points in just a moment.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken it as my responsibility as chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, working with the members of that committee largely on a bipartisan basis, to help make recommendations to the House with regard to our investments in research and development. Is my criteria for trying to advise the House on these investments in R&D, which I think we all agree are important, to get the maximum amount out of the Federal budget that we can without regard to the conditions that face the country?

No, that is not the criteria. The real criteria is: What is the amount necessary in order to maintain the economic viability of this country and to ensure that we will be able to retain a position of economic leadership in the world? Within that magic number, which happens to be about 2 percent of GNP for civilian research and development, we then have to decide what is the most effective way to spend it: big science? Little science? Health science? Planetary science? Support for university science? Or support for research done in Government-owned laboratories? And we attempt to make these kinds of recommendations.

□ 2210

I will say to you that this country has been in an economic slump for close to 10 years. A part of the reason for that is our investments in research and development have consistently declined over those years.

Today, we do invest about 2 percent of GNP in civilian R&D, plus another 1 percent approximately in military R&D, and that includes both Government and private. The Japanese invest approximately 3 percent in civilian R&D. It has been increasing for 25 years. They passed us about 10 years ago. And the reason that their economy has flourished is because, to a large extent, not entirely, they have continued to increase those investments in civilian R&D.

Germany has done the same thing, as have most of the European countries. Little countries like Taiwan today are investing almost as much in R&D as we are in the United States, measured as a percent of GNP.

In the last week we have been considering two of our largest investments in civilian research and development. If we decide in our wisdom that we cannot afford those, we will have reduced our civilian R&D spending by approximately 10 percent, about $3 billion per

year. Instead of 2 percent, we will have 1.8 percent. The following year we will probably go down another 10 percent. We will be at 1.6 percent. Not only will Taiwan have passed us by, but probably Hong Kong, South Korea, and most of the other countries. We will wonder why our economy fails to keep up with the economies of these other countries in the world.

Now, I also am going to make a point that I hope no one will take offense at. The opposition to the space station made two major points. They were made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] to begin with.

Mr. Chairman, let me compliment the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] for the aggressive efforts that they have been making. They are totally misguided, and their arguments are wrong, but they have proceeded to make the best case that they thought they could.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has said repeatedly that this is a clean cut amendment and that it goes to reduce the deficit. That has been repeated by several others opposing the space station.

That is totally wrong. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] pointed out that it was totally wrong in his remarks, and other members of the Committee on Appropriations will point out the same thing.

If you win this fight, you take $2.1 billion out of the NASA budget, and it will not go to reducing the deficit. It will go to increasing the funding for HUD, for VA, for EPA, you name it, but it will not reduce the deficit.

You reduce the deficit when you pass the budget, when you pass the reconciliation bill, and maybe when you pass the 602(b) allocations within the committee. You do not reduce it by cutting our money here unless it is on the final conference report on the appropriations bill when it is too late to recycle that money back into some other accounts.

Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has also made the point that the space station is taking dollars from other national programs. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has said, and it has been repeated by numerous other opponents, that NASA has taken money and the space station has taken money from other accounts.

There is nothing farther from the truth. If NASA and the space station did not exist, the Committee on Appropriations would have to invent it in order to have more money to put into housing, VA, EPA, and other programs. Here are the figures in this chart, and I will just read them off to you very briefly.

This is the Veterans' Administration. It has the largest amount of increase over last year of any other agency. This is HUD. It has the next largest amount.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 10) 32

This is NASA, which has not even a cost-of-living increase over last year. Of course, the red indicates above or below the President's request. NASA has taken a $700 million cut below the President's request. That money has been recycled then into these other departments, and that is how they get the money in the Committee on Appropriations to increase these amounts. If they did not have NASA in that subcommittee, there would be no place to get that money, and all of these programs would be less than they are today.

Now, is that something new? Did it just happen recently? The answer to that is "no."

In 1991, the NASA appropriation was $1.257 billion less than the President's request. That is $1.257 billion that was recycled into these other agencies.

In 1992, it was $1.4 billion less. That too was recycled into these other agencies.

In 1993, we had a good year, only $663 million less than the President's request was in the appropriation bill, and that too was recycled.

This year we are back up again to $708 million being recycled into these other agencies.

The claim that NASA and the space station are hurting these other agencies in ridiculous on its face. The worst thing that could happen, and I am going to try to make it happen, is to take NASA out of this particular appropriations subcommittee. And I love the chairman, who has done a great job. It could have been much worse than it actually is.

But the NASA budget needs to be compared with other science programs, not to compete with much larger agencies, such as HUD and VA, with larger political constituencies. You would get better science funding under such circumstances.

This appropriations subcommittee has even had to cut the National Science Foundation below the President's request because of competition with all of these other agencies.

Now, I want us all to recognize the realities of what is going on here. I want this Congress to make prudent investments in research and development that will benefit this country. That is the purpose.

We know that there are things wrong with these programs. The distinguished chairman has pointed out that his support for the space station is contingent upon the management reforms and cost reductions which are absolutely vital. Of course, I can point out that one of the reasons that the costs have gone up is that the Committee on Appropriations for 5 years in a row has redesigned the space station. Each time it takes more time. It has to be reshaped, downgraded, and that takes more money, believe it or not. But Appropriations had to do that in order to be able to take these cuts out of NASA.

So that is what has been happening. Now, I agree and our committee has known for years that NASA was taking on too large a future budget burden in view of the resources that it had. We are prepared to work with the Committee on Appropriations and the administration to accomplish that $18 billion in cuts which the President has said he wants, to cut one-third off the staff of NASA, which we think we can do, and to make this program really work. But to eliminate it is a bad thing for the future of this country, and I urge Members to vote against the Roemer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last week when H.R. 2200, the multiyear NASA authorization bill was taken up on the Floor, the House voted by a narrow margin to continue its longstanding support of the space station program. Why now, on this appropriations bill, should we similarly decide to support the space station?

There were many arguments advanced in favor of and against the space station last week. One of the central concerns that has been expressed over the past several years is that the space station, however meritorious, is simply too expensive and will eat everyone's lunch. That is, it will detract from funding for other important veterans, housing, and science programs.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today demonstrates as dramatically and as clearly as possible that this is simply not the case. At the outset of this year, NASA and the administration undertook an extraordinary effort to constrain the overall level of funding for the space program in general and the space station in particular.

Overall, NASA's budget was reduced by over $2 billion this year as part of the administration's request. The out years have been baselined at inflation. This required a concerted effort to look at each and every program in NASA to extract the maximum scientific output for the dollar.

For the space station, which is central to the manned space program, a special redesign study has been carried out over the past 3 months and reviewed by a high level, blue ribbon panel of experts. The result is a very affordable and efficient program which I believe is responsive to the cost concerns expressed over the past several years.

The level of funding for the space station development contained in this bill is $1.91 billion. This is a reduction of over $200 million below last year's level. Over the next 5 years, over $4 to $6 billion will be saved and $18 billion over the life of the program. By any measure, NASA and the administration have done an extraordinary job of making the station a model of cost effectiveness not only for space projects but for all major Government programs. The redesigned space station program will be carried out within a flat funding profile—no increases whatsoever. This will ensure that the overall NASA budget level will be controllable and that no other important NASA science program will suffer.

Mr. Chairman, these charts show the overall result of this effort and how the NASA funding in this bill compares to that of other agencies. The first chart compares what is in the bill with

the fiscal year 1993 spending level and with the funding level for 1994 requested by the administration. The bill provides a very small increase for NASA—much smaller than any other agency except EPA for which construction projects are being cut back. With respect to the request levels, the bill provides for a major reduction in NASA programs—far greater than any other agency.

The next chart shows the percent change for each agency from fiscal year 1993–94 that is requested and the percent changed actually contained in the bill. Although the administration requested a moderate increase—principally for a new technology initiative not related to station—the actual increase in the bill is far less than inflation. For the other major accounts in VA, HUD, and NSF, the bill provides at least inflationary growth. Even for EPA for which the administration requested a substantial decrease in construction projects, the bill makes only a minor decrease.

Mr. Chairman, the point which I hope my colleagues will recognize is that this bill provides the needed funding for the space station and also substantially meets the funding requirements for other priority programs. The space station is not competing with any other NASA science program nor is it detracting from Veterans or Housing programs. Simply said, the station program proposed by the President and contained in this bill is a reasonable and prudent one and it is eating no one's lunch.

Finally, I will point out that the space station is the centerpiece and next logical step in our manned space program. It is good science and we have major international agreements with other nations which will pave the way for other cooperative efforts.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting against the Roemer amendment to terminate this program. Killing the manned space program will not benefit any other agency and will not reduce the deficit. It will, however, permanently cripple what has been one of our Nation's proudest and most productive programs.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member again rises in support of the amendment to delete funding for NASA's proposed space station. At a time of huge budget deficits, unmet domestic needs, and more appropriate NASA priorities, it is totally unjustifiable to waste over one hundred billion taxpayer dollars for what the New York Times recently described as "pork barrel spending for the aerospace industry."

Mr. Chairman, while the number of missions and science applications for this grandiose project have eroded to a single and highly questionable purpose, the costs of this incredible boondoggle have skyrocketed. Supporters of the space station make elaborate and preposterous claims of the benefits to be derived from this project, but the American public has become increasingly aware that such claims are merely desperate attempts to maintain a continuous source of Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, there is perhaps, no more telling demonstration of the infeasibility and impracticality of the space station program than the desperate attempts of the administration to force *Freedom*'s planners to drastically reduce the costs of this enormous science project. Despite having requested alternative designs which would cost $5, $7, and $9 billion dollars over 5 years, the President was forced to choose from three alternatives—none of which came close to his savings goals. Given the complete unreliability of former estimates, this Member has no reason to believe that the latest estimate will be any more accurate.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of grandiose science projects like the superconducting super collider and the space station criticize opponents for abandoning science. However, in fact, opponents of these grandiose science projects are probably America's science savior. Instead of focusing attention on just a few incredibly expensive projects with little in guaranteed benefits, we prefer to place American science dollars on numerous, innovative projects with higher prospects for far greater returns for the money spent. In this appropriations bill, projects with great potential commercial applications—like the national aerospace plane—have been drastically cut or scrapped entirely because the space station has been given such a high priority.

Mr. Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to support the Zimmer-Roemer amendment to delete funds for the space station, a glamorous cost-ineffective project this Nation and American basic and applied science cannot afford and should not undertake. The space station was a well-intended, exciting project that is now clearly a costly boondoggle which is primarily supported for cost-ineffective parochial, geographic, and industrial reasons.

I urge my colleagues to load and fire the silver bullet by voting for the Zimmer-Roemer amendment to kill this glutinous turkey now.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment to H.R. 2491 to kill the space station program.

Mr. Chairman, certainly we must try to cut spending, get control of our Federal budget, and cut our budget deficit.

We must not, however, sacrifice our children's future and the future of our space program in the name of budgetary expediency.

Mr. Chairman, the space station is central to the manned space program. Year after year the Congress has voted overwhelmingly to support the space station. President Clinton has strongly endorsed this program. Now we have a plan to reduce the cost of the station by over $4 billion over the next 5 years and by $18 billion over the life of the program.

Despite what the authors of this amendment argue, the space station will provide unparalleled opportunities for first-class basic and applied research in life sciences and microgravity materials research.

Examples of potential benefits from research aboard the space station include space physiology experiments to benefit medical research on diseases such as osteoporosis, motion sickness, and diabetes.

The space station also will facilitate the growth of protein crystals to benefit development of new pharmaceuticals, and will give researchers the opportunity to produce crystals for a wide range of commercial applications.

Mr. Chairman, the space station has vast potential to help the United States compete economically with Europe, Japan, and others in the years ahead.

But more than that, the vote today on the space station will determine whether or not the United States will continue to lead the world in the exploration of the frontier of outer space.

If we pass this amendment to kill the space station, we will close the frontier of space to future generations of Americans and, as a result, will only be able to watch as other nations look to overtake us.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment being offered today by my colleagues from Indiana and New Jersey to delete funding for the space station.

Clearly, there has already been plenty said about why we should or shouldn't support this massive program and we have all listened to colleagues on both sides of the aisle give strong and impassioned speeches for and against the space station.

For the Members who have referred to the past glory and successes of America's space programs, I certainly agree that the work of NASA and our scientists has been exciting and glorious and has raised the quality of life here in America. Conversely, for those Members who have expressed concern about the budget deficit, the dramatic cost overruns on the space station to date or who have referred to the jobless teenagers, unemployed parents or homeless children in the district, I have to agree, that now is the time and this is the program where we must draw the line and firmly stand for what is most important to America.

I know where the budget priorities are for many of my constituents and, believe me, outer space is the last place they want Congress to send federal dollars right now. I urge my colleagues to join me and take this chance to stand for what is most important to this country by supporting the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would announce that pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair will order a 5-minute vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] immediately after the vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 220, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—196

Ackerman	Bilbray	Coble
Allard	Blackwell	Collins (GA)
Andrews (ME)	Brewster	Collins (IL)
Baesler	Brown (OH)	Collins (MI)
Ballenger	Bunning	Condit
Barca	Camp	Conyers
Barlow	Cantwell	Costello
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Coyne
Bellenson	Clayton	Danner
Bereuter	Clyburn	de Lugo (VI)

Deal
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Dickey
Dingell
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Evans
Ewing
Fawell
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gekas
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastert
Hefner
Herger
Hoagland
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutchinson
Inglis
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lipinski
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Nadler
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Synar
Tauzin
Thomas (WY)
Underwood (GU)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Washington
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—220

Abercrombie
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman
Combest
Cooper
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
de la Garza
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Everett
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kennelly
Kim
Klug
Kopetski
Kyl
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lloyd
Manton
Martinez
Matsui
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
Meek
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Slattery
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Valentine
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Waters
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—23

Becerra
Berman
Blute
Coppersmith
Diaz-Balart
Faleomavaega (AS)
Ford (TN)
Hamburg
Henry
Hunter
Istook
McMillan
Meehan
Murphy
Payne (NJ)
Richardson
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Sangmeister
Skeen
Smith (IA)
Sundquist
Unsoeld
Weldon

□ 2237

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Istook for, with Mr. Berman against.

Mr. Meehan for, with Mr. Diaz-Balart against.

Mr. Sangmeister for, with Mr. Richardson against.

Mrs. Unsoeld for, with Mr. Skeen against.

Ms. SHEPHERD and Mr. MENENDEZ changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] on which a recorded vote is ordered.

The Clerk will re-report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY: Page 44, line 10, strike "$5,170,000" and insert "$4,200,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 149, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—267

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Derrick
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Martinez
Matsui
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Rush
Sangmeister
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Swett
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thurman
Torkildsen
Upton
Vento
Vucanovich
Walsh
Weldon
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—149

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Bacchus (FL)
Barcia
Beilenson
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Brewster
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Byrne

Cardin	Horn	Price (NC)
Carr	Houghton	Rangel
Chapman	Hoyer	Reed
Clay	Hughes	Reynolds
Clayton	Inslee	Rose
Clyburn	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Coleman	Johnson (SD)	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sanders
Collins (MI)	Kanjorski	Sarpalius
Conyers	Kennedy	Sawyer
Coyne	Kildee	Schenk
Cramer	Klein	Schroeder
Darden	Kopetski	Scott
de Lugo (VI)	LaFalce	Serrano
DeLauro	Lambert	Skaggs
Dellums	Laughlin	Smith (IA)
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	Stokes
Dixon	Lewis (GA)	Strickland
Edwards (CA)	Lloyd	Studds
Edwards (TX)	Mann	Stupak
Engel	Markey	Synar
English (AZ)	Mazzoli	Tejeda
Eshoo	McDermott	Thompson
Evans	McNulty	Thornton
Farr	Meek	Torres
Fazio	Mfume	Towns
Fields (LA)	Miller (CA)	Traficant
Filner	Mineta	Tucker
Fingerhut	Mink	Underwood (GU)
Flake	Moakley	Valentine
Foglietta	Mollohan	Velazquez
Ford (MI)	Moran	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Volkmer
Furse	Nadler	Walker
Gejdenson	Natcher	Washington
Gephardt	Norton (DC)	Waters
Gibbons	Oberstar	Watt
Gonzalez	Obey	Waxman
Green	Olver	Wheat
Hall (TX)	Owens	Whitten
Harman	Pastor	Wise
Hastings	Payne (VA)	Woolsey
Hefner	Pelosi	Wynn
Hilliard	Pickett	Yates
Hochbrueckner	Pickle	

NOT VOTING—23

Becerra	Henry	Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Berman	Istook	Skeen
Blute	McMillan	Stark
Coppersmith	Meehan	Sundquist
Diaz-Balart	Murphy	Torricelli
Faleomavaega (AS)	Payne (NJ)	Unsoeld
Ford (TN)	Portman	
Hamburg	Richardson	
	Ridge	

□ 2245

Messrs. GEJDENSON, JOHNSON of South Dakota, BOEHLERT, MOAKLEY, and INSLEE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. CANTWELL changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BYRNE

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. BYRNE: Page 50, line 20, strike "That" and all that follows through "*further*," on line 25.

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced this amendment to guarantee that the management structure of the newly redesigned Space Station Program is the best it can be. This amendment will allow the program's only independent oversight body to remain in place. We all remember the human and technological tragedy of the *Challenger* disaster. The Space Station *Freedom* Program Office was established after a distinguished panel of scientific experts, charged with examining the factors behind the *Challenger* incident, recommended that an independent geographically separate facility be established to ensure that the program had an honest broker among all NASA centers and contractors.

I wish to remind my colleagues that last December it was this office, established as a watchdog, that identified the overruns and forced the program's other centers to acknowledge cost problems within their own facilities. This office led the effort to resolve a critical situation and in the process strengthen the case for preserving Space Station *Freedom*.

I presume our purpose is to restructure this program for maximum cost-efficiency. If we eliminate the program office in the process, we defeat that purpose. We would be getting rid of the only facility in the program that has a track record of identifying overruns and cutting costs.

I contacted the White House and spoke with Dr. Jack Gibbons, the President's Director of Science and Technology Policy. He stated that he was currently preparing instruction for NASA to change management structure but his instructions did not specify any particular management changes. The administration has been very clear: a move to eliminate the program office is getting ahead of the process.

We are asking NASA to do more with less money. The least we can do is give them the tools to make the program run well. Without this office to do the oversight and integration work with the other centers, we are putting the entire program at even greater risk of further overruns and, perhaps, even a repetition of the *Challenger* disaster.

NASA claims closing this facility will save $230 million. I believe this is another "case of cooking the books." They admit that hiring another contractor—undoubtedly more forgiving of NASA management—will cost $50 billion plus the $100 million we estimate for closing this office and relocating workers. It would also mean a schedule delay of between 6 and 18 months. That would cost another $1 to $3 billion. Only at NASA could they claim to save $230 million by spending a minimum of $1,150,000,000. That is not cost savings. It is taxpayer gouging.

Congressman WOLF and I urge you to support this amendment. This is a vote for fiscal responsibility and program excellence. Elimination of the program office would absolutely assure further cost overruns and could very well result in another heartbreaking failure in America's space program.

□ 2250

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

Ms. BYRNE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The amendment makes sense. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, as for the micromanagement of NASA, Congress should not be directing program office functions. No decisions have been finalized by NASA or the Administration regarding "specific management, personnel, or facilities changes," and Congress should wait until there is more information. Also, NASA could realign these functions without Congress dictating it by withholding funding.

First, will delay space station program.

Second, could cost taxpayers between $1 and $3 billion in cost overruns due to delays.

The dislocation of program and project personnel will have a serious effect on the Space Station Program costs and schedule. Physical move costs are estimated to be $100 million according to Robert W. Moorehead, deputy director of space station *Freedom* Program and Operations' Office of Space System Development. Mr. Moorehead also estimates that the program could slip between 6 and 18 months depending on the retention of program and project personnel and that this slip could cost the American taxpayer between $1 and $3 billion.

Third, safety—Reston office was a reform after the *Challenger* accident—Strong, independent space station *Freedom* Program office is essential in maintaining objective program analysis. The program office would be subject to considerable pressure from the host center to implement decisions in the Center's best interest if located in the same area.

Fourth, this amendment is cost neutral—it does not reduce or increase NASA funding. It merely allows NASA to make the best decision regarding the future of the program office and its employees. The Stokes language is premature.

Fifth, what will the effect on the 2,000 employees be? The Stokes language kills their jobs, but does not answer concerns regarding rehiring, transfers, other job opportunities within NASA or the Federal Government et cetera. If these dedicated employees must lose their jobs, NASA should be afforded the opportunity to prepare reasonable plans to provide for transfers, rehiring et cetera.

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

Ms. BYRNE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment. The amendment is agreeable to the subcommittee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BYRNE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia [Ms. BYRNE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY: Page 50, line 14, strike "$7,475,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,457,400,000".

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before you would cut the amount of spending in NASA's small research and development account which is being spent on the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network in Saginaw, MI, called CIESIN. It is an amount of $18 million.

I would have liked to have done it a different way. I would like to have just killed that program, but they tell me I cannot do that that way, because that would be legislating on an appropriations bill, so we are cutting the amount of that, and we will let NASA make up their mind whether it comes out of that. But we are sure, given the choice, that it would.

Last year at this time we had a long and interesting discussion about this project, and like a lot of others, it simply appeared in the NASA budget about 4 years ago. NASA did not ask for it. NASA did not want it. NASA did not know what it was to do.

At that time, in fact, I quote the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], as saying that CIESIN had spent $41 million over 3 years, and that NASA itself had no idea where the money was going.

Well, another year has gone by, and we have spent over $16 million on CIESIN at this point. Admittedly, CIESIN has been included in this year's NASA authorization. But even the committee noted that CIESIN needed to work on refocusing its mission from a local economic development and university standpoint to support an international data collection.

Let me read from the authorizing committee:

The committee is concerned that CIESIN may not have used its previous funding effectively and remains unfocused with too many projects. The committee also is concerned that the fiscal 1993 construction facility funding, $42 million, provided for CIESIN may exceed program requirements and what other comparable facilities cost. However, the committee believes that if CIESIN is to evolve from an activity primarily funded for regional economic and university support reasons to an organization carrying out a national program in human dimensions of climatic change, then certain management reforms must be implemented.

In other words, the committee is not very sold on CIESIN.

In fact, the only one that seemed to be really sold on CIESIN was the gentleman who represented the university where that was, who is no longer a Member of this body, but he was well placed when he was in this body, and he was able to put this in even though NASA never requested it.

So to do this, NASA asked this year for $10 million for it, and the Office of Management and Budget deleted it. But at the NASA authorization hearing, the $10 million was put back in, and then the committee broke for lunch.

By the time it returned, the White House had decided $18 million was needed to properly fund CIESIN.

It is hard to believe that CIESIN's needs could have grown by $8 million over the course of an hour and a half.

We have spent almost $100 million in total on CIESIN over the past 4 years in this account alone. As we saw earlier tonight, an extra $2 million was tucked away in the Office of Science and Technology down at the Office of the President, an account which inflated both line items.

I say that it is time we ended this. This really is a silly expenditure. If we are trying to save money, this is a good place to start.

$18 million is not all the money in the world, but it seems like a lot of money to most of us. This is a time that I think we can really make a difference here.

So I ask you for your support for this amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Mr. Chairman, there has been for a number of years admittedly some disagreement about the funding level for CIESIN. But there is absolutely no disagreement about its need.

CIESIN is providing an effort and service that is found no where else throughout the science community. It is a critical factor in the storage, interpretation, and dissemination of the Earth observing system's information.

It is one thing to complete the EOS hardware. But it is quite another thing to intelligently gather the information, make it available to readable and usable form, and disseminate it to researchers across the United States and around the world.

To my knowledge, CIESIN was the only Federally funded agency that was at last year's Rio environmental summit. It represented the United States adequately in something we all should take pride in—and I believe CIESIN has an important and essential role to play in the multibillion-dollar EOS Program.

In fact, the Legislative Committee originally included $10 million for this program in its recommendation. An additional $8 million was added to that authorization by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BARCIA.

I would urge that we support the CIESIN effort—because it is vital to the success of the Earth observing system.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope with all the talk we have had about science pork that at some point we will take a look at this project, because this project really is one where we have to question the accounting practices.

We have got $18 million that is being invested in this particular R&D account. It is not going to do something about hard sciences with the Earth Observation System. This is NASA doing social science data and support research and human dimensions of global change.

What does that mean? It means that an agency which is a hard-science agency has been put into something that they really do not have any expertise about at all.

So what has happened here is that CIESIN has only been able to cost, of its 1992 funding in 1993, they have only been able to cost out $14.8 million of the $24.3 million of grant money that was given them.

What does that mean? Well, it means that it is a very unusual practice. When my staff asked NASA about this, whether this is a usual practice of what happens there, they were told, "Absolutely not."

□ 2300

In fact, the inspector general has recently initiated an audit of these accounts because they are in such poor shape.

If you want to know what is really going on in CIESIN, what you have to do is look at their board. They have a board made up of 13 people. One of those people is the president of CIESIN. They get money directly from NASA.

Then you have the remaining 12 people. Those 12, 10 of the 12 people on this board get CIESIN grants. Now, what does that mean? That means 11 of the 13 people on the board are grant recipients from the agency.

Now, there is something drastically wrong with this. This is very small board. What they say is, "We recuse ourselves when our institution is involved in this." Well, it is a very small board, so you know what is happening here: People on the board are taking care of each other. Otherwise you would not have all the grants going to just people on the board.

Then, if you take a look at where the money is going as well, you will find that $4 million of the money that we are going to put into this program is going for something called the Services Development Account. More than half of that is spent not in the agency back in Michigan, where they are supposedly doing all this good science work; it is spent for their Washington office.

In the Washington office they are spending $686,000 of the money to pay consultants.

Now, if you want to look at something that just is money gone bad and

is not providing any hard science data for the country—in fact it is providing no science data at all—this program makes no sense. You have got to look at this program as just being a complete outrage. If in fact it was doing real work, it might be worth supporting, but this is not a program which is doing real work.

In fact, the Science Committee's report on CIESIN says, "If CIESIN is to evolve from an activity funded primarily for regional economic development university support regents to an organization carrying out a program in human dimensions of climate change, then certain management reforms must be implemented."

I point out these issues because this program represents a classic example of how Congress operates. Federal money has been funneled here into a particular congressional district; there was no mission. In trying to create a mission, in trying to create a mission, they have done all the wrong things. This is $18 million that we ought not spend.

I would ask you to support the gentleman from Colorado's [Mr. HEFLEY] amendment. It is exactly the right thing to do.

Mr. BARCIA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. HEFLEY.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct some of the misinformation that the two previous speakers have shared with the House.

First of all, I begin by saying that I extended an offer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] with a hand-delivered message or hand-delivered letter, to indicate to him that if he had any questions regarding the operations of CIESIN, that a briefing would be scheduled, that all of his questions could be answered.

On June 15 I sent a letter, hand-delivered, to Congressman WALKER's office in which I said, "BOB, in the interest of providing you and your Republican colleagues more information about CIESIN's current activities and achievements, I have directed the consortium to be ready to brief you at your convenience. Additionally, I invite you to view a demonstration of CIESIN's data network at the Washington office. I would be more than pleased to set this up and have representatives of the consortium be prepared to answer any questions that you have."

In addition, I included a special report on the 1992 and 1993 activities, the last two audits performed on their books. Congressman WALKER chose not to indicate any interest in getting the answers to his questions; he prefers a confrontation on the floor as opposed to getting the information that he seeks. But I would like to address the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado's amendment is ill advised. Even though the consortium is only 3 years old it has already received many accolades. Just to mention a few, in a letter from NASA, Mr. Shelby Tilford states that "CIESIN is developing plans to support the legislatively mandated Global Change Research Information Office [GCRIO] and the program office for the International Geosphere and Biosphere Program START initiative. We believe CIESIN has an important contribution to make, both to NASA's program and to the broader United States Global Change Research Program effort." Mr. William P. Butz, the Associate Director for Demographic Programs in the U.S. Department of Commerce states, "I've heard glowing reports on Extract and Explore from colleagues . . .", these are two software products created by the consortium, "then I saw the system myself * * * I want to compliment CIESIN for your important role in these developments."

From the former Science Advisor, Dr. Allan Bromley, "We appreciated the efforts that CIESIN has made in support of our Global Change Research Program and the United States' participation at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development at Rio. Such endeavors are very helpful as the U.S. strives to encourage the full and open distribution of data and information in support of global change research in the international arena."

And lastly, in a letter from the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, speaking about CIESIN networking efforts, "a highway system is useless without maps and direction signs, and CIESIN is performing an extremely valuable function in providing us with maps and directions to the data and information that we need."

The Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network has since its inception been working to create a computer network to facilitate access to, use of, and understanding of global change information worldwide. Just recently, the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences released a study entitled Global Environmental Change: Understanding the Human Dimensions. The study makes recommendations, one of which states: The Federal Government should establish an ongoing program to ensure that appropriate data sets for research on the human dimensions of global change are routinely acquired, properly prepared for use, and made available to researchers on simple and affordable terms.

This recommendation is exactly what CIESIN is now undertaking.

The requirements for this consortium have been repeated over and over again by many distinguished scientists and organizations. By zeroing out the consortium's funding the gentleman believes he will be striking at inefficiency, but he would be doing exactly the opposite. Though the gentleman from Pennsylvania is supportive of putting more vehicles into space, as am I, by striking funding for CIESIN he will disable our government's ability to analyze and disseminate the data compiled from these missions. And that I say is waste.

For all Members of this House who are concerned about fiscal responsibility, know that this consortium has already taken a reduction. In this bill, CIESIN will receive an appropriation 10 percent lower than the funds appropriated to it through NASA last fiscal year. I ask for your support and your vote against the amendment by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

I yield back the remainder of my time.

CIESIN,
University Center, MI, June 27, 1993.

Hon. JAMES A. BARCIA,
Longworth House Office Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARCIA: Thank you for requesting my comments on two articles that appeared in The Saginaw News this Sunday. While conveying useful information, some of the statements in the articles require correction and clarification.

CIESIN's financial record are annually reviewed by the accounting firm, Ernst & Young. This audit ensures that CIESIN is in full compliance with all federal requirements (as required by OMB Circular 133, "Audits of Institutions of Higher Education and Other Nonprofit Organizations"), including specific funding restrictions of those federal agencies from which we receive funding. The audit for 1992 was just completed in May (and submitted to NASA) and we are proud to note that the auditors gave CIESIN their highest rating. As in previous years, the auditors stated that CIESIN is in full compliance with Federal directives and is in excellent standing with its financial records.

CIESIN submits a proposal to NASA every year that details how the organization will spend program dollars to carry out its goals and responsibilities as defined by Congress and NASA. That proposal undergoes careful scrutiny by NASA and once approved, all required reporting documentation associated with the approved proposal is submitted to NASA for review and approval. In 1992, all contracts let by CIESIN, over $10,000, and all international travel were pre-approved by NASA.

I agree with the statement attributed to you that most of the criticism of CIESIN has not been directed at the program but appears to arise from a lack of information about the CIESIN initiative. In this regard, I hope to have the opportunity, in the future, to assist you in demonstrating the information technology and explaining the importance of the CIESIN effort.

I believe that the article conveys a misimpression of CIESIN's accountability for government funds in the quotes attributed to Congressman Walker. CIESIN would be most willing to have the Congress inspect CIESIN's books and, if desired, review the annual written audit reports by CIESIN's

independent auditors including NASA's reviews of the audit reports. With respect to the IRS information which the reporter used to write the article, CIESIN promptly provided the IRS 990 forms to the reporter on the day he requested them. CIESIN has an "open-book policy" for Congress or any federal agency that participates in the initiative.

The article makes note of CIESIN's spending for expert advice and Washington, D.C. operations. In 1992, all CIESIN's consultant contracts for $10,000 and above were approved by the sponsoring federal agency. These are reasonable expenses and fully justifiable in pursuit of CIESIN's congressional mission.

Building a worldwide electronic information network to serve the global environmental change community, including policy makers, educators, resource managers and researchers, requires extensive expertise in a number of areas, particularly since technology is so rapidly changing international communications and the whole nature of resource sharing. This endeavor has never been taken on before and is so critically important to furthering our understanding of global change. It would be extremely shortsighted if CIESIN did not draw upon the best expertise available. It has been to the advantage of CIESIN, the federal government, and the federal taxpayer for CIESIN to tap and build upon the expertise that exists within the members of the Consortium, as well as the broader global change and information technology community, to help deliver its mission.

The Washington, D.C. operation houses six staff, one coordinator for each Federal agency with which the organization has an active working relationship. The majority of this staff is funded by agencies other than NASA as outlined through agreements with those agencies. These individuals have a high level of expertise consistent with that needed to serve as a project coordinator with each of these agencies and to enable CIESIN to advance the initiative as directed by Congress. In some cases, agencies have specifically required in their contracts that such a project coordinator be located in Washington, D.C. The director of CIESIN's Washington office is a high-level executive position in the CIESIN organization. The position salary is commensurate with the responsibilities of that office and the geographic location.

CIESIN has worked very closely with NASA over the past two months to make sure that the 1993 proposal, referred to in the article, was clearly focused. This has meant redirecting activities, but it is my understanding that we have successfully accomplished that process and that NASA technical staff has fully accepted the proposal.

With respect to the second article in The Saginaw News that attempts to second guess CIESIN's spending over the last three years, the reporter tried to force together pieces of a puzzle that do not make a fair and accurate picture. The IRS forms are based upon a calendar year which does not take into consideration several factors such as federal fiscal year appropriations and procedures, project start and completion dates, organizational billing cycles, and when employees actually begin employment within any one certain year, to name a few. Without factoring in those considerations, the resulting story can be misleading and inaccurate. My staff worked with the reporter in an attempt to clarify these points, but we were apparently unsuccessful in explaining these distinctions.

I assure you that CIESIN is very proud of its accomplishments and how we conducted business over the past several years. We continue to draw praise from those who have carefully examined our efforts. Just last week we held our first Science Advisory Committee meeting in Saginaw. Its members include some of the foremost scientists in the global change community. The Committee was extremely complimentary and reassuring that "CIESIN has made enormous progress in a very short time" and that we are headed in the right direction. I have attached a list of the distinguished scientists who attended the meeting.

Thank you for this opportunity to set the record straight and for your interest in CIESIN.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERTA BALSTAD MILLER, Ph.D.,
President and CEO.

CONSORTIUM FOR INTERNATIONAL EARTH SCIENCE INFORMATION NETWORK, FIRST MEETING OF SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, PARTICIPANTS

SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

B.L. Turner II, *Chair*, George Perkins Marsh Institute, Clark University.

Francis Bretherton, Space Science & Engineering Center.

Robin Cantor, National Science Foundation, Decision, Risk and Management Science Program.

William Riebsame, Department of Geography, University of Colorado.

Gary Yohe, Department of Economics, Wesleyan University.

SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT ABLE TO ATTEND

Sheila Jasanoff, Department of Science and Technology Studies, Cornell University.

Vernon Ruttan, *ex officio member*, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Minnesota.

Steven Sanderson, University of Florida, Tropical Conservation and Development Program.

Ellen Silbergeld, Professor of Toxicology and Epidemiology, Department of Epidemiology, School of Medicine, University of Maryland at Baltimore.

CIESIN REPRESENTATIVES

Bob Chen, Director of Interdisciplinary Research, CIESIN.

Barbara Eddy, Science Program Manager, CIESIN.

Jack Eddy, Vice President for Research and Chief Scientist, CIESIN.

Roberta Balstad Miller, President, CIESIN.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words and in strong opposition to the amendment cutting funds for CIESIN.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. If ever there was a case of being penny-wise and pound-foolish, this amendment is clearly it.

We have loaded the sky with satellites. We have collected data from one end of the Earth to another. The problem we have is making this data available so it can be used by universities, businesses and others who will put it to practical use, information that we have spent literally billions of dollars on.

CIESIN will allow us to make the most cost-effective use of the environmental data that we work so hard, and invest so much, to gather.

The winners and losers of the future will be determined by those who have access to information.

How many times have we come to the floor and defended scientific programs on the basis that the research will have practical spinoffs, practical applications?

This program that we talking about now gets that information out so that we can use it, so it can have some practical effect on our daily lives. The program has already been cut 10 percent, 10 percent below last year's funding level. It has taken its fair share of cuts in these difficult budget fiscal times.

We are talking about information that will help improve the quality of life for people who work in research to improve the quality of our lakes, our rivers, our streams, our oceans; we are talking about tracking the release of toxins which endanger the health of so many of our communities.

This amendment, in fact, if it is adopted, will spend money. Yet this program will save money.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. We have already taken a 10 percent cut in this program in the bill over last year.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words and in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. KLUG. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, just very quickly, I do not want to prolong this any more. I understand the gentleman from Michigan being in favor of this program; that is the way we do things around here. It seems they are practically the only people in favor of this.

Remember, NASA did not want it, did not know what it was doing after we spent $40 million on it. The authorizing committee was quite critical of it.

They say around here that once a program is started you cannot get rid of it no matter how worthless or how bad it is. Let us prove them wrong. Let us get rid of this program that will cost $18 million. We have spent over $100 million on it already.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 240, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—176

Allard	Bachus (AL)	Ballenger
Archer	Baker (CA)	Barrett (NE)
Armey	Baker (LA)	Bartlett

Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lancaster
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Long
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shuster
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Synar
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—240

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Camp
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Knollenberg
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—23

Becerra
Berman
Blute
Coppersmith
Diaz-Balart
Faleomavaega (AS)
Ford (TN)
Hamburg
Henry
Istook
McMillan
Meehan
Murphy
Payne (NJ)
Richardson
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Skeen
Stark
Sundquist
Unsoeld
Waxman
Wheat
Wilson

□ 2327

Mr. BATEMAN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft; $4,882,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 51, line 12, strike "$4,882,900,000" and insert "$4,778,400,000".

Page 51, line 21, strike "$545,300,000" and insert "$512,700,000".

Mr. KLUG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc, considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues will bear with me a minute, we will all have an opportunity to get home much quicker.

Mr. Chairman, I offer these en bloc amendments on behalf of myself, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

□ 2330

Mr. Chairman, last year the House voted 259 to 159 to terminate the ASRM rocket system, only to discover, much to the despair of many of us, that when it went to conference committee full funding was restored again at a level of nearly $350 million.

To refresh your memory, the ASRM rocket system was first launched as an initiative shortly after the *Challenger* accident, to be designed as a second rocket launching system, this time based in Mississippi.

Where are we today? According to NASA, costs for the ASRM program have now risen to $650 million this year, and total costs for the program are not estimated to be at $3.7 billion, more than double the original projections. And the earliest expected completion of ASRM has been moved back from the original estimate of 1995 to the year 2003, more than double the anticipated timeline when the program was first announced.

Now, I stand before you this evening in the hopes that we will finally kill this project with one final recorded vote. Members should know that the authorization committee has already terminated ASRM, and the Committee on Appropriations draft in front of us only at this point includes termination costs.

What this amendment will do will do two things: first of all, to roll back the termination costs from $104.5 million back to $100 million, which was the level last year; and, even more importantly, strike $30 million slated in construction costs to complete a facility in Mississippi we no longer need at this point.

Who is in favor of this amendment? A number of budget watchdog groups are in favor of this, including the Citizens against Government Waste, Citizens for a Healthy Environment, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and also the National Taxpayers Union. Environmental groups opposed include Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, the Sierra Club, and the National Wildlife Federation.

The Bush administration tried to kill this, and so in the past have Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Two more pieces of evidence: a November 1989 GEO report confirmed that the ASRM will not be needed either for constructing the space station nor for launching the advanced x-ray astrophysics facility. In fact, according to testimony in front of the authorizing committee, by the time the ASRM project is completed and ready to be launched, it will serve for only one shuttle mission before it becomes obsolete.

Second, the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astrophysics described the ASRM as a dead-end development.

There is absolutely no need whatsoever to go on with this project. The Congressional Budget Office says the taxpayers would save some $2.5 billion through the termination of this program, and continuation of ASRM diverts money from other more urgent NASA programs.

Second, let me make the case again we are going to strike another $32.6 million in additional facility costs to complete a project in a construction facility which at this point has absolutely no mission whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], for their fine work on the authorization committee to try to kill this project.

Let me urge my colleagues again tonight on both the Republican and Democrat side for an overwhelming vote to kill the ASRM project, so that there is no chance whatsoever that in the conference committee it, like Dracula, will live again.

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

Mr. KLUG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

This amendment is necessary because the Committee on Appropriations was silent on what it wanted to do with the ASRM, which gives them some wiggle room to resurrect the ASRM, even though the authorization committee has killed it.

The only thing that is in the current budget, the bill that is before us, are termination costs. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] is correct. However, in the committee report the committee appears to acknowledge that the ASRM may be deauthorized this year, but does not say so.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment to close the loop on defunding the ASRM. as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has said, the mission of the ASRM will have gone before the ASRM is completed. It is time we save the taxpayer money by supporting this amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might engage my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], in a colloquy with reference to this amendment.

In light of the time, I wonder if we might explore the possibility of a time limit on this amendment.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the House has been more than patient with the long process we have been through this evening. They have been very responsive to our effort to make sense out of a very complex bill.

I am sure Members do not want to stay here very much longer. Frankly, I will be very surprised if we find ourselves wanting to indulge ourselves in a lot more debate.

I am willing to consider time limitations, though I am hesitant to do so. I would like to have a sense of the House from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes, with the time to be divided 10 minutes on each side.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object and assuming that I will control my time, I have no objection. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would cut by $4 million the remaining $104,500,000 that the committee has included for ASRM termination and transition costs—should the legislative committees in the final analysis, elect to terminate ASRM.

I want to stress that point. The House authorization committee—the Science and Technology Committee—has terminated ASRM and picked up two or three activities from the current shuttle solid rocket motor program—and moves those to the new Yellow Creek facility.

We have exactly mirrored the legislative committees action in our report—which if Members would like to read it—it is on page 76.

But, we have also said that until a final decision is made by the legislative committees to terminate this program—we don't want to jump start the issue.

Therefore, we have cut $175 million from shuttle production—which will be applied to ASRM if the program is terminated by the legislative committees at some future date.

We have left $104 million for termination and transition costs should that action be taken.

In effect, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is meaningless. It cuts $4 million from the $104 million included in our bill for ASRM termination-transition—if the program is actually terminated.

What the gentleman suggests is that if the House votes for this amendment somehow ASRM is terminated.

That, of course, is not true. Let the legislative process work its will first—don't jump start or second guess the science committees.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we also would oppose the gentleman cutting the $32 million included in the bill to complete the construction of the Yellow Creek facility.

If the facility is going to serve the purpose of handling selected functions from the current solid rocket motor—and offer NASA at some time in the future the ability to recompete that contract—then these funds are needed to complete the Yellow Creek facility.

□ 2340

I would urge the House to reject the gentleman's amendment.

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

Let me make just one quick point, if I could. That is the fact that the House already voted to kill this project 259 to 159. The VA-HUD language that we see in the report tonight is commendable, but the purpose here this evening is to express the will of the House, once again, that this project be terminated and that our conferees do not allow it to come back.

Mr. Chairman, to amplify the argument, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

I will be brief. I realize the hour is late.

Let me say this: Over the years we have all been fascinated by many programs that come out of space, Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, the space shuttle. But now we are looking at a situation where the ASRM, which would be built in Mississippi, and the redesigned rocket motor are two different issues that we are looking at.

Members realize what the advanced solid rocket motor really is. This is really a paper missile. This is something that really has not been built at this particular time. The redesigned rocket motor has performed flawlessly, with one horrible exception. And we all know what that exception is.

From that time, that is where it got the name "redesigned" rocket motor. And now for 27 times it has worked great. And right now we have got a shuttle in space.

So the question comes down to what do we want to have. Do we want to get ahead and finish this facility or do we want to build something we have already got?

We talked about the space station not too long ago as the big issue. We discussed it twice.

Let us be very candid about it. Why would we want to build two of them? If we are going to have a space station, we have to have something that will work and something that will put it in space. And we have got that. And it has been working very, very well.

This is really what we are looking at at this particular time. The question come up, what do we do with this facility? We have just built a beautiful facility. We have got to use that somewhere.

Well, if you have just gone through base closings, like many of us have, you could go to the Pentagon. They will tell my colleagues what to do with an awful lot of these facilities.

There are ways that they can be absorbed into other areas. If we really want to save some money, if we want to have a chance now to save some money this time, I think overall, without going ahead, with the building where it presently is, we are saving an awful lot of money, as we look in space and look at the votes we have already made.

I would urge the House to vote for the Klug amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time a he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The ASRM facility is 70 percent complete. It would be irresponsible to support this amendment. Vote against it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

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

The distinguished chairman has already explained the thrust of what this amendment would do and has indicated that he has been working with the authorizing committee to establish a rational basis for the termination of the ASRM Program.

We all agree that the program is of diminished priority and, as has been indicated, it did not survive a test vote in the House last year.

So there is really no difference between the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin and my position, I think, and the position of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], that we want to terminate this program. There is a difference in how we do it, however.

In the authorizing bill, which is still before the house and has not yet been passed, there is a provision to terminate the advanced solid rocket motor program, yet to complete the facilities and to maintain as nearly as possible a substantial employment base at that facility, engaged in a new set of programs which involve refurbishing rocket motor cases and building rocket nozzles for the current space shuttle Program.

We think that the language in the current bill, the appropriations bill, is quite compatible with the language we have in the authorization bill. It would be severely disturbed to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

We will come out in essentially the same place. We will not have an ASRM Program, but we will have a more rational use of the assets which have been developed as part of that program.

I urge a no vote against the amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD]

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this amendment, I rise in its strong support.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join my colleague, Mr. KLUG, in sponsoring this amendment to eliminate funds for the advanced solid rocket motor from the VA–HUD appropriations bill.

By now we all know the history of the ASRM. Last year, it had virtually no support in Congress or even at NASA itself. It wasn't in the President's budget request. It was soundly defeated on the House floor. It wasn't even included in the Senate bill. But funding for the ASRM was restored by the conference committee.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here they go again.

Even though the authorizing committee very explicitly killed the project, the Appropriations Committee has funded the ASRM.

The ASRM is not necessary to our space program and NASA knows it.

The redesigned solid rocket motor—which has replaced the *Challenger* motor—is perfectly capable of safely and effectively performing the functions intended for the ASRM.

Development of the ASRM is behind schedule by 4½ years, which has more than doubled its cost to a projected $3.7 billion.

Also, testing of the ASRM will generate hundreds of tons of hydrogen gas, severely impacting the environment.

As the sponsor of legislation to terminate the ASRM, which has 52 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this amendment to strike funding for the ASRM.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], another cosponsor of the legislation and one who has been a strong fighter on fiscal issues.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Klug-Hansen-Orton-Penny amendment to the fiscal year 1994 VA–HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill, and I urge all Members to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment is intended to ensure that funds are not appropriated in fiscal year 1994 which could result in the continuation of the advanced solid rocket motor—which was not authorized in this year's NASA reauthorization bill. This amendment cuts over $30 million appropriated in the bill for ASRM construction activities and reduces by about 5 percent—or $5 million—the funds suggested in the bill for transferring ASRM activities to Yellow Creek, MS.

The advanced solid rocket motor—which NASA admits is not necessary—is opposed by the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste. Environmental groups such as Friends of the Earth and the Sierra Club are opposed to the advanced solid rocket motor because of the negative effect the rocket's exhaust has on the environment.

Last year after the House voted to kill the advanced solid rocket motor, the Senate appropriated $50 million for the project; however, the House-Senate conference committee appropriated $360 million for this project. Due to the current fiscal crisis, we can not afford to make this same mistake and keep this unnecessary project alive.

Again, I urge Members to vote in favor of the Klug-Hansen-Shepherd-Penny amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], who is in support of the amendment.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief.

Let me suggest there is one very important aspect to what is going on here in completion of the Yellow Creek facility.

Yes, the House has voted and continues to vote to kill the ASRM program. Yes, everyone admits that. But the issue here is whether the Yellow Creek facility is going to be completed.

The money that is in this bill is for completion of the facility for one purpose, and that is to transfer a portion of the production of the RSRM, the solid rocket motor currently being constructed by Thiokol Corp. in Utah, to transfer the nozzle production facilities from Utah, where it is currently being produced, to Mississippi. Hundreds of jobs simply to transfer from one State to another. That is what the difference is here that no one has yet brought up.

So there is a question of whether we are simply going to kill the program, to cut the funding now, or whether we

are going to complete the construction of the Yellow Creek facility so that we can transfer jobs from a current operating facility into Mississippi.

I would urge passage of the amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD].

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my esteemed colleague, Representative KLUG. Many of you in this body have already voted to eliminate the ASRM program before. Some of you are confronting the issue for the first time. I would like to just briefly outline the compelling reasons for termination.

First, ASRM is unnecessary. The solid rocket motor currently being used on the space shuttle has proven to be safe and reliable. Both the National Research Council and the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel have questioned whether ASRM would be safer and more reliable. ASRM no longer has a mission. It can't be developed in time to be used for the missions it was designed for. In addition, new advances in rocket technology promise to make the ASRM obsolete before it is even developed.

Second, ASRM is massively over budget and behind schedule. Cost overruns have increased the original estimate from $1.67 billion to $3.9 billion, more than doubling its cost. The first ASRM launch has been pushed back 64 months, to December 2000, too late to be used for space station and other planned projects. All indications are that further cost overruns and delays are inevitable, as noted in a November GAO report. Because of this, the National Taxpayers Union has targeted ASRM for elimination as an egregiously wasteful Government program.

Third, ASRM threatens the local and global environment. The hydrogen chloride gas generated by tests of the system in Mississippi will cause acid rain over environmentally sensitive wetlands, while the free chlorine will also accelerate the depletion of the ozone layer. In addition, the ASRM exhaust releases aluminum particulates which contribute to respiratory problems. Local chapters of all the major nationwide environmental groups have united to oppose the project.

It the sheer wastefulness of the project isn't enough to convince you, then maybe fiscal responsibility will have some sway. Eliminating ASRM would save more than $1.95 billion over 5 years. At this time of tight budget and program cuts, we cannot continue to pour money down the ASRM rathole. We need to send a strong message to the White House, the Senate, and the conference committee that we want ASRM completely and absolutely abolished. Voting for this amendment will send that message. I urge you to vote for the Klug amendment and to cut funding for ASRM.

□ 2350

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

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just again to emphasize that the Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Healthy Environment, Citizens for a South Environment, and the National Taxpayer Union all support this amendment.

If we listen closely to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] as the authorization committee and last year the House voted 259 to 159 to terminate this program, let us send a strong message to the conferees and guarantee once and for all the ASRM stays grounded on Earth.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment and any further attempts to disrupt an efficient and effective NASA program at Yellow Creek, Mississippi.

Some of my colleagues seem to have forgotten that this program was conceived out of a concern for the safety of NASA astronauts. The advanced solid rocket motor program was initiated on the recommendation of the Presidential Commission on the space shuttle *Challenger* accident and NASA to provide our space program with a rocket to improve shuttle safety, improve shuttle reliability, increase shuttle payload by 30 percent, and give NASA more control of the program by providing a government-owned facility.

Those needs are still evident in our manned space program today.

In this year when we are spending so much time and energy to use our resources wisely, it makes no sense to shut down an operation that is substantially completed and has already had an investment of $1.6 billion put into it.

The site at Yellow Creek, in Northeast Mississippi was chosen, because:

It was already owned by the government.

It already had roads, power, water, and other utilities along with some building.

It was adjacent to a waterway transportation system.

Those factors saved a year in construction and $100,000.

This is a good program and the reasons given for starting this program are still valid.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the advanced solid rocket motor continues to be a vital part of our Nation's space program. It was designed to instill a long-term competitive environment in the production of shuttle motors and enhance flight safety and reliability in the aftermath of the *Challenger* disaster.

The ASRM fulfills these expectations while at the same time increasing payload capability by more than 13,000 pounds and decreasing the cost of motor production by almost $15 million per flight pair.

More than $500 million has been invested in several locations across the Nation so far, including the development of a state-of-the-art facility in Mt. Vernon, IN, where the casings for the ASRM are being constructed.

The Congress has already invested a total of $1.5 billion in this program and the costs to terminate are equal to the total investment needed to complete its development.

Make a responsible budgetary vote which also enhances the nation's technical capability for future missions in space. Vote against the Klug-Hansen-Orton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time under the unanimous consent agreement has been consumed.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $545,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *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 substantially amortize through payment or reimbursement such contractor investment, unless an appropriations Act specifies the lease or contract pursuant to which such facilities are to be constructed or leased or such facility is otherwise identified in such Act: *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 for personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902) and travel expenses, $1,637,500,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appropriation for training, investigations, costs associated with personnel relocation, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $15,391,000.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

During fiscal year 1994, 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 1994 shall not exceed $945,000.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880–1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; $2,045,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: *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 AND INSTRUMENTATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out an academic research facilities and instrumentation 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, $55,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995.

UNITED STATES POLAR RESEARCH PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses in carrying out arctic and antarctic research and operational support and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program and the Arctic research 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; $158,100,000, 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); acquisition, maintenance, and operation of aircraft for research and operations support; improvement of environmental practices and enhancements of safety; $62,600,000, 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

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, $569,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: *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.

CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES INSTITUTE

For necessary expenses for support of the Critical Technologies Institute as authorized by section 822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6686), $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary salaries and expenses in carrying out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $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; $120,800,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under salaries and expenses in fiscal year 1994 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, $3,997,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION HEADQUARTERS RELOCATION

For necessary support of the relocation of the National Science Foundation, $5,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds shall be used to reimburse the General Services Administration for services and related acquisitions in support of relocating the National Science Foundation.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), $30,476,000.

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; $5,000,000: *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.

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 1994 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

SAVINGS ASSOCIATION INSURANCE FUND

For payments of insurance losses, in fiscal year 1994, of the Savings Association Insurance Fund as authorized by Public Law 101–73, such sums as may be necessary.

FSLIC RESOLUTION FUND

For payment of expenditures, in fiscal year 1994, of the FSLIC Resolution Fund, for which other funds available to the FSLIC Resolution Fund as authorized by Public Law 101–73 are insufficient, $1,326,000,000.

FDIC AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAM

For the affordable housing program of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 40 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831q), $7,000,000 to pay for any losses resulting from the sale of properties under the program, and for all administrative and holding costs associated with operating the program.

Notwithstanding any provisions of section 40 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act or any other provision of law, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall be deemed in compliance with such section if, in its sole discretion, the Corporation at any time modifies, amends or waives any provisions of such section in order to maximize the efficient use of the available appropriated funds. The Corporation shall not be subject to suit for its failure to comply with the requirements of this provision or section 40 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

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, $34,046,000.

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 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 1994 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 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, 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. 517. (a) The Resolution Trust Corporation ("Corporation") shall report to the Congress 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.

This Act may be cited as the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 69, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 518. Compliance With Buy American Act.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended in violation of sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c; popularly known as the "Buy American Act"), which are applicable to those funds.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has been approved by both sides.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has afforded me a copy of the amendment, and I am pleased to accept the amendment on behalf of the subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STOKES. 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 CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2357

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) 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. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, 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.

POSTPONEMENT OF FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2491 UNTIL JUNE 29, 1993

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, but that further consideration under operation thereof be postponed until the legislative day of June 29, 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my understanding is that the effect of the unanimous consent request will be to preserve our right to ask for separate votes on amendments that were passed in the Committee of the Whole tomorrow morning when we come back in.

I would ask the gentleman from Ohio, is that correct?

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

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on rollcall No. 274, the rule (H. Res. 208) waiving certain points of order to H.R. 2491, making appropriations to the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies appropriations bill, 1994. I was on official business as a member of the U.S. Congress/European Community parliamentarians 41st meeting.

If present, I would have voted "aye" on the rule since it is one of the few open rules that has been granted by the Committee on Rules, since this session began.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to an airline flight on June 28, 1993, I was not able to cast my vote on the rollcall No. 274, the Rule for H.R. 2491, the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations.

If I had been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 274–277 on H.R. 2491 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 274; "present" on rollcall 275; "no" on rollcall 276; and "no" on rollcall 277.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a commitment of long standing required me to be away from the Capitol and prevented me from voting on rollcall Nos. 275 through 283. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes 276 through 279, inclusive, and 283; "yes" on rollcall votes 280 through 282, inclusive; and "present" on rollcall vote 275.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I was on leave of absence when rollcall votes occurred in the House of Representatives.

Had I been present, I would have cast my votes as noted for the following roll-call votes which occurred during my absence. Votes on which I was paired and announced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ARE NOTED BY AN ASTERISK.

Rollcall No. 274, H. Res. 208, rule governing debate for VA, HUD Appropriation Act, "nay*."

Rollcall No. 275, Quorum Call.

Rollcall No. 276, Burton amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD, Appropriation Act, cut CDSG grants by $223 million, "nay."

Rollcall No. 277, Penny amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD Appropriation Act, cut CDSG grants by $50 million, "nay."

Rollcall No. 278, Solomon amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD Appropriations Act, restore funding for Selective Service System, "nay*."

Rollcall No. 279, Gramm amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD Appropriation Act, reduce HUD policy development/research programs by $48 million, "aye."

Rollcall No. 280, Kolbe amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD Appropriation Act, provide $10 million for HUD HOPE grants program, "Aye*."

Roll No. 281, Roemer amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD Appropriation Act, delete space station funding, "Nay*."

Roll No. 282, Hefley amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD Appropriation Act, cut $970 thousand for employees detailed to the Office of Science, and Technology Policy, "Aye."

Roll No. 283, Hefley amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD Appropriation Act, remove funding for consortium for the International Earth Science Information Network [NASA] Project—$18 million, "Aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I was on leave of absence during the House session due to illness in my family. Had I been here, I would have voted as follows during consideration of H.R. 2491, VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1994: Roll No. 274—nay; Roll No. 276—yea; Roll No. 277—yea; Roll No. 278—nay; Roll No. 279—yea; Roll No. 280—yea; Roll No. 281—yea; Roll No. 282—yea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and unable to

be present when the House considered amendments to the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. I wish the permanent record to show that had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 276, "nay" on rollcall No. 278, and "aye" on rollcall No. 281.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidabily detained on rollcall votes 274, 276, and 277. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 274. Additionally, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall votes 276, and 277.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, while I was in Massachusetts assisting my wife, Robi, with the delivery of our son, I missed a series of roll call votes.

On Monday, June 28, during consideration of HR 2491, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill, I would have voted the following:

Rollcall 274, "no."
Rollcall 275, "present."
Rollcall 276, "aye."
Rollcall 277, "aye."
Rollcall 278, "aye."
Rollcall 279, "aye."
Rollcall 280, "aye."
Rollcall 281, "aye."
Rollcall 282, "aye."
Rollcall 283, "aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2492, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-160) on the resolution (H. Res. 210) waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2490, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-161) on the resolution (H. Res. 211) waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to explain to Members that we will be reconvening tomorrow morning at 11:00 a.m. We will not have 1-minute speaches. We will go directly to the completion of the VA-HUD appropriation bill. We will then be taking up the Agriculture appropriation bill, and the D.C. appropriation bill. If we have time, at the end of that we will go to the Transportation bill. That will leave us with three appropriation bills for the rest of the week.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2400

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2118, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1993

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2118) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MCDADE

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. McDADE moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2118, be instructed to take no action that would cause the net new spending in the bill to exceed either the Committee 602(a) budget authority and outlay allocations for discretionary domestic, defense and international spending or the overall budget authority and outlay spending caps for those three categories established by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-508).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees. This motion calls for a fiscally responsible supplemental conference. It says that if we are going to pass a much-reduced supplemental to deal with a small number of selected needs, it must stay within the committee allocations for discretionary domestic, international, and defense spending and the overall spending caps.

To the extent that spending would cause such a breach, offsetting spending reductions would need to be provided.

This is the basis on which the House passed the two supplementals that will now be considered jointly in this conference. It is a far cry from the first supplemental, the so-called economic stimulus legislation, which proposed $16 billion in new spending without offsets and declared it all to be an emergency. As a result, that stimulus never made it out of Congress.

As the Members know, the Senate has chosen to combine the two supplementals passed by the House earlier this year into one bill. When the House passed H.R. 2118, which was for unanticipated needs arising from Somalia, as well as small business, and the judiciary, all the funding was within all relevant spending caps and ceilings with one exception—the outlays for the Small Business Loan Program exceeded the outlay cap for the Commerce Subcommittee by a small amount. When we considered the bill on the floor, I engaged the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy assuring the House that we would take care of this problem in conference.

Similarly, when the House considered the second supplemental, H.R. 2244, the so-called son of stimulus, it was offset by rescissions in other programs.

There is always the temptation, when a spending bill goes to conference, to take the higher numbers and not worry about the consequences. This motion specifically instructs the conferees to keep to the fiscally responsible road that we have followed in passing these two supplementals and to make sure that all spending limits are maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the motion.

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

Mr. McDADE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on this side we accept the motion. Certainly we intend to stay under the caps for 1993, and we accept the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NATCHER, SMITH of Iowa, YATES, OBEY, STOKES, BEVILL, MURTHA, DIXON, FAZIO, HEFNER, HOYER, CARR of Michigan, DURBIN, MCDADE, MYERS of Indiana, REGULA, LEWIS of California, PORTER, ROGERS, WOLF, and LIGHTFOOT.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my being delayed while in route to the Capitol earlier today prevented me from voting on rollcall No. 274, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2491, VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1994. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Tuesday, June 29, 1993.

HOWARD H. BAKER, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 168) to designate the Federal building to be constructed between Gay and Market Streets and Cumberland and Church Avenues in Knoxville, TN, as the "Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 168

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building to be constructed between Gay and Market Streets and Cumberland and Church Avenues in Knoxville, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the "Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 168, as amended, is a bill to designate the Federal building to be constructed between Gay and Market Streets and Cumberland and Church Avenues in Knoxville, TN, as the Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse.

This bill has my enthusiastic support. Senator Baker was born on November 15, 1925, in Huntsville, TN. After attending college at Tulane University and at the University of the South in Sewanee, TN, Senator Baker attended law school at the University of Tennessee Law College. He graduated from law school in 1949, and in that same year was admitted to the Tennessee bar.

He was engaged in the private practice of law from 1949 until 1966, when he was elected to the U.S. Senate.

Senator Baker had a very distinguished career in the Senate where he served from 1966 until 1985. He was the minority leader from 1977 through 1981 and he was the majority leader from 1981 through 1985.

Subsequently, Senator Baker was appointed White House Chief of Staff to President Reagan. He served in that capacity for 1 year, 1987–1988.

Senator Baker's outstanding contributions to his State of Tennessee and the Nation make it fitting and proper to name this United States courthouse to be constructed in Knoxville, TN, after Howard H. Baker, Jr.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 168, a bill to designate the United States Courthouse, currently under construction in Knoxville, TN, the Howard H. Baker, Jr. U.S. courthouse. I am proud to be the sponsor of this bill, and I appreciate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Ohio, joining me in cosponsoring this bill.

This legislation to name the Federal courthouse under construction after Howard Baker is a fitting tribute to Senator Baker's extraordinary career and public service.

Senator Baker was first elected to the U.S. Senate in 1966, the first Republican ever popularly elected to the U.S. Senate from Tennessee, and won reelection in 1972 and 1978. Senator Baker served as minority leader of the Senate from 1977 to 1981 and majority leader from 1981 to 1985, when he chose to retire.

In 1987, then President Reagan asked Senator Baker to serve as Chief of Staff to the President, at a time when the administration needed steady and seasoned leadership during the Iran-Contra controversy.

In 1982, Senator Baker received the Jefferson Award for Greatest Public Service Performed by an Elected or Appointed Official. In 1984, Senator Baker received the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Since leaving Public Service, Senator Baker has been elected to numerous boards of directors of U.S. corporations. He is the recipient of honorary degrees from Yale, Dartmouth, Georgetown, Bradley, Pepperdine, and Centre College. He is currently a partner in the law firm of Baker, Worthington, Crossley, Stansberry and Woolf.

I am sorry to say Senator Baker's wife, Joy, passed away this spring after a long and courageous battle with cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I simply would say that Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., is one of the greatest statesmen in the history of the State of Tennessee. He has been recognized to a great deal here in Washington, having the formal rooms of the Library of Congress named after him. But he has not received that same recognition in Tennessee, and naming this Federal building after him will be a very fitting tribute to a very great American.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill in honor of my good friend and fellow Tennesseean, Howard H. Baker, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, I wish to commend and thank Mr. TRAFICANT of Ohio, the chair of the Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, the ranking Republican of this subcommittee and author of this legislation.

Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1966, where he served for 19 years. He also served in this body and spent one term—the 82d Congress, from 1951–53—as a member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee.

In his distinguished career, Senator Baker actively backed major civil rights initiatives and played an instrumental role in the development of the landmark clean air and water legislation of the early 1970's.

His reputation for fairness led to his selection to co-chair the committee which investigated Watergate. From 1977 to 1985, Senator Baker served as minority leader from 1977 to 1981, and as majority leader from 1981 to 1985. In

1987, he was appointed White House Chief of Staff by President Reagan. After leaving the White House, Senator Baker was elected to the boards of American Express, Waste Management, United Technologies, Pennzoil, and the Mayo Clinic.

Senator Baker has received many honors and awards, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the Jefferson Award for Greatest Public Service Performed by an Elected or Appointed Official.

It is certainly a well-deserved and fitting tribute to name a Federal building in his honor, and I urge support for the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], for his outstanding efforts. He is a fine legislator, and through his efforts this bill is possible. I also want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the ranking member of the full committee, and the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 168, to establish the Howard H. Baker U.S. Courthouse. This is certainly a well deserved honor for a man who has served the State of Tennessee and the country with pride, distinction, and integrity.

I had the privilege of knowing and working with Howard Baker during his tenure in the Senate and also in the White House and I consider him a trusted friend and colleague. Mr. Baker's distinguished career has included duties as Senate minority leader, majority leader, White House Chief of Staff, and recipient of numerous awards, honors, and accolades. His political career has spanned three decades and I know that the people of Tennessee and people around the country appreciate his work.

Establishing this U.S. courthouse is certainly a worthy tribute to Mr. Baker and it is a small token of our appreciation for his dedication to public service. I commend the committee for their recognition of one of Tennessee's finest leaders and I am glad to offer my support to this effort.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 168.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 0010

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAFICANT. 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. 168, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AFRICAN-AMERICAN MUSEUM ACT

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 877) to authorize the establishment of the National African American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 877

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 "National African American Museum Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the presentation and preservation of African American life, art, history, and culture within the National Park System and other Federal entities are inadequate;

(2) the inadequate presentation and preservation of African American life, art, history, and culture seriously restrict the ability of the people of the United States, particularly African Americans, to understand themselves and their past;

(3) African American life, art, history, and culture include the varied experiences of Africans in slavery and freedom and the continued struggles for full recognition of citizenship and treatment with human dignity;

(4) in enacting Public Law 99-511, the Congress encouraged support for the establishment of a commemorative structure within the National Park System, or on other Federal lands, dedicated to the promotion of understanding, knowledge, opportunity, and equality for all people;

(5) the establishment of a national museum and the conducting of interpretive and educational programs, dedicated to the heritage and culture of African Americans, will help to inspire and educate the people of the United States regarding the cultural legacy of African Americans and the contributions made by African Americans to the society of the United States; and

(6) the Smithsonian Institution operates 15 museums and galleries, a zoological park, and 5 major research facilities, none of which is a national institution devoted solely to African American life, art, history, or culture.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL AFRICAN AMERICAN MUSEUM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Smithsonian Institution a Museum, which shall be known as the "National African American Museum".

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Museum is to provide—

(1) a center for scholarship relating to African American life, art, history, and culture;

(2) a location for permanent and temporary exhibits documenting African American life, art, history, and culture;

(3) a location for the collection and study of artifacts and documents relating to African American life, art, history, and culture;

(4) a location for public education programs relating to African American life, art, history, and culture; and

(5) a location for training of museum professionals and others in the arts, humanities, and sciences regarding museum practices related to African American life, art, history, and culture.

SEC. 4. LOCATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE NATIONAL AFRICAN AMERICAN MUSEUM.

The Board of Regents is authorized to plan, design, reconstruct, and renovate the Arts and Industries Building of the Smithsonian Institution to house the Museum.

SEC. 5. BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF MUSEUM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Smithsonian Institution the Board of Trustees of the National African American Museum.

(b) COMPOSITION AND APPOINTMENT.—The Board of Trustees shall be composed of 23 members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

(2) An Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, designated by the Board of Regents.

(3) Twenty-one individuals of diverse disciplines and geographical residence who are committed to the advancement of knowledge of African American art, history, and culture appointed by the Board of Regents, of whom 9 members shall be from among individuals nominated by African American museums, historically black colleges and universities, and cultural or other organizations.

(c) TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Board of Trustees shall be appointed for terms of 3 years. Members of the Board of Trustees may be reappointed.

(2) STAGGERED TERMS.—As designated by the Board of Regents at the time of initial appointments under paragraph (3) of subsection (b), the terms of 7 members shall expire at the end of 1 year, the terms of 7 members shall expire at the end of 2 years, and the terms of 7 members shall expire at the end of 3 years.

(d) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Board of Trustees shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of the member was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of the term.

(e) NONCOMPENSATION.—Except as provided in subsection (f), members of the Board of Trustees shall serve without pay.

(f) EXPENSES.—Members of the Board of Trustees shall receive per diem, travel, and transportation expenses for each day, including traveltime, during which they are engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board of Trustees in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to employees serving intermittently in the Government service.

(g) CHAIRPERSON.—The Board of Trustees shall elect a chairperson by a majority vote of the members of the Board of Trustees.

(h) MEETINGS.—The Board of Trustees shall meet at the call of the chairperson or upon the written request of a majority of its members, but shall meet not less than 2 times each year.

(i) QUORUM.—A majority of the Board of Trustees shall constitute a quorum for purposes of conducting business, but a lesser number may receive information on behalf of the Board of Trustees.

(j) VOLUNTARY SERVICES.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the chairperson of the Board of Trustees may accept for the Board of Trustees voluntary services provided by a member of the Board of Trustees.

SEC. 6. DUTIES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MUSEUM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board of Trustees shall—

(1) recommend annual budgets for the Museum;

(2) consistent with the general policy established by the Board of Regents, have the sole authority to—

(A) loan, exchange, sell, or otherwise dispose of any part of the collections of the Museum, but only if the funds generated by such disposition are used for additions to the collections of the Museum or for additions to the endowment of the Museum;

(B) subject to the availability of funds and the provisions of annual budgets of the Museum, purchase, accept, borrow, or otherwise acquire artifacts and other property for addition to the collections of the Museum;

(C) establish policy with respect to the utilization of the collections of the Museum; and

(D) establish policy regarding programming, education, exhibitions, and research, with respect to the life and culture of African Americans, the role of African Americans in the history of the United States, and the contributions of African Americans to society;

(3) consistent with the general policy established by the Board of Regents, have authority to—

(A) provide for restoration, preservation, and maintenance of the collections of the Museum;

(B) solicit funds for the Museum and determine the purposes to which those funds shall be used;

(C) approve expenditures from the endowment of the Museum, or of income generated from the endowment, for any purpose of the Museum; and

(D) consult with, advise, and support the Director in the operation of the Museum;

(4) establish programs in cooperation with other African American museums, historically black colleges and universities, historical societies, educational institutions, cultural and other organizations for the education and promotion of understanding regarding African American life, art, history, and culture;

(5) support the efforts of other African American museums, historically black colleges and universities, and cultural and other organizations to educate and promote understanding regarding African American life, art, history, and culture, including—

(A) development of cooperative programs and exhibitions;

(B) identification, management, and care of collections;

(C) participation in the training of museum professionals; and

(D) creating opportunities for—

(i) research fellowships; and

(ii) professional and student internships;

(6) adopt bylaws to carry out the functions of the Board of Trustees; and

(7) report annually to the Board of Regents on the acquisition, disposition, and display of African American objects and artifacts and on other appropriate matters.

SEC. 7. DIRECTOR AND STAFF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, in consultation with the Board of Trustees, shall appoint a Director who shall manage the Museum.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution may—

(1) appoint the Director and 5 employees of the Museum, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service; and

(2) fix the pay of the Director and such 5 employees, without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "Board of Regents" means the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

(2) The term "Board of Trustees" means the Board of Trustees of the National African American Museum established in section 5(a).

(3) The term "Museum" means the National African American Museum established under section 3(a).

(4) The term "Arts and Industries Building" means the building located on the Mall at 900 Jefferson Drive, S.W. in Washington, the District of Columbia.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the succeeding fiscal years. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available only for costs directly relating to the establishment and operation of the Museum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

H.R. 877 was jointly referred to both of us.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, of the 15 major Smithsonian museums and galleries that line The Federal Mall, in Washington, DC, none adequately chronicles the history, culture, and art of black Americans.

As a result, in 1985 my friend and colleague, the late Representative Mickey Leland sponsored a resolution calling for the establishment of a black museum to recognize the heritage and accomplishments of all African-Americans. Over the last 8 years many people have labored and grappled with the desire to bring this museum to fruition.

Today, we have reached a milestone in that journey. H.R. 877, as amended, authorizes the establishment of the National African-American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution. The museum is to be located in the Arts and Industries Building. The 143-year-old Arts and Industries Building is a historic building occupying one of the prime spaces on The Mall. It is strategically located next to the National Museum of African Art, which provides a unique opportunity for scholars and visitors alike to appropriately connect the history of the black man's African ancestors to that of his experience in America.

The Museum will establish a board of trustees composed of 23 members, of which nine shall be from among individuals nominated by black museums, historically black colleges and universities, and cultural or other organizations.

Although H.R. 877 authorizes $5 million for the museum to begin its preliminary work on planning and design, the institution, mindful of fiscal constraints, has requested a modest $710,000 in it's fiscal year 1993 budget.

I strongly believe that the time has come to adequately and positively honor and document the heritage of this country's 30 million black Americans. The National African-American museum will inform and educate the people of the United States and its millions of visitors from abroad to important elements of the cultural legacy and accomplishments of black Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 877, as amended.

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H.R. 877. This legislation authorizes the establishment of the National African-American Museum, within the Smithsonian Institution. In 1991 the Smithsonian Board of Regents accepted a report from the African-American Institutional Study Committee and endorsed its findings, that a free-standing African-American museum within the Smithsonian Institution is necessary.

As seen in the Los Angeles riots, we have reached a point in history where interracial understanding is of utmost importance. One way we, the American Congress, may foster such understanding is to authorize the establishment of an African-American Museum, similar in design to that of the American Indian. It would provide for scholarship relating to African-American life, art, history, and culture, as well as being a site for exhibitions which better educate the millions of visitors who come to the Smithsonian annually.

Only recently have we realized the prominent role the African-American culture has played in the melting pot

of America. Over 12 percent of the American population is of African descent. This significant portion of the American population, with its distinct history and culture, can't be ignored. Museums have only recently acknowledged the great need to collect African-American materials. Consequently, the country has already lost many important African-American artifacts and documents. The new Smithsonian African-American Museum would further alert communities to the value of many items not previously recognized as significant.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 877, as amended, a bill to authorize the establishment of the National African-American Museum within the Smithsonian Museum.

Any history of America is incomplete without a full accounting of the significant contributions African-Americans have made in the development and progress of our country.

I was very pleased tonight to participate for the first time with Chairman STOKES as one of the cardinals in handling the appropriation bill for VA-HUD. So many of the great Members here, including one of our ranking members, Mr. CLAY, and so many others who have contributed so greatly to our Congress, but not only that, the many black Americans who came here perhaps not under the best of circumstances but have prevailed and have cut out a niche in American history so deserving of this museum.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve my comments to a future time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

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

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a National African-American Museum would make a long-lasting contribution to the complete and accurate documentation of American history. While that history is both rich and diverse, without the story of African-Americans, it is incomplete.

There is so much to be learned about African-American history, and so much we do not know. The National African-American Museum will heighten public knowledge and awareness of the fact that the culture of African-Americans is intricately woven into the fabric of American society. It will recognize the creativity of African-American artists, performers, writers, inventors, and thinkers—individuals who have influenced and enriched our country.

The National African-American Museum will help us discover and appreciate the contributions of great African-Americans like: Paul Robeson, actor and singer who with his powerful voice took the theater by storm; Maya Angelou, poet, writer, and professor, who thrilled the crowd by reading an original poem at the inauguration of President Clinton; Mathew Alexander Henson, explorer and member of Adm. Robert E. Peary's fourth expedition to the North Pole, and Dr. Charles Drew, blood plasma researcher and educator who set up the first blood bank in England and who became an expert in blood preservation techniques and transfusions.

The National African-American Museum will be a tribute to Carter G. Woodson, historian, editor, and educator, and traditionally considered the father of African-American history. The author of many scholarly books, Woodson's work has given us many insights into how the African-American experience enriched American history. With the establishment of this new museum, all of us will have an opportunity to share in that exploration.

I want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, Mr. TRAFICANT, and the subcommittee's ranking Republican member, Mr. DUNCAN, for their leadership on this important measure. I also want to pay special tribute to the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials, BILL CLAY, for his commitment to this issue. Lastly, we wouldn't be here today had it not been for the foresight and determination of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the chief deputy majority whip, who has worked unceasingly in bringing this dream to a reality.

Finally, as many of you know, I have been a member of the board of regents of the Smithsonian Institution for 10 years. During that time I have seen the Smithsonian achieve some great successes. However, none may be more profound or more significant than the establishment of a National African-American Museum. That is why I am particularly proud of the action the House is taking today, and I urge support for the bill.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 877, a bill to establish, within the Smithsonian, the National African-American Museum. This museum shall be housed in the Arts and Industries Building on The Mall, which has been slated for significant interior upgrades and renovations to accommodate a modern museum and create a world class aesthetic environment.

Mr. Speaker, for over 10 years, there have been proposals initiated by African-Americans to urge a presence of African-American art on The Mall. Several bills have been introduced, and bills have been reported by committees. Last Congress, the Public Works and Transportation Committee favorably reported H.R. 1246, which would have authorized the construction of a new building to house the African-American Museum. While that bill did not pass Congress, I believe it set the groundwork for the bill before the House today.

H.R. 877, as reported by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, authorizes the establishment of an African-American museum. This museum would follow the recommendations of the African-American Institutional Study Committee. These recommendations include three central features:

First, a freestanding African-American museum should exist at the Smithsonian;

Second, the museum should be housed in the Arts and Industries Building; and

Third, the board structure should be modeled on that of the National Museum of the American Indian.

H.R. 877 reflects those recommendations, and is fitting with the budget constraints for Federal activities. The board of trustees will have the authority to accept gifts, raise funds, and set a budget.

This bill enjoys the support of the committee, the Smithsonian, and many other interested parties. I urge the House to adopt H.R. 877.

□ 0020

Mr. Speaker, I believe it will make many important contributions to the life of this Nation. I want to say that I am proud to have had a small part in this. I especially want to commend my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, who I think played a very important role in bringing this legislation to the floor tonight.

I urge support of this very important legislation and am pleased to say that I believe it has the unanimous support of those on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the principal sponsor and the driving force behind this bill, the Member who has done more to bring it to the floor than anybody else.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to speak in support of the bill to establish an African-American Museum on The Mall.

Many people have devoted a great deal of energy and support to this effort. I want to thank the chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA]. And I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], chairman of the Public Buildings Subcommittee. I thank them both for shaping and moving this bill with more than all deliberate speed.

I also want to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], chairman of the Libraries and Memorials Subcommittee. Thank you for your help and patience and your stick-to-iveness.

I want to acknowledge the staff of both committees who have been a great help.

I must mention our late and beloved colleague, Mickey Leland, who began this process several years ago. This project has been a long time coming. I am proud to be here tonight as it comes to the floor of the House. I am proud that almost every single member of the Congressional Black Caucus along with many others in this body are cosponsors of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this effort is important because the story of black people in America must be told, and it is not. Without it, American history is incomplete.

Our history is as old as this country's history. Our history is recent yet little known.

One of the greatest periods in our Nation's cultural history was the Harlem Renaissance. Writers, artists, poets, and photographers like Langston Hughes, James Van Der Zee, Countee Cullen, and Aaron Douglas were all part of the Renaissance.

And, then there are the thousands of unsung, unnamed heroes of the civil rights movement, men and women who dedicated—and in many instance, gave—their lives to make our Nation great. Men and women who inspired the movements toward democracy which we are witnessing today in Asia and Eastern Europe.

I could go on and on. We have built fine universities and colleges and successful businesses. The history of African-Americans is a drama that is continuing to unfold.

Our history is rich. Our story has not been told. And now we have an opportunity to tell it.

We have identified a beautiful, historic building, the Arts and Industries Building, on The Mall, which will house the museum. We should not and cannot let this opportunity pass us by.

I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], one of the most outstanding Members of the House and one who has been very instrumental also in helping to advance this bill.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

My special thanks to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], the ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], for moving this bill so promptly this session. This bill needed strong support to survive the hurdles that it has met in the past.

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. LEWIS] for his initiative and his work in keeping this bill alive; to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], who refused to believe that its time would not come and who held hearings and refused to give up, session after session.

I want to thank all of these gentlemen for finally bringing us to this moment when this bill has come to the floor of this House, where it deserves, and is getting, bipartisan support.

This bill, of course, will help establish a museum, but not any museum; but one that will remind Americans that African-American history is American history. The new museum will have the additional value that we would so encourage in our community today, the value of encouraging pride in African-Americans who in some ways feel left out of the American equation still.

If one understands that she has a proud history as African-Americans do, she will be able to come to grips with the problems that beset our community. The establishment of a National African-American Museum will make a longlasting contribution to the compete and accurate documentation of American history itself. History has its own power, and all Americans, including African-Americans, need its truths to challenge hateful assumptions, easy myths, accepted distortions, and negative stereotypes about the role of African-Americans in the progress of this great Nation.

It is not enough to know about the injustices we hear every day that African-Americans endured, and still endure; we owe it to ourselves to learn about the heroism, about the successes of African-Americans, about Ida B. Wells and the ingenuity of George Washington Carver, and to discover the creative artistry of African-American artists, performers, writers, and thinkers. The National African-American Museum will help us use the power of history to construct a better future. This building will be visited by many of the 20 million Americans and others from countries around the world who visit this city each year, even as they will visit the Holocaust Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly appropriate that there also be an African-American museum for these visitors to see.

Finally, though I am especially proud of this building because it is in my district, be assured that my district, when one refers to the Federal enclave where this museum will be located, is the district of every Member.

The African-American Museum will be a national treasure that Americans of all backgrounds will not only visit but greatly appreciate.

My thanks to all of the Members who have been instrumental in bringing this moment to this House.

□ 0045

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of all those who have spoken.

I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], certainly the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and all the members of the subcommittee and our ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] for all the tremendous achievements that the black people have had in our country finally that will come to fruition with a museum that has been long deserving.

I am very proud and honored to rise in support of it and associate myself with leaders such as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] and everyone who has advanced this legislation.

Mr. TRAFICANT. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the ranking member on our subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] and also thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] for the support they have given.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letters from the Honorable CHARLIE ROSE, and the Hon. NORMAN MINETA:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 28, 1993.

Hon. NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works and Transportation, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter on H.R. 847, to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes.

I acknowledge your Committee's jurisdiction over the subject matter of H.R. 847 and based on that, your right for sequential referral of the bill.

I recognize that your not pursuing sequential referral of this bill should in no way be

construed as a waiver of any jurisdiction your Committee has relating to the subject matter of the bill. I will gladly include our exchange of correspondence on this matter in the Committee Report to be filed with H.R. 847, or if none, in the Record during debate on the bill.

I look forward to your continued support on H.R. 847.

With my very best wishes,

Sincerely,

CHARLIE ROSE,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, DC, June 25, 1993.

Hon. CHARLIE ROSE,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the Committee on House Administration has ordered reported H.R. 847, to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institute to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes.

It is also my understanding that your Committee is interested in proceeding to the House Floor expeditiously and that you would like the Committee on Public Works and Transportation to waive its right to sequential referral of the bill so that you may be able to do so.

After review of the bill, the Committee has no objection to its proceeding forward and, thus, will not seek a sequential referral.

While we are waiving our right to sequential referral, we want to state that this should in no context be construed that our Committee is relinquishing its jurisdiction over the matter addressed in H.R. 847. We can certainly foresee circumstances in the future when we would exercise our jurisdictional rights on this matter. We are, however, proceeding this way only in order that the legislation be brought to the Floor expeditiously. We do reserve our right to have Members of our Committee named as conferees, should there be a conference on this legislation.

Lastly, we would ask that our exchange of letters acknowledging our position be included in your Committee Report on H.R. 847. If such Report is not filed, we would then ask that the letters be inserted in the Record during debate on H.R. 847.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Chairman.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 877 which would create a National African-American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution.

While we still have a considerable way to go before this museum is fully realized, I am confident that soon I will be able to take my granddaughter to see exhibits and displays that celebrate the enormous contributions of her ancestors to this experiment called America.

The fact is, however, that this museum is important to all Americans, not just those who share my granddaughter's African-American heritage. No one can doubt that the culture and history of African-Americans have played an indispensable role in defining American culture. Our music has been America's music; our art, America's art; our struggle for civil rights, America's struggle. Notwithstanding this close connection many have attempted to minimize or deny the role that we have played in the history and definition of the broader American fabric. With this museum we will recapture a portion of our country's history and experience which all too frequently has been ignored or hidden or purposefully unexplored. This museum will allow all of us to learn about the tremendous contribution of African-Americans to our time and place.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a time when we need to draw on the collective wisdom of our populace it is now. If ever there was a time to learn from our past it is now. We must pass this bill and create the National African-American Museum for our past but particularly for our future.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this legislation to create a National African-American Museum. I note with pride that this bill was first introduced in the House in 1982 by the late Congressman from Texas, Mickey Leland.

Congressman Leland was a close friend of mine, and to many who have served here. His guidance and commitment to principle were among the predominant reasons for my entering public service. This legislation brings great honor to his legacy.

This museum will honor and recognize the often overlooked contributions of African-Americans to our Nation. It is most appropriate that this museum gain visibility as an important segment of the Smithsonian Institution.

When the National African-American Museum becomes reality, it will document the many accomplishments of Americans such as the great humanitarian Mother Hale, who offered her love and care to Harlem's weakest and most vulnerable.

This museum will also give Americans the opportunity to learn more about the notable suffragist, Ida B. Wells. She fought in the front line for the right to vote by women and people of color.

The heritage of these great leaders of American history will be consolidated among notable African-Americans ranging from Harriet Tubman to Langston Hughes to Thurgood Marshall.

I thank the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Georgia, as well as the chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, for their dedication to passing this long overdue legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 877, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the establishment of the National African American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. 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 H.R. 877, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM EXTENSION AT DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 847 to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 847

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PLAN FOR NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM EXTENSION.

The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall have authority to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1993, a total of $8,000,000 to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 847 authorizes the board of regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport.

This extension will provide the necessary storage space, restoration facility, and exhibition gallery for the museum to collect, preserve, and display aeronautical and space flight equipment.

Enactment of H.R. 847 will enable the Smithsonian to continue planning for the extension by investigating means of financing its construction. In fact, the Commonwealth of Virginia has committed itself to financially supporting the extension, and the institution expects to seek other funds from

non-Federal sources to complement those from Virginia and any that Congress may appropriate for construction.

The National Air and Space Museum is the most visited of all of the Smithsonian Museums. It is one of the brightest jewels of the Smithsonian's crown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 847, as amended.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do rise tonight in support of this legislation that seems to have had nine lives. For the past 12 years, the Smithsonian has been seeking a site to store our national treasures that are too large for the current Air and Space Museum. However, each year the bill has been delayed, by those who wished to see the extension located elsewhere in the Nation. Again and again the bill has been resuscitated, and five times since 1983, the Smithsonian Institution's Board of Regents has determined the Washington Dulles International Airport to be the most logical and cost-effective site for the museum's annex.

Almost $450,000 has been spent evaluating and questioning alternative sites, and time after time, Dulles has been the answer. Last year, the House resoundedly affirmed the regents' decision when H.R. 3281, a bill to open a national competition for the museum, was defeated 106 to 317.

The Dulles location sight has permanent access to an airport runway, sufficient area for present needs and future expansion, and both the interest and financial support of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The currently inadequately storage facility in Suitland, Md., has exposed the Enola Gay and other historical artifacts to metal corrosion, rust deposits, and extreme temperature fluctuations that have already added years to the artifacts' restoration time.

It is, therefore, more economically sensible to support the Dulles location now, before further deterioration occurs and repair costs escalate.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 847, legislation I introduced which authorizes the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport.

I would like to commend and thank the chairman of the House Administration Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials, Mr. CLAY, for his leadership on this legislation. I would also like to recognize the Libraries and Memorials Subcommittee ranking Republican, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and the House Administration Full Committee Chairman and ranking Republican, Mr. ROSE and Mr. THOMAS of California for their efforts on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I serve, along with Mr. NATCHER and Mr. MCDADE, as a congressional member of the Smithsonian's Board of Regents. I want to assure you that the regents' review process of the headquartering issue was a thorough one. We addressed this issue at no fewer than six specific regent meetings and votes.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that the Congress take action on this legislation. There is an inventory of invaluable artifacts ready to be displayed in the Dulles extension. These artifacts are temporarily being stored at the Garber Facility in Suitland. However, the lifespan of the Garber facility was due to expire during the 1950's and the objects being housed there are in danger of deterioration.

To ensure the preservation of the Air and Space Museum artifacts for future generations, a permanent facility with adequate accommodations is necessary. H.R. 847 will make great strides towards this goal by authorizing the planning and design of the National Air and Space Museum extension to Dulles Airport. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 847, a bill to authorize the construction of an annex to the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport.

Mr. Speaker, let me also thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] for his consistency and persistence in this over many, many years, and I do appreciate it.

I also want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for moving the bill and getting it out, and also I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] for his cooperation and help.

Mr. Speaker, great icons of American aviation—the *Enola Gay*, the S.R. 71 Blackbird spy plane, the space shuttle *Enterprise*, and many others—currently rest in various stages of deterioration in warehouses and quonset huts, out of the view of the American public.

Why?

Because there is no room for these large artifacts at the Smithsonian's main Air and Space Museum facility on The Mall. And because Congress has spent a decade debating the location of a proposed annex which could properly house and exhibit these aviation wonders for families who come from all over the country with the Air and Space Museum at the top of their sightseeing list.

It was in 1983, 10 years ago, when the Smithsonian Board of Regents, an independent body acting under its designated authority, decided to locate an annex, not a separate museum, at Dulles. This decision promptly took on an aviation life of its own, becoming for the last decade, a political frisbee in the Congress.

During this drawn out period of debate, the Regents have been required over and over to go back to the drawing board, and on at least five occasions, the Board has reaffirmed its choice of Dulles as the appropriate site for the museum annex.

What's worse, during this ten years of indecision, a generation of ten-year-olds has grown up and gone off to college, without the opportunity to experience some of the most fascinating testaments to our Nation's creative genius in civil, military and space flight. It is one thing to hear about the space shuttle *Enterprise* from your parents. It is another to go to a museum and not only view and touch it, but also perhaps to sit down at a computer terminal and become the astronaut who guided it through the galaxy.

Mr. Speaker, dating back to the legend of Icarus, aviation and space has held a special fascination for mankind. It is estimated that the Air and Space Museum extension which would be authorized by H.R. 847 will attract about 750,000 to 1 million visitors in its first year.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has reaffirmed its offer of a financial package valued at $150 million which includes infrastructure improvements, an interest free loan, bonding authority and direct site improvements. In addition, the private sector awaits the passage of this legislation in order to launch efforts to raise private funding.

Mr. Speaker, the other body has passed this legislation several times, but this is the first time it has ever made it to the floor of the House for a vote. This has in effect denied families a historical educational opportunity. I urge that we pass this legislation in the name of, not only the Nation's ten-year-olds, but also those of us who are several multiples of that.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support—my somewhat conditional support—for H.R. 847, which authorizes the Smithsonian Institution to plan and design a facility at Dulles Airport to house many of its priceless spacecraft, aircraft and artifacts. I support this bill because it's past-argument that the Smithsonian needs a decent

structure to replace the decrepit buildings at the Garber facility in Suitland, MD. I support it conditionally because that replacement for Garber is what is justified at this time, and I understand from the bill's sponsor and supporters that such a facility is all that is contemplated here.

□ 0040

By this I mean a facility that is designed and intended to address certain important needs in support of the National Air and Space Museum on The Mall with the mission to include conservation and protection of artifacts held by the Smithsonian, refurbishing and restoration of such items, providing storage and access for archival and research materials, preparation of materials for exhibit at The Mall museum and related activities. By way of contrast, however, the facility authorized by this bill is not intended to be a second Air and Space Museum with full exhibit space and visitor services comparable to the National Air and Space Museum. That, at least, is how the greatly scaled back proposal of the Smithsonian has generally been described, and I wonder if I might inquire of the sponsor of the bill if that is an essentially accurate description.

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

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The extension will provide a permanent modern facility for the artifacts that are currently at the Suitland site. The deterioration of these artifacts is a growing problem, and this plan is really for a scaled back display component at the Dulles International Airport site.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

In the past I raised objections to costly proposals to put a full-fledged museum extension at Dulles. But the proposal has now been reduced in scope and appears to address criticisms raised by the GAO and others. It is to be designed and limited to meet the immediate needs to protect, preserve, and restore the Smithsonian's extraordinary collection. A facility sized accordingly is necessary and appropriate.

I remain somewhat wary that this facility may eventually grow into that second full museum that the Smithsonian Board of Regents once contemplated. Let me just say that we do not have the money for anything like that in the foreseeable future, and if and when we do, it will be essential for the Smithsonian and the Congress then to consider the question of geographic equity and diversity in siting major new facilities. Sites outside the Washington metropolitan area offer advantages to the American public and taxpayers which will eventually have to be addressed.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 847, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for planning and design of a National Air and Space Museum extension at Washington Dulles International Airport.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. 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. 847, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

HOMELESS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2517) to establish certain programs and demonstrations to assist States and communities in efforts to relieve homelessness, assist local community development organizations, and provide affordable rental housing for low-income families, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2517

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 "Homeless and Community Development Amendments Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. INNOVATIVE HOMELESS INITIATIVES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle E of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act is amended by adding after section 443 (42 U.S.C. 11402) the following new section:

"SEC. 444. INNOVATIVE HOMELESS INITIATIVES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION.—The Secretary shall carry out a demonstration under this section under which the Secretary may provide financial and technical assistance—

"(1) to metropolitan cities, urban counties, units of general local government, Indian tribes, and private nonprofit organizations to demonstrate the desirability and feasibility of carrying out projects and activities that implement a work plan that provides for a continuum of care for homeless persons under subsection (c); and

"(2) to States, units of general local government, Indian tribes, and private nonprofit organizations to demonstrate the feasibility and desirability of carrying out innovative programs to assist homeless individuals under subsection (d).

"(b) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(A) The terms 'State', 'metropolitan city', 'urban county', 'unit of general local government', 'Secretary', and 'Indian tribe' have the meanings given such terms in section 102(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

"(B) The term 'private nonprofit organization' has the meaning given such term in section 422 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act.

"(C) The term 'homeless individual' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act.

"(2) FUNDING.—To such extent or in such amounts as have been provided in appropriation Acts for fiscal year 1994, $150,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to carry out the demonstration under this section in such fiscal year, of which—

"(A) $50,000,000 shall be from any amounts made available to carry out the shelter plus care program under subtitle F of this title in such fiscal year;

"(B) $40,000,000 shall be from any amounts made available to carry out the supportive housing program under subtitle C of this title in such fiscal year;

"(C) $25,000,000 shall be from any amounts made available to carry out the HOME Investment Partnerships Act in such fiscal year;

"(D) $25,000,000 shall be from any amounts made available to carry out the community development block grants program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 in such fiscal year; and

"(E) $10,000,000 shall be from any amounts made available under section 402 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to carry out the HOPE homeownership programs in such fiscal year.

Of any amounts made available to carry out the demonstration under this section, 50 percent shall be available for assistance under subsection (c) and 50 percent shall be available for assistance under subsection (d).

"(c) HOMELESS CRISIS FUNDING.—

"(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall designate such metropolitan cities, urban counties, units of general local government (including units in rural areas), and Indian tribes as areas eligible for assistance under this subsection, as the Secretary may determine. The Secretary shall establish criteria for making such designations, which shall at a minimum include—

"(A) the extent of unmet need of homeless individuals in the jurisdiction, including those who are wholly without adequate shelter of any kind;

"(B) the gap between the jurisdiction's existing system of assisting homeless persons and the continuum of care model described in paragraph (2);

"(C) the degree of cooperation between the jurisdiction and nonprofit homeless service providers;

"(D) the degree to which private nonprofit and for-profit entities express willingness to make financial and other commitments to the jurisdiction's homeless assistance efforts; and

"(E) national geographic diversity in the designation of jurisdictions.

After selecting areas for designation under this paragraph but before designating such areas, the Secretary shall consult with the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate regarding such designations.

"(2) WORK PLAN.—To receive assistance under this subsection within a designated jurisdiction, the jurisdiction or a private nonprofit organization shall submit to the Secretary a work plan that shall, at a minimum—

"(A) describe existing conditions for homeless persons and families throughout the jurisdiction;

"(B) set forth a realistic and feasible strategy that contains specific projects and activities resulting in a continuum of care for the jurisdiction's homeless persons and targets, goals, and strategies for implementation and completion of such projects and activities;

"(C) be prepared with appropriate cooperation from affected governments and government agencies, private nonprofit organizations, and contributing for-profit entities;

"(D) specify those projects and activities for which the jurisdiction requests funding from the Secretary under this subsection and the amounts thereby requested; and

"(E) specify courses, amounts, and timetables for the financing of other projects and activities.

"(3) DESIGNATION.—The designation referred to in paragraph (1) and assistance provided under this subsection shall be made on a noncompetitive basis.

"(d) INNOVATIVE PROJECT FUNDING.—

"(1) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance under this subsection to States, units of general local government (including units in rural areas), Indian tribes, and private nonprofit organizations for assistance for innovative programs to assist homeless individuals.

"(2) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for assistance under this subsection shall be in such form, and shall include such information, as the Secretary shall determine. Each application shall contain, at a minimum—

"(A) a description of the existing conditions for homeless individuals in the jurisdiction;

"(B) an explanation of how the proposed project will further the efforts of the jurisdiction to meet the housing and supportive services needs of homeless individuals through an integrated and coordinated system;

"(C) evidence that the application has been prepared in coordination with appropriate governmental entities, private nonprofit organizations, and for-profit entities; and

"(D) a description of the projects and activities for which the applicant is requesting funding under this subsection and the amounts requested.

"(3) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish selection criteria for awarding assistance under this subsection, which shall include, at a minimum—

"(A) the extent of the commitment of the applicant to alleviating poverty and homelessness;

"(B) the extent of the applicant's continuing capacity to effectively provide assistance to homeless individuals;

"(C) the extent to which the project or activity is innovative and may be replicable or serve as a model for implementation in other jurisdictions; and

"(D) diversity by geography and community type.

"(4) APPROACH.—Assistance under this subsection may be used to provide innovative approaches for, or alternative means of, meeting the immediate long-term needs of homeless individuals by assisting—

"(A) the purchase, lease, renovation, operation, or conversion of facilities to assist the homeless, which facilities shall be safe and sanitary and, when appropriate, meet all applicable State and local housing and building codes and licensing requirements;

"(B) the provision of supportive services for the homeless; and

"(C) such other activities as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(5) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall establish requirements for assistance under this subsection, which may include limitations on administrative expenses, terms of renewal funding for short-term lease projects, and requirements for repayment of assistance under this subsection when the project ceases to be used to assist the homeless in accordance with the provision of this subsection.

"(e) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress for each fiscal year in which the Secretary provides assistance under the demonstration under this section. The reports shall describe the activities carried out with assistance under the demonstration and set forth any findings and recommendations of the Secretary as a result of the demonstration. Each such report shall be submitted not later than the expiration of the 3-month period beginning upon the conclusion of the fiscal year for which the report is made.".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 101(b) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 443 the following new item:

"Sec. 444. Innovative Homeless Initiatives Demonstration Program.".

SEC. 3. MOVING TO OPPORTUNITY FOR FAIR HOUSING.

Section 152(e) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 1437f note) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "$52,100,000" and inserting "$165,000,000"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: "No amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1994 to carry out the demonstration under this section may be obligated to any public housing agency or expended before the Secretary submits to the Congress a report describing how amounts made available for the demonstration in fiscal year 1993 were allocated and expended and containing the information required in interim reports under subsection (d)(1), to the extent such information is available to the Secretary.

SEC. 4. ASSISTANCE FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may provide assistance under this section to the National Community Development Initiative for making grants under this section to community development support organizations for such organizations to assist local community development organizations in increasing their technical and administrative capacities and carrying out community development projects and activities and developing affordable housing, and to provide technical and predevelopment assistance relating to such community development and housing projects.

(b) ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS.—A community development support organization that receives a grant under this section shall use any such amounts to carry out the following activities and provide the following assistance:

(1) CAPACITY BUILDING.—Providing training, education, support, and advice to local community development organizations to enhance the technical and administrative capabilities of such organizations to conduct activities under paragraphs (2) and (3) and providing amounts for such organizations to obtain such capacity building assistance, which may include assistance to the staff, management, directors, and members of such organizations regarding legal, financial, construction, engineering, property management, and other matters.

(2) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING ACTIVITIES.—Providing amounts (through loans and grants) and other assistance for local community development organizations to carry out community development activities that benefit low-income families and activities to develop and support affordable housing, which may include providing financing for rehabilitating, constructing, acquiring, and maintaining affordable housing.

(3) PROJECT-RELATED PREDEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—Providing technical assistance and amounts to local community development organizations for predevelopment activities relating to specific projects under paragraph (2), which may include conducting project feasibility analyses, obtaining project consultants, preparing preliminary financing applications, obtaining legal, architectural, and engineering assistance, site acquisition, and title clearance.

(4) OTHER ACTIVITIES.—Other activities, as determined by the National Community Development Initiative in consultation with the Secretary.

(c) PROHIBITION OF USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS FOR SUPPORT ORGANIZATION ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—No amounts from a grant under this section may be used for administrative costs of a community development support organization.

(d) REQUIREMENTS.—The National Community Development Initiative may make grants under this section only to community development support organizations that—

(1) submit to the Secretary an application that contains—

(A) a request for a grant under this section that specifies the amount of the assistance requested;

(B) a description of the method by which the community development support organization will select local community development organizations to assist;

(C) specification of the intended beneficiaries of assistance provided by the community development support organization;

(D) measurable goals by which to determine the effectiveness of the use of the grant amounts; and

(E) such other information as the Secretary may require;

(2) are selected by the Secretary under subsection (f); and

(3) agree to comply with the provisions of this section and provide assistance in the manner described in the application of the organization approved by the Secretary.

(e) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not provide any assistance to the National Community Development Initiative from amounts made available for this section unless the Secretary determines that an amount equal to 3 times the amount to be provided by the Secretary has been made available to the National Community Development Initiative from private foundations and corporations for use with grant amounts for the purposes under subsection (b).

(2) UNUSED AMOUNTS.—Any amounts appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year which may not be used because matching amounts pursuant to paragraph (1) have not been made available in the year, shall be available or committed on October 1 of the next fiscal year for the purposes under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 205 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, in the discretion of the Secretary.

(f) SELECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall select community development support organizations for grants under this section from among organizations submitting applications under subsection (d)(1).

(2) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall make selections under paragraph (1) based on the information contained in the applications, the capacity and experience of such organizations to provide training, support, advice, and assistance to local community development organizations, and such other criteria as the Secretary shall establish.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In establishing the content of the criteria under paragraph (2), the relative weight to be given to the various criteria, and the process under this subsection for selection of applications for grants under this section, the Secretary shall consult with the National Community Development Initiative and the members of such Initiative.

(g) REPORTS.—

(1) GAO.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Congress describing the effectiveness of the use, by community development support organizations and local community development organizations, of amounts from grants under this section.

(2) SECRETARY.—Not later than 15 months after the date that amounts made available pursuant to subsection (i)(1) are first disbursed to the National Community Development Initiative, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress describing the activities carried out by community development support organizations and local community development organizations with amounts provided under this section and matching amounts, the effectiveness of such activities, and any other findings of the Secretary as a result of assistance provided under this section.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) DISTRESSED AREA.—The term "distressed area" means an area in which the percentage of the families residing in the area that are low-income families is substantially higher than such percentage for the region in which the area is located, or that possesses other characteristics indicating a need for housing or community development assistance, as determined by the community development support organizations.

(2) GRANT.—The term "grant under this section" means a grant with assistance provided under subsection (a) by the Secretary from amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (i)(1). Such term does not include assistance provided with any amounts made available by private foundations and corporations pursuant to the requirement under subsection (e).

(3) LOCAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS.—The term "local community development organization" means a nonprofit organization—

(A) that has among its principal purposes the provision of affordable housing in a distressed area or conducting community development activities that primarily benefit low-income families in a distressed area; and

(B) whose governing board is comprised of business, civic, and community leaders and residents of the distressed area in which the organization carries out its activities.

The term includes community development corporations and community housing development organizations (as such term is defined in section 104 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act).

(4) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT ORGANIZATION.—The term "community development support organization" means a nonprofit organization funded by the National Community Development Initiative that—

(A) has among its principal purposes providing assistance throughout the United States to local community development organizations to facilitate such local organizations' activities to develop or maintain affordable housing or revitalize distressed communities;

(B) has demonstrated experience and ability in providing a range of assistance to local community development organizations, which may include financing, technical assistance, construction activities, property management, and training; and

(C) meets standards of fiscal responsibility established by the Secretary.

(i) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts made available for carrying out the HOME Investment Partnerships Act for fiscal year 1994 shall be made available for use under this section to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, except that the amount so made available for use under this section may not exceed $25,000,000.

(2) COMMUNITY HOUSING PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES.—Section 205(1) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12724(1)) is amended by striking "$14,000,000" the second place it appears and inserting "$25,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2517, the Homeless and Community Development Amendments Act of 1993, which I introduced on June 24, 1993 with Congresswoman MARGE ROUKEMA, addresses several areas of critical concern with regard to this Nation's housing.

The bill at the desk is an amended version of H.R. 2517.

The Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, which I chair, and specifically the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, has worked closely with Secretary Henry Cisneros and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in drafting this legislation. In addition, on June 16, 1993, the Subcommittee held a hearing on the proposals contained in this legislation, at which Secretary Cisneros and various other public witnesses, testified.

First, the legislation would establish a homeless demonstration program to provide financial and technical assistance to State and local governments—including rural areas—cities, urban counties, Indian tribes, and private non-profit organizations, to assist areas experiencing significant homelessness in carrying out programs to assist the homeless. In addition, this provision provides for the development of innovative programs for the homeless. A total of $150 billion is authorized in fiscal year 1994 for this demonstration program.

Second, the legislation would increase the number of units of Section 8 existing housing certificates and/or vouchers for the Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing program. This provision increases the authorized level for the Moving To Opportunity For Fair Housing program from $52.1 million to $165 million in fiscal year 1994.

Third, the legislation would provide for a National Community Development Initiative [NCDI] program of assistance to local community development organizations. The NCDI provision is authorized at $25 million for fiscal year 1994 out of the HOME Investment Partnership program. In addition, this bill increases the amount authorized for the Community Housing Development Organizations [CHDOs] in FY 1994 from $14 million to $25 million.

While small in scope, this bill represents a beginning to the much greater work that must be done to address this nation's long neglected housing and community development needs. It is my hope, therefore, that we will have swift passage of this necessary legislation.

SHORT SUMMARY

INNOVATIVE HOMELESS INITIATIVES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

This would provide $150 million in Fiscal Year 1994 for the establishment of a new "Innovative Homeless Initiatives Demonstration Program". Funding for the program would be from offsets from the Shelter Plus Care and the Supportive Housing programs of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, the HOME Investment Partnership program, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and the Homeownership for People Everywhere (HOPE) program. This demonstration program would have two components, for "Homeless Crises Funding" and "Innovative Project Funding."

With regard to the Homeless Crises Funding component, HUD would designate metropolitan cities, urban counties, units of general local government (including units in

rural areas) and Indian tribes as eligible for financial and technical assistance. Among the criteria to be used to designate these areas are 1) the extent of unmet need of homeless individuals in the jurisdiction; 2) the gap between the jurisdiction's existing system of assisting homeless persons and other continuum of care models; 3) the degree of cooperation between the jurisdiction and non-profit homeless service providers; 4) the degree to which private non-profit and for-profit service providers express a willingness to commit to homeless assistance efforts; and 5) geographic diversity.

With regard to the Innovative Project Funding component, HUD, based on applications for assistance, would be authorized to provide financial and technical assistance to States, units of general local government (including units in rural areas), Indian tribes and private non-profit organizations for innovative programs for the homeless. Selection criteria for awarding assistance would include: 1) the extent of the applicant's commitment to alleviating poverty and homelessness; 2) the extent of the applicant's capacity to effectively provide assistance to homeless individuals; 3) the extent to which the project is innovative; and 4) diversity by geography and community.

MOVING TO OPPORTUNITY FOR FAIR HOUSING

This would increase the FY 1994 authorization for the Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing program from $52,100,000 to $165,000,000, increasing the number of units of Section 8 existing housing certificates and/or vouchers for this program. It also would provide that no funds appropriated for FY 1994 for this program may be obligated to any public housing agency or expended until the Secretary issues a report to Congress providing information regarding the FY 1993 allocations and expenditures under the program.

ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

This would provide funds for a public private partnership among the federal government, private foundations, and community development support organizations as program administrators. The partnership would be designed to build technical and administrative capacity among nonprofit community development organizations, including community housing development organizations, and to provide financial support in the form of loans, grants, and predevelopment costs for affordable housing and community development activities in distressed cities. For this initiative up to $25 million from the HOME appropriation is authorized.

HUD would provide funds to the National Community Development Initiative, a coalition of private foundations and corporate investors, in order to provide funds to community development support organizations selected by the Secretary. The federal funds would be leveraged at least three to one nonfederal to federal to comprise the pool. In turn the support organizations would pass through the funds to local community development organizations for the activities authorized to support the expansion of affordable housing and community development.

The provision also increases the authorization for appropriation from $14 million to $25 million for housing education and organizational support grants for community housing development organizations under the HOME program.

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE

Provides that this Act is to be cited as the "Homeless and Community Development Amendments Act of 1993."

SEC. 2. INNOVATIVE HOMELESS INITIATIVES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Amends Subtitle E of title IV of the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, creating a new section 444 establishing an "Innovative Homeless Initiatives Demonstration Program."

Establishment of demonstration: Requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to establish a demonstration under which it may provide financial and technical assistance under this section to: 1) metropolitan cities, urban counties, Indian tribes, and private non-profit organizations to assist them in implementing work plans to provide a continuum of care for homeless persons; and 2) to States, units of general local government, Indian tribes, and private non-profit organizations to assist them in carrying out innovative programs to assist homeless individuals.

Definitions: Defines, for purposes of this section, the terms "State", "metropolitan city", "urban county", "unit of general local government", "Secretary" and "Indian tribe" as having the same meanings as in section 102(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. Defines "private non-profit organization" and "homeless individual" as having the same meaning as in section 422 and section 103, respectively, of the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act.

Funding: Provides that, to such extent or in such amounts as have been provided in appropriation Acts for FY 1994, $150 million is to be available to HUD to carry out this demonstration. Provides that of this $150 million: 1) $50 million is to be available from the "shelter plus" program under the McKinney Act; 2) $40 million is to be available from the "supportive housing" program; 3) $25 million is to be available from the "HOME Investment Partnerships Act"; 4) $25 million is to be available from the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974; and 5) $10 million from the HOPE program under section 402 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act. Provides that of any of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section, 50 percent should be available to each of the two programs established by this section.

Homeless crisis funding: Authorizes HUD to designate the metropolitan cities, urban counties, units of general local government (including units in rural areas) and Indian tribes, that are to be eligible for assistance under this program.

Requires HUD to establish criteria for making such designation, including, at a minimum, 1) the extent of unmet need of homeless individuals in the jurisdiction, including those without adequate shelter of any kind; 2) gaps in the jurisdiction's existing system of providing a continuum of care for the homeless; 3) the degree of cooperation between the jurisdiction and non-profit service providers; 4) the degree of willingness by private non-profit and for-profit entities to make financial and other commitments to the jurisdiction's homeless assistance efforts; and 5) national geographic diversity.

Requires HUD to consult with the House and Senate Banking Committees after selecting, but before designating, areas for assistance.

Requires the designated jurisdiction, or a private nonprofit organization within a designated jurisdiction, in order to receive assistance, to submit a workplan, which at a minimum must: 1) describe conditions for the homeless in the jurisdiction; 2) set forth a strategy that will result in a continuum of care for the jurisdiction's homeless; 3) be prepared with appropriate cooperation from affected governments, private non-profit organizations and contributing for-profit entities; 4) specify the projects and activities for which funding is requested, and the amounts; and 5) specify the courses, amounts and timetables for the financing of other projects and activities.

Provides that the designation of jurisdictions and the assistance provided is to be made on a noncompetitive basis.

Innovative project funding: Authorizes HUD to provide assistance to States, units of general local government (including units in rural areas), Indian tribes, and private nonprofit organizations for innovative programs to assist homeless individuals.

Provides that the applications for assistance are to include such information as HUD may determine, but at a minimum include: 1) a description of the existing conditions for homeless in the jurisdiction; 2) an explanation of how the proposed project will help the jurisdiction meet the housing and supportive services needs of homeless individuals; 3) provide evidence of cooperation with governmental entities, nonprofit organizations and for-profit entities; and 4) describe the projects and activities for which funding is requested and the amounts.

Requires HUD to establish selection criteria for awarding assistance, which must include at a minimum: 1) the extent of the applicant's commitment to alleviating poverty and homelessness; 2) the extent of the applicant's capacity to effectively provide assistance to homeless individuals; 3) the extent to which the project is innovative, replicable or serves as a model for other jurisdictions; and 4) diversity by geography and community.

Provides that the assistance may be used to provide innovative or alternative approaches to meeting the immediate long-term needs of homeless individuals by assisting: 1) the purchase, lease, renovation, operation or conversion of facilities to assist the homeless; 2) the provision of supportive services for the homeless; and 3) such other activities as HUD may prescribe.

Requires HUD to establish requirements for assistance which may include limitation on administrative expenses, terms of renewal funding for short-term lease projects and requirements for repayment of assistance when the project ceases to be used to assist the homeless.

Reports: Requires HUD to submit an annual report to Congress for each fiscal year that assistance is provided under this demonstration, which report shall: 1) describe the activities carried out under the demonstration; and 2) set forth any findings and recommendations by HUD as a result of the demonstration.

SEC. 3. MOVING TO OPPORTUNITY FOR FAIR HOUSING

Amends Section 152(e) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, to increase the authorization for appropriations from $52.1 million to $165 million for the Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing demonstration program for FY 1994.

Amends Section 152(e) of the 1992 Housing Act to provide that no amounts appropriated for FY 1994 to carry out this demonstration program may be obligated to any public housing agency or expended before the Secretary submits a report to Congress describing how program funds in FY 1993 were allocated and expended. Requires that the report contain information required in interim reports filed under existing law, Section 152(d)(1), including a statement of the number of persons served, the level of counseling

and types of services provided, the cost of providing such counseling and services, and updates on the employment record of families under the program, to the extent such information is available to the Secretary.

SEC. 4. ASSISTANCE FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Authority: Authorizes HUD to provide assistance to the National Community Development Initiative (NCDI) to make grants to community development support organizations for the purpose of assisting local community development organizations to increase their capacity to carry out community development and affordable housing projects and to provide predevelopment assistance for community development and housing projects.

Assistance to Local Community Development Organizations: Requires community development support organizations to provide to local community development organizations: (1) capacity building assistance including training, technical, and administrative assistance to staff, management, directors, and members; (2) loans and grants and other assistance to carry out community development activities to benefit low income families and to rehabilitate, construct, acquire, and maintain affordable housing; (3) project related predevelopment assistance which may include feasibility analyses, providing consultants, financing applications, legal, architectural, and engineering assistance, site options or acquisition, and title clearance; and (4) other activities determined by the NCDI in consultation with HUD.

Prohibition on use of grants for support organization administrative costs: Prohibits the use of grants funds to provide administrative expenses for the community development support organizations.

Requirements: Authorizes the NCDI to make grants only to community development support organizations which have submitted an application to HUD. Requires that the application include a request for a specific amount of grant funds; a description of the selection process for local community development organizations; specification of the intended beneficiaries; measurable goals; and any other information as HUD may require. Requires HUD to select the community development support organization(s) for funding and that the organization(s) agree to comply with the provisions of this initiative and with the provisions of their applications.

Matching requirement: Requires that the NCDI match funds made available by HUD three dollars from private foundations and corporations to one dollar from HUD. Requires, at HUD's discretion, that any appropriated funds not used because of lack of matching funds, be available or committed to the next fiscal year for purposes of housing education and organizational support grants and other State and local housing strategies under the HOME program under section 205(1) and (2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act.

Selection: Requires HUD to select community development support organizations for grants pursuant to applications which shall be evaluated based on criteria determined by HUD in consultation with the NCDI and its funders. Requires such criteria to be based on information in the applications, the capacity and experience of the organizations to provide training, support, advice, and assistance to local organizations and other criteria established by the Secretary.

Reports: Requires GAO to submit a report to Congress not later than 3 years after the date of enactment which describes the effectiveness of the assistance and the uses of the funds by the support organizations and the local organizations. Requires HUD to submit a report to Congress not later than 15 months after amounts are first made available to NCDI, and annually for an additional 3 years describing the activities of the support organizations and local organizations with the HUD funds and matching funds, the effectiveness of the activities and any other findings.

Definitions: Provides definitions of "distressed area", "grant", "local community development organizations" which includes community development corporations and community housing development organizations under the HOME program, "grants" and "community development support organization."

Funding: Authorizes to be appropriated amounts not to exceed $25 million for FY 1994 for this program from the HOME Investment Partnership program. Also increases from $14 million to $25 million amounts authorized for appropriation for the housing education and organizational support grants under the HOME program.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation which would authorize four housing initiatives for the Department of HUD.

Several weeks ago, HUD Secretary Cisneros presented 10 legislative initiatives to the Appropriations Committee which he wanted added to the FY94 VA–HUD Appropriation bill.

Now, I want to commend the Secretary for his quick understanding of the major problems he faces as the new Secretary of HUD and for his commitment and enthusiastic support for solutions to those problems. As was the case with Secretary Kemp, this new Secretary has not shied away from seeking to put his mark on the housing needs of this Nation.

Unfortunately, none of the Secretary's proposals had been formally transmitted to our authorization Committee nor had the Administration briefed Chairman GONZALEZ, myself or our Subcommittee staff on the contents of these proposals or the need to move forward with them.

After reviewing each of these proposals, I expressed concern that several of these initiatives constituted various degrees of legislation which I felt should be authorized. In addition, at least three of the provisions would have reestablished discretionary funds within the Secretary's office which I felt needed much study.

And finally, I disagreed with the way in which these initiatives would be funded.

On May 25, I wrote to Chairman STOKES and Ranking Member LEWIS of the VA–HUD Appropriations Subcommittee asking that they not take any action on these initiatives until the Housing Subcommittee had a chance to hold a hearing and review the provisions of the programs.

This process was agreed to and for their cooperation, I want to thank Chairman STOKES and Mr. LEWIS. On Wednesday, June 16, our Housing Subcommittee did receive testimony from Secretary Cisneros on his proposals.

Immediately after the hearing, the Housing committee staff began working on legislative language which the Committee had planned to send to the Appropriations Committee.

On Thursday, June 17, Chairman GONZALEZ sent the legislation to the Appropriations Committee for their consideration.

Last Friday, I sent a letter to Chairman NATCHER and Ranking Member MCDADE expressing my preference that this legislation not be added to the Appropriations bill and that it proceed through the regular legislative process of authorization. I suggested that our Committee could consider introducing a bill and having it added to the suspension calendar if our remaining concerns could be worked out.

The Appropriations Committee adopted the fiscal year 1994 VA–HUD appropriations bill but decided not to add any of the legislative initiatives requested by the Secretary.

Subsequently, Chairman GONZALEZ and I introduced the legislation. Since there was majority/minority concurrence on the provisions, the decision was made to seek Leadership authority to take this bill to the Suspension calendar. This is where we are tonight.

SUMMARY

This bill includes four provisions. Only one actually constitutes the creation of a new program and none of the initiatives require new spending. All funding comes from previously authorized levels.

ADDITIONAL UNITS FOR MOVING TO OPPORTUNITY

This proposal would increase funding for the Moving to Opportunity demonstration program created in the 1992 Housing Act from $52.1M to $165M. Section 152 of the 1992 Housing Act created, at the request of Secretary Kemp, a program which would use Section 8 assistance, plus some additional funds for counseling, to help families living in public housing in areas with a high concentration of poor people, to find alternative housing in the private sector. HUD requested the additional funds in order to make the demonstration more viable.

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS

A second proposal would set-aside $25M from the HOME program to support additional non-profit capacity building through an initiative proposed by both the Enterprise Foundation and the Local Initiative Support Corporation [LISC].

These organizations will use these funds to leverage 3 times that amount for non-profit support and housing development. An additional $11M is added to the HOME program's Community Housing Development Organization [CHDO] set-aside. This authorization represents a reduction from the original request for $50M. We also added a GAO audit after one year and prohibited LISC and Enterprise from using any of these funds for administrative expenses.

INNOVATIVE HOMELESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

The final initiative would establish a $150M demonstration program within the McKinney Act to carry out innovative homeless programs which emphasize a continuum-of-car approach to the problem instead of the highly compartmentalized efforts which currently exist.

This program would also be used to support joint ventures with individual cities that have a significant homeless problem and who are experimenting with innovative solutions.

As originally proposed this program was to be a $200M discretionary program as well as

being non-competitive. The bulk of the funds were also to come from the HOME program.

This initiative is now a demonstration program and is competitive in nature. It is authorized for 1 year and is subject to a GAO audit. The majority of the funds for this program must now come from existing homeless program accounts.

These four initiatives are well conceived and do address several important areas where new ideas are most needed.

QUESTIONS

First, do any of these programs actually increase spending?

No. All of these initiatives are funded through the transfer of existing authorized accounts.

Why create new programs when HUD is having problems administering the programs they already have?

Of the four initiatives, only one really constitutes a new program.

That would be the authorization of the partnership between HUD and pension funds who wish to invest in affordable housing projects.

The remaining three initiatives are variations on existing HUD programs.

The Homeless initiative basically takes the fundamentals of the supportive housing, shelter plus care, and old supplemental assistance program, and melds them into one demonstration program.

The community development organization capacity building is an integral part of the HOME program as well as other community development initiatives.

The Moving to Opportunity initiative is an expansion of an existing authorized program.

Does the funding for the Homeless initiative come from existing McKinney programs or other housing programs?

Of the $150 million for this initiative: $90 million comes from existing McKinney programs ($45 million from supportive housing and $45 million from shelter plus care); $25 million from HOME; $25 million from CDBG; and $10 million from HOPE.

Does the legislation require the pension fund initiative to purchase properties held by HUD in its multifamily disposition program?

No. The pension fund demonstration program is designed to permit HUD to enter into a partnership with any pension fund to develop ways in which affordable housing investment opportunities can be made available to the billions of dollars held by pension funds.

Today, several billion dollars worth of pension fund money is invested overseas. This program would seek ways to direct some of that investment money into affordable housing in this country.

However, HUD currently holds a growing inventory of multifamily housing projects which have either defaulted or have resulted in HUD holding the mortgage.

Language in this bill authorizes the Secretary to use a significant amount of the funds made available for investment in the HUD FHA inventory when economically feasible.

How would the pension fund program actually work?

In the case of the AFL–CIO Housing Investment Fund, the Fund would attempt to identify economically attractive affordable housing and match that housing with a nonprofit or other entity willing to take ownership and management of the property.

The Fund would also seek financing for the project and would enlist GSEs such as FANNIE MAE or FREDDIE MAC to consider underwriting the mortgage.

Once all of this is done, the Fund would seek HUD's approval of Section 8 assistance as the assurances that some form of rent payments would be paid.

If the GSE purchases the mortgage and bundles it with other mortgages to issue a security, the pension fund would purchase the security.

□ 0050

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the bill we have before us is a modified version of the bill that came to the floor earlier, and that section 5 of the bill relating to section 8, Community Investment Demonstration Program, has in fact been stricken from the bill and does not appear in the version that is being considered on the floor.

I would ask the gentlewoman, is that correct?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is also correct, yes. The initial bill contained four housing initiatives. The bill before us this evening has only the three. The Housing Investment Trust Partnership has been deleted from this bill and will be considered at another time separately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], a distinguished member of this committee and one of the helpful authors of this legislation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we focus often on the disagreements and the problems. It should be noted that this is a case where a new Secretary came to the Congress and said,

> Given that we are in the middle of the budget year, I can't make a whole new set of changes. There are some important things I would like to do and not wait until October 1st.

Mr. Speaker, it is to the credit of the chairman and the ranking minority member, their constructive relationship that they have maintained, that we were able to bring a bill to the floor that gives the new Secretary the flexibility within existing budget rules to move forward. I think that is an example of cooperation, both Executive, Legislative, and across partisan lines, that ought to be noted.

As the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] correctly pointed out, we also had the Committee on Appropriations which had originally been asked to move ahead with this deferring, recognizing the authority of the authorizing committee, and it will work out well.

I did just want to note, as the gentlewoman acknowledged to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the last section of the bill was stricken. It is a provision that would ease the ability of pension funds to make some housing investments. I understand some Members have some questions about that.

I simply wanted to affirm I think that is good public policy. I think we have done it in the right way. I just wanted to note that it is being dropped today in the interest of proceeding with the less controversial parts, but that does not mean that part is dead. It is, as I understand it, the intention of the chairman and the ranking member for us to bring this bill back before the House after the recess as a freestanding bill, one that has some jurisdictional reference to education and labor. They talked about it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] wears two hats. She is the ranking member on the Housing Subcommittee and the ranking member sometimes on the Committee on Education and Labor. She is quite ranking and manages to cover many of these fields. But, thanks to that, I do believe, and I just wanted to note, we will be bringing to the floor, as I understand it, after the recess the provision in this bill dropped out so we can give the membership a chance to vote on what I think is a good provision.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the most honorable one here. I have two hats, but not two heads. I do appreciate the cooperation here. I have no doubt but we can in the time that we have before us resolve any outstanding difficulties. I think it is a matter of technicalities, and it is important for us to protect the pension funds and the fiduciary standards, and that they can be enforced. That is certainly something I will insist upon, and I know the chairman will, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. Speaker, I have every expectation that we can resolve any remaining difficulties.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA]. I also agree that we can bring forward a bill that fully protects the legitimate fiduciary responsibilities of pension funds, and also housing. I appreciate the gentlewoman saying that. I will testify that, having come here with her, the gentlewoman has never been known to speak through any of her hats.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, at this time of night, that is quite admirable.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2517, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT OF 1993

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2531), to extend certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 "Housing Programs Extension Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MANUFACTURED HOUSING.

(a) EXTENSION OF COMMISSION.—Section 943(g) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625; 104 Stat. 4415) is amended by striking "on October 1, 1993" and inserting "at the end of September 30, 1994".

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Section 943(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625; 104 Stat. 4414) is amended by striking "9 months after the Commission is established pursuant to subsection (b)" and inserting "August 1, 1994".

(c) INTERIM REPORT.—Section 943(d) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625; 104 Stat. 4414) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) (as amended by subsection (b) of this section) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

"(2) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 1994, the Commission shall submit an interim report to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Congress. The report shall describe the activities of the Commission under paragraph (1) and shall contain any information specified in such paragraph that is available to the Commission and any evaluations and recommendations specified in such paragraph that may be made by the Commission, at such time.".

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 943(f) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625; 104 Stat. 4415) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1994 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.".

SEC. 3. RECIPROCITY IN APPROVAL OF HOUSING SUBDIVISIONS AMONG FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 535(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490o(b)) is amended by striking "June 15, 1993" and inserting "September 30, 1994".

(b) RETROACTIVITY.—Any administrative approval of any housing subdivision made after June 15, 1993, and before the date of the enactment of this Act is approved and shall be considered to have been lawfully made, but only if otherwise made in accordance with the provisions of section 535(b) of the Housing Act of 1949.

SEC. 4. FHA INSURANCE AUTHORITY.

Section 531(b) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1735f-9(b)) is amended by striking "$65,905,824,960" and inserting "$92,146,000,000".

SEC. 5. GNMA GUARANTEE AUTHORITY.

Section 306(g)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)(2)) is amended by striking "$88,000,000,000" and inserting "$107,700,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2531, the Housing Programs Extension Act of 1993, which I have introduced with Congresswoman MARGE ROUKEMA, is legislation that is necessary to continue the existence of several important and useful housing programs, and to provide a critically needed extension of commitment authority for the Federal Housing Administration [FHA] insurance program and the Government National Mortgage Association [GNMA] mortgage backed securities program.

The bill first extends the existence of the National Commission on Manufactured Housing for an additional year, from October 1, 1993 to September 30, 1994. The bill also gives the National Commission additional time to issue its final report, and requires that it issue an interim report.

Next, the bill extends a requirement, which expired on June 15, 1993, for reciprocity for housing subdivision mortgage approvals, between the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] and the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA]. Specifically, this provision extends from June 15, 1993 to September 30, 1994, the requirement that HUD consider a VA certificate of reasonable value on one or more properties in a housing subdivision to be an administrative approval for the entire subdivision. The bill also gives limited retroactive effect to this extension to cover administrative approvals made after June 15, 1993 but before enactment of this legislation.

Finally, the bill increases the fiscal year 1993 commitment authority for the FHA to insure mortgages, and for GNMA to guarantee mortgage backed securities. With regard to both FHA and GNMA, HUD has informed the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development that their commitment authority will be reached well before the end of the fiscal year.

This bill specifically increases the commitment authority for the FHA from $65.1 billion to $92.1 billion in fiscal year 1993. For GNMA, the bill increases the commitment authority from $88 billion to $107.7 billion in fiscal year 1993. I would like to emphasize that this is an authorization provision. I understand that the Appropriations Committee will soon be addressing this issue in the upcoming conference on the fiscal year 1993 supplemental appropriations bill.

All of the extensions and authorizations provided by this legislation are needed and worthwhile. It is my hope, therefore, that can deal with this matter in a quick and thorough manner.

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN HENRY B. GONZALEZ ON THE INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2531—THE HOUSING PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT OF 1993

Today I join with Congresswoman Marge Roukema in introducing H.R. 2531, the Housing Programs Extension Act of 1993, legislation that is necessary to continue the existence of several important and useful housing programs, and to provide a critically needed extension of commitment authority for the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insurance program and the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA) mortgage backed securities program.

The bill first extends the existence of the National Commission on Manufactured Housing for an additional year, from October 1, 1993 to September 30, 1994. The bill also gives the National Commission additional time to issue its final report, and requires that it issue an interim report. The National Commission on Manufactured Housing was authorized in 1990 by the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to study and develop recommendations for modernizing the National Manufactured Housing and Safety Standards Act of 1974, and current construction and regulatory standards applicable to manufactured—or mobile—housing. The work of the National Commission is needed to insure that effective federal statutory and regulatory mechanisms are in place to protect the health and safety of current owners and future purchasers of manufactured housing. This bill, by giving the National Commission additional time to do its work, will help in attaining this objective.

Next, the bill extends a requirement, which expired on June 15, 1993, for reciprocity for housing subdivision mortgage approvals, between the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), thereby continuing the current streamlined process for such approvals. The bill provides for the continuation of a current statutory requirement that has been extended by Congress at various points in the past, the last time in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992. Specifically, this provision extends from June 15, 1993 to September 30, 1994, the requirement that HUD consider a VA certificate of reasonable value on one or more properties in a housing subdivision to be an administrative approval for the entire subdivision. The bill also gives limited retroactive effect to this extension to cover administrative approvals made after June 15, 1993 but before enactment of this legislation.

Finally, the bill increases the Fiscal Year 1993 commitment authority for the FHA to

insure mortgages, and for GNMA to guarantee mortgage backed securities. With regard to the FHA, HUD has informed the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development that their commitment authority will be reached well before the end of the fiscal year. HUD has warned that it would be unable to process any additional commitments for mortgage insurance under the single family program, whether for refinancing or for home purchases, if the authority is not increased. As for GNMA, HUD has estimated that it's commitment authority will also be reached before the end of the fiscal year. HUD attributes the increased activity with regard to GNMA to increased mortgage refinancing activity and new home sales. HUD has stated that the lack of additional commitment authority for GNMA would mean that mortgage backed insurance activity would halt completely, thereby seriously reducing that availability of mortgage credit.

This bill specifically increases the commitment authority for the FHA from $65.1 billion to $92.1 billion in FY 1993. For GNMA, the bill increases the commitment authority from $88 billion to $107.7 billion in FY 1993. I would like to emphasize that this is an authorization provision. I understand that the Appropriations Committee will soon be addressing this issue in the upcoming conference on the FY 1993 Supplemental Appropriations bill.

All of the extensions and authorizations provided by this legislation are needed and worthwhile. It is my hope, therefore, that this legislation will be considered in a quick and thorough manner.

SHORT SUMMARY

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MANUFACTURED HOUSING

This provision extends the termination date for the National Commission on Manufactured Housing from October 1, 1993, to September 30, 1994. In addition, the provision requires the Commission to issue an interim report on its activities, and any evaluations and recommendations, on March 1, 1994, and extends the date for issuance of the Commission's final report to August 1, 1994. Finally, the provision authorizes to be appropriated for the Commission, for FY 1994, such sums as may be necessary. The Commission was authorized by the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to develop recommendations for modernizing the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974.

RECIPROCITY IN APPROVAL OF HOUSING SUBDIVISIONS AMONG FEDERAL AGENCIES

This provision will extend the current requirement for reciprocity among the federal agencies for housing subdivision approvals, thereby continuing the current streamlined process for subdivision approvals. Specifically, this provision extends from June 15, 1993, to September 30, 1994, the requirement that the Department of Housing and Urban Development consider a Department of Veterans Affairs' certificate of reasonable value on one or more properties in a housing subdivision to be an administrative approval for the entire subdivision. This provision also gives retroactive effect to this extension, by considering any administrative approval of a subdivision made after June 15, 1993, but before enactment of this Act, to be approved and lawfully made, provided it is otherwise in compliance with existing law.

FHA INSURANCE AUTHORITY

This provision increases the FY 1993 commitment authority of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) to insure mortgages from $65,905,824,960 to $92,146,000,000. HUD has projected that the current FHA commitment authority limit for FY 1993 will be reached before the end of the fiscal year.

GNMA GUARANTEE AUTHORITY

This provision increases the FY 1993 commitment authority of the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA) to guarantee mortgage backed securities from $88,000,000,000 to $107,700,000,000. HUD has projected that the current GNMA commitment authority limit for FY 1993 will be reached before the end of the fiscal year.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE

Provides that this Act is to be cited as the "Housing Programs Extension Act of 1993."

SEC. 2 NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MANUFACTURED HOUSING

Amends Section 943(g) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, by extending the termination date for the National Commission on Manufactured Housing (National Commission) from October 1, 1993, to September 30, 1994.

Amends Section 943(d) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to extend the date for issuance of the National Commission's final report, from "9 months after the Commission is established" to August 1, 1994.

Amends Section 943(d) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to require the National Commission to submit an interim report, by March 1, 1994, to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and Congress, specifying the activities, and any evaluations and recommendations of the National Commission.

Amends Section 943(f) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, by authorizing to be appropriated for the National Commission, for fiscal year 1994, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 3. RECIPROCITY IN APPROVAL OF HOUSING SUBDIVISIONS AMONG FEDERAL AGENCIES

Amends Section 535(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 to extend from June 15, 1993, to September 30, 1994, the requirement that the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development consider the issuance by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of a certificate of reasonable value on one or more properties in a housing subdivision to be an administrative approval for the entire subdivision.

Provides that any administrative approval of any subdivision made after June 15, 1993, but before enactment of this Act, is to be considered approved and lawfully made, provided it is in accordance with the other provisions of Section 535(b) of the Housing Act of 1949.

SEC. 4. FHA INSURANCE AUTHORITY

Amends Section 531(b) of the National Housing Act to increase the limit on the fiscal year 1993 aggregate mortgage insurance authority of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) from $65,905,824,960 to $92,146,000,000.

SEC. 5. GNMA GUARANTEE AUTHORITY

Amends Section 306(g)(2) of the National Housing Act to increase the limit on the fiscal year 1993 aggregate mortgage-backed guarantee authority of the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA) from $88,000,000,000 to $107,700,000,000.

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

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2531, the Housing Programs Extension Act of 1993.

Although this Congress last year passed a 2-year housing authorization bill, certain provisions involving housing related programs need extensions and extra authorities.

There are four provisions in this bill.

The first provision would extend, for 1 additional year, the National Commission on Manufactured Housing.

The Commission was created in the 1990 National Affordable Housing Act to develop recommendations for modernizing the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974.

However, due to a delay in funding for the Commission, the Commission has just now gotten started and will need this extension in order to complete its mandate.

The provision also requires an interim report by the Commission by March 1, 1994, so that we may consider any recommendations they may have during our authorization hearings next year.

The second provision extends to September 30, 1994, a cooperative agreement between the Department of HUD and the Veterans Administration which requires the Department of HUD to consider the VA's certificate of reasonable value on one or more properties in a housing subdivision.

This provision helps to streamline the effort of home builders to receive assurances that their properties can be financed with VA- and FHA-guaranteed mortgages.

In the past FHA and VA have enjoyed a reciprocal agreement in approving new home/new subdivision mortgages. FHA has accepted VA certificates of reasonable value and the VA has accepted HUD conditional commitments.

This provision would extend that cooperation.

The third and fourth provisions would increase the commitment authority of the FHA to insure mortgages in fiscal year 1993 and increases the commitment authority of Ginnie Mae to guarantee mortgage backed securities.

These increases in authority are needed due to a higher degree of mortgage activity in 1993 due to lower interest rates, the reductions in the FHA single family mortgage insurance premium and the increase in allowable mortgage loan limits authorized last year.

This is a clear indication of our success in promoting homeownership through the FHA program.

□ 0100

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2531.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on both of the bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO THE STAFF OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I were not to note for the RECORD that these two housing bills and the legislation are the result of the maiden voyage or effort in this legislative scheme of things on the part of the new director of the subcommittee staff on Housing and Community Development, Mr. John Valencia, and the new counsel, Mr. Paul Ceja, and of course, present with us all through this late night is the overall staff director of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Mr. Meek.

I just thought it would be suitable to recognize that.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 2:30 p.m., on account of illness in the family.

Mr. COPPERSMITH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 2 p.m., on account of official business.

Mr. VENTO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BLUTE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of the imminent arrival of a member of the family.

Mr. MCMILLAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today and tomorrow, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. ISTOOK (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. SKEEN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today and the balance of the week, on account of recuperating from surgery.

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 Mrs. ROUKEMA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CANADY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HASTERT, for 60 minutes, on June 30.

Mr. TALENT, for 60 minutes each day, on July 13 and 14.

Mr. HORN, for 60 minutes each day, on July 19 and 27.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOPETSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKWELL, for 60 minutes, on June 30.

Mr. BECERRA, for 60 minutes, on June 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. ROUKEMA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEWIS of California in three instances.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. LEWIS of California in four instances.

Mr. KYL.

Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. LAZIO.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mr. KINGSTON.

Mr. GILLMOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RUSH.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mr. SKELTON in three instances.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. ACKERMAN in three instances.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

Mr. BAESLER.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. BLACKWELL.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

Mr. HUGHES.

Mr. FARR.

Mr. DEFAZIO.

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported what that committee did on the following dates presented, to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 16, 1993:

H.R. 890. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to improve the procedures for treating unclaimed insured deposits, and for other purposes.

On June 18, 1993:

H.R. 2343. A bill to amend the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 to permit States to adopt timber export programs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 29, 1993, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1487. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his decision to order a military strike on Iraq on June 26, 1993, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1544(a) (H. Doc. No. 103-104); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1488. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his intent to suspend indefinitely Mauritania from their status as GSP beneficiaries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2462(a). (H. Doc. No. 103-105); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

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. CLAY: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 877. A bill to authorize the establishment of the National African-American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. 103-140, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONIOR: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 210. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-160). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 211. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-161). 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. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 2531. A bill to extend certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COMBEST:

H.R. 2532. A bill to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Lubbock, TX, as the "George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HOLDEN (for himself and Mr. MCMILLAN):

H.R. 2533. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1996, the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFINGTON (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. STARK, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 2534. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow the deduction for advertising or other promotion expenses with respect to sales of tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWLAND (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 2535. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide additional authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide health care for veterans of the Persian Gulf war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself and Ms. LOWEY):

H.R. 2536. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the 7-year restriction on eligibility for widow's and widower's insurance benefits based on disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2537. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for full benefits for disabled widows and widowers without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2538. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 2-year waiting period for divorced spouse's benefits following the divorce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2539. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in widow's and widower's insurance benefits by reason of delayed retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2540. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase of up to 5 in the number of years disregarded in determining average annual earnings on which benefit amounts are based upon a showing of preclusion from remunerative work during such years occasioned by need to provide child care or care to a chronically dependent relative; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 2541. A bill to provide that pay for Members of Congress may not be increased in any fiscal year if, in the immediately preceding fiscal year, total budget outlays of the Government exceeded its total revenues; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and House Administration.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 2542. A bill to establish additional international exchange and training programs with the independent States of the former Soviet Union and the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 2543. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish requirements and provide assistance to prevent nonpoint sources of water pollution, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 2544. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to allow persons who suffer discrimination or a loss of business as a result of a violation of the antiboycott provisions, to bring an action for damages against the person committing the violation; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 2545. A bill to authorize appropriations for grants by the Environmental Protection Agency and other appropriate entities to assist colonias; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 2546. A bill to authorize appropriations for the provision of financial assistance to protect public health, the environment, and water quality along the United States-Mexico border; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H. Res. 209. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a two-thirds vote to waive any rule of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 18: Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 21: Mr. KLINK and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 58: Ms. FURSE, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 326: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. YATES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 417: Mr. BAESLER and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 501: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO and Mr. HAMBURG.

H.R. 502: Mr. HASTERT and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 505: Mr. GILCHRIST.

H.R. 656: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 723: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 773: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 786: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 790: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. LAMBERT, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 840: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 1006: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 1079: Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 1080: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1082: Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 1141: Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1158: Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 1161: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1181: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1200: Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 1251: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. CANTWELL.

H.R. 1279: Mr. FISH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. GRAMS.

H.R. 1295: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 1362: Mr. SABO and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1490: Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1526: Mr. HOKE and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 1560: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1583: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1697: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BUYER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KING, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. NATCHER.

H.R. 1738: Mr. SARPALIUS AND MS. LAMBERT.

H.R. 1783: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1786: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1900: Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. SABO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HAMBURG.

H.R. 1986: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 2026: Mr. HAMBURG.

H.R. 2043: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHENK, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2088: Mr. BEVILL and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2112: Mr. BARLOW, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 2136: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2142: Mrs. MEEK.

H.R. 2151: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WELDON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2287: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2307: Mr. HYDE and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 2331: Mr. KING, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. TORRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BARLOW.

H.R. 2370: Mr. TUCKER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 2414: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KING, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2415: Mr. KASICH, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2417: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 2441: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 2481: Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. DELAY.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. SAXTON.

H.J. Res. 79; Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr.

KASICH, Mr. MCCOLLUM,, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.J. Res. 88: Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 139: Mr. COOPER.

H.J. Res. 190: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.J. Res. 196: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SABO, and Mr. KIM.

H.J. Res. 198: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. SKELTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. GRAMS and Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 100: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. FINGERHUT.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. MORAN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. NORTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. HAYES.

H. Res. 134: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H. Res. 165: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Res. 174: Mr. TAUZIN.

H. Res. 175: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 10) 33

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INDEPENDENT UKRAINE AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. STENY H. HOYER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important countries to emerge from the dissolution of the Soviet Union is Ukraine. It is large, populous, rich in resources, and strategically important. It enjoys good relations with virtually all of its neighbors. Since becoming an independent state, Ukraine has made major strides in respecting the rights of its citizens, including its minorities, and toward finding its own place in the community of nations.

At the same time, independent Ukraine confronts difficult challenges—many the result of the legacy of Soviet rule. Ukraine's political situation is unsettled, partially the result of the lack of a new constitution that would clearly defined the separation of powers. Its economy, partly because of political paralysis, is in dire condition.

In April, I traveled to Kiev with a congressional delegation led by Majority Leader RICHARD GEPHARDT. We had the opportunity to meet with many Ukrainian officials, including President Kravchuk, Prime Minister Kuchma, and Parliamentary Chairman Pliushch. We heard from them, and many others, concerns about Ukraine's security vis-a-vis Russia. Much of Ukraine has been under Russian domination for over 300 years, and has endured systematic Russification and campaigns of denationalization. Talking to President Kravchuk and others in Kiev highlighted, for me, that Ukrainian motivations cannot be understood without considering the historical background. Ukrainians also felt that the United States was not taking Ukraine seriously. Our delegation brought this message back home with us, and, I believe that our visit and discussions will lead to a better understanding of Ukraine, and hence, a stronger basis of friendship between the United States and Ukraine.

In the last few months, Ukraine has been visited by Ambassador Strobe Talbot and by Secretary of Defense Les Aspin. Both have attempted to understand Ukraine's concerns, and to assure Ukraine of its importance to the United States. I especially want to commend Secretary Aspin for his proposal, forwarded to Ukrainian officials in meetings in Kiev earlier this month, to remove nuclear weapons from Ukraine's missiles and aircraft and place them under international supervision, on Ukrainian soil. This is an important issue for all concerned, and for the entire world community. I am also encouraged that the administration is emphasizing the importance of broadening the focus of United States-Ukrianian relations from nuclear weapons to a wider set of issues.

United States policy, to be successful, must deal with Ukraine as the separate, distinct, and politically important country that it is, and to stress commitment to its territorial integrity. We need to expand our assistance programs in Ukraine. As the report accompanying the recently passed International Relations Act of 1993 notes, "The U.S. must initiate a larger, more effective assistance program for Ukraine that promotes political and economic reform and is specific to Ukraine."

A recent Washington Post article, "Reborn Ukraine Faces Growing Pains in Its Quest for Global Respect," by Steven Coll, effectively describes Ukraine's current situation and the challenges it faces as a newly independent state.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1993]

REBORN UKRAINE FACES GROWING PAINS IN ITS QUEST FOR GLOBAL RESPECT

(By Steve Coll)

KIEV, UKRAINE.—Independent Ukraine is a child of the former Soviet Union that few outside its borders expected and, arguably, even fewer wanted. it arrived 18 months ago into a radically changed world as a lost nation reborn—embryonic, laden with grievance, surrounded by historic enemies and possessed of more than 1,500 nuclear warheads.

Now that Ukraine is threatening to keep these weapons, it has attracted the world's attention after an interlude of what Ukrainian leaders term grievous neglect.

As a result of Ukraine's threats, the West—particularly the Clinton administration—is being forced to reckon directly for the first time with Ukraine's passionate attempt to create a peaceful, independent and militarily secure country on land where no such country has existed for the last 350 years.

But a central difficulty is that Ukrainian leaders have expressed growing hostility toward the United States because of perceived American coolness toward Ukrainian independence—even as Washington has dispatched a succession of high-level missions to Kiev aimed at broadening the U.S.-Ukrainian relationship.

Apart from its nuclear inheritance, independent Ukraine looms as a formidable player in post-Cold War political, economic and security arrangements. The country sits astride central Europe, has a population as large as France, is rich in agriculture and contains a large share of the former Soviet Union's military and industrial infrastructure.

Anatoly Sobchak, the liberal Russian mayor of St. Petersburg, once called Ukrainian independence "a land mine under the future of all mankind." Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk prefers to think of it as "the great idea," albeit one he embraced only late in his career as a Soviet communist ideologist. At the least, it is an idea that a reluctant, distracted post-Cold War America is now trying to influence.

Yet Ukraine is far from realizing its potential, and the perceived perils ahead sometimes cause its leaders to offer apocalyptic assessments of their country's potential future, should "the great idea" of Ukrainian statehood fail, as it has twice before in this century.

"Our failure to survive would be coupled with conflicts, large-scale conflicts, confrontation between great forces, as it happened in Yugoslavia," Kravchuk said in an interview. "This might become a serious problem for the whole world. . . . A lot of human lives would be lost."

Ukraine's unexpected rebirth has in some respects flummoxed the West. As recently as August 1991, then-President George Bush wished publicly that Ukrainian independence would just go away. In what columnist William Safire dubbed his "Chicken Kiev" speech, Bush urged Ukrainians to remain part of the former Soviet Union, warming against the pursuit of "suicidal nationalism."

Bush's phrase partly reflected Ukraine's terrible and bloody history. In the 20th century alone, 13 million people have died violently on the land wedged between Europe and Russia that is now independent Ukraine. The victims were starved to death in a forced political famine, slaughtered in several wars, murdered in ethnic and antisemitic pogroms, executed by Stalinist firing squads and exterminated in Nazi death camps.

Ukrainian leaders, however, have interpreted their history not as a cautionary tale, but as a call to arms.

In the last brief interlude of genuine Ukranian independence, between 1917 and 1921, Ukraine's idealistic leaders failed to build an army—and were promptly overwhelmed by pro-Russian Bolsheviks, at what turned out to be an enormous future cost in Ukranian lives and freedom.

That experience is a driving force of Ukranian nation-building today, nationalist politicians and intellectual say. One lesson learned is that the state must first and foremost be defined as a body of armed men. A second lesson is eternal vigilance against Russia. Thus Ukraine's main priority since independence in December 1991 has not been economic or constitutional reform but the creation of the most potent and loyal military possible—a process in which the disposition of nuclear weapons plays a key part.

"Fundamentally, in our relations with Russia, that is where our fate will be determined," said Dmytro Pavlychko, chairman of the Ukrainian parliament's commission on foreign affairs. "And there we must take care of ourselves."

Measured against this intent, Ukrainian leaders feel they have succeeded well. They have lured home ethnic Ukrainian deserters from far-flung former Soviet army outposts. They have established panels to quiz ethnic Russian officers on Ukrainian language and history and have quietly shipped out more than 2,000 such Russian officers deemed to have failed their loyalty exams. They have engaged in detailed negotiations with Moscow for the division of prized former Soviet military assets.

But the specter of conflict with Russia still haunts Ukraine's government. Russian officials have made frequent and sometimes public comments about the inevitability of Ukraine's return to the Russian fold, and Ukrainian leaders worry that Russia's political class largely sees independent Ukraine as a temporary misunderstanding.

Moreover, Russia has refused to sign a treaty recognizing Ukraine's independence

and present borders if it leaves the Commonwealth of Independent States. Nor has Russia relinquished claims to the Crimea, the disputed peninsula ceded to Ukraine during the Soviet era.

"Most Russians think Ukraine is a toy town character, with the biggest expense being on cans of blue and yellow paint," said British analyst Neil Malcolm. "Ukrainian independence is regarded [in Russia] as a kind of phantom phenomenon that can't last."

In addition, Ukrainian officials complain vehemently that during and after the Soviet Union's collapse, the United States tacitly accepted Russia's tentative view of Ukrainian independence, and they say they doubt Washington is committed in any meaningful way to a long-lived independent Ukrainian existence.

A year ago, Ukrainian politicians hinted with relative timidity that they would be grateful for some form of U.S. security guarantees against Russia. Now several Ukrainian leaders say privately but adamantly that no matter what Washington promises in the form of such guarantees, they will be hard pressed to believe in them.

Some U.S. officials admit candidly to having botched the Ukrainian situation, at least until the most recent Clinton administration initiatives. A few even plead guilty to Ukraine's central charge—that the United States has so far signaled, in effect, that it will not respond vigorously if Russia seeks to retake Ukraine.

"Our policy was not to get involved in bilateral issues [between Ukraine and Russia], but the Russians were throwing the gauntlet down to the Ukrainians and we didn't say anything," said a U.S. official. "You can see a lot of things the Ukrainians are validly concerned about."

But does the United States really have a national interest in Ukrainian independence?

A few analysts, including Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Jimmy Carter's national security adviser, advocate promoting a strong Ukraine as a means of containing Russia's post-Cold War ambitions. But most U.S. policy makers emphasize support for a democratic, stable, free-market Russia as the best way to tame the historic Russian bear. And that approach only feeds Ukraine's insecurities.

Both sides in the American debate agree the United States has a national interest in preventing military conflict between Ukraine and Russia. But again, the emphasis from Washington has been on cooperation pacts and a balanced approach, not on hard security guarantees for Ukraine. Such guarantees would inflame Russian nationalists, among other things.

To Ukrainian leaders, all this sounds like impotent American confusion.

"They don't have a concept at all—not just as to Ukraine, but to Russia and all the countries of the former Soviet Union," said Pavlychko, referring with disgust to his latest talks with U.S. officials. "Right now all they are doing is looking at the largest beast [Russia] and throwing scraps at him."

The West's primary argument to Ukraine today is that Kiev is in danger of learning the wrong lessons from history. In the new world order, this argument goes, national security rests as much on economic strength and vitality as on military clout. And in this respect, Ukraine is failing badly.

Ukraine's economic output fell 20 percent last year, according to Western estimates. Inflation is running at about 25 percent to 30 percent per month. Energy supplies are short and likely to get shorter if Russia fulfills its recently announced plan to raise all oil prices to world levels. Privatization of Ukraine's massive, inefficient heavy industry and military-industrial complex has barely begun.

Yet despite growing recognition in Kiev of the urgent need for radical economic reform, the Ukrainian government has remained deadlocked.

Opposition leaders blame Kravchuk, along with former hard-line Communist allies in parliament and recalcitrant sections of the vast Ukrainian military-industrial complex, which made as much as one-third of the hardware for the Soviet military.

"Ukraine as a republic has no Yeltsin," lamented opposition legislator Serhii Holovatyi. The result, he said, is flagging commitment to Ukrainian independence, especially among the country's ethnic Russian population of 11 million, situated mainly in Ukraine's heavily industrialized east.

Yet the nominally liberal Ukrainian opposition has not pushed very hard for radical change, either. "I have an internal conflict when I do this," conceded opposition leader Vyacheslav Chornovil, a longtime political prisoner under Soviet communism, referring to his generally cordial relations with his onetime tormentor, Kravchuk. Yet it is essential to "build an independent Ukraine" by avoiding domestic conflicts, he said.

For his part, Kravchuk evokes fears that "rash steps can result in upheaval, and then there will be no reform at all." Better to move slowly under his own authoritarian leadership, he argued, "strictly along the center line."

EARLY INJUSTICE BREEDS INTOLERANCE

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Jennifer Prediger, as can be seen by the following, is not only an eloquent writer, but a gifted social commentator.

EARLY INJUSTICE BREEDS INTOLERANCE

(By Jennifer Prediger)

Children are greatly influenced by what they see. In American society one of the most powerful influences is the media. Early in life American children are introduced to the fantasy world of cartoons. However as American society becomes more of a mosaic of different cultures and beliefs, the fairness with which different groups are portrayed in cartoons becomes an issue.

In general, cartoons have not portrayed a diverse view of different races. Warner Brother's character, "Speedy Gonzalez" is an example of the stereotypes seen in many cartoons. Gonzalez is a rodent with an exaggerated Mexican accent who always has a taco in hand. Disney has also been guilty of feeding stereotypes to children in its portrayal of many characters. In the movie "Oliver and Company" large ebony Doberman pincers are given characteristics typically associated with African-Americans. They speak in slang, and are named after Cadillacs. In the cartoon "Tom and Jerry" the maid is always depicted as a robust, black woman.

In general, the main characters of cartoons are white, wealthy males. Women who have key roles in cartoons usually fit the same social and racial criteria. African-Americans. Asians, Latinos, and Native Americans are seen as subservients to white males and are often portrayed as barbaric neanderthals. Frequently, Native Americans are shown with tomahawks and headdresses participating in what is assumed to be tribal ritual. Oftentimes Asians are also portrayed in an unflattering light. The stereotypical views of different races that are often shown in cartoons are damaging to children because these images often provide them with their first glimpse of different cultures.

At Jefferson High School in Portland, Oregon, Linda Christensen teaches a course that exposes the racism and sexism present in cartoons. Her students watch numerous cartoons in class and afterwards do a series of follow-up charts. They critique the amount of sexism and racism in a particular cartoon. Several Jefferson seniors put together a pamphlet which rates cartoon on a grading scale of "A"-"F." The students have also developed a checklist which informs parents on what to look for in cartoon to decide whether or not the imagery is positive or potentially damaging to the child's view of different cultures.

As American society becomes more multicultural, there are more diverse cartoons being developed. In order for all cultures to be appreciated, images of all ethicities must be portrayed fairly.

THE HOUSING PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT OF 1993

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I join with Congresswoman MARGE ROUKEMA in introducing the Housing Programs Extension Act of 1993, legislation that is necessary to continue the existence of several important and useful housing programs, and to provide a critically needed extension of commitment authority for the Federal Housing Administration [FHA] insurance program and the Government National Mortgage Association [GNMA] mortgage backed securities program.

The bill first extends the existence of the National Commission on Manufactured Housing for an additional year, from October 1, 1993 to September 30, 1994. The bill also gives the National Commission additional time to issue its final report, and requires that it issue an interim report. The National Commission on Manufactured Housing was authorized in 1990 by the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to study and develop recommendations for modernizing the National Manufactured Housing and Safety Standards Act of 1974, and current construction and regulatory standards applicable to manufactured—or mobile—housing. The work of the National Commission is needed to insure that effective Federal statutory and regulatory mechanisms are in place to protect the health and safety of current owners and future purchasers of manufactured housing. This bill, by giving the National Commission additional time to do its work, will help in attaining this objective.

Next, the bill extends a requirement, which expired on June 15, 1993, for reciprocity for

housing subdivision mortgage approvals, between the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] and the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA], thereby continuing the current streamlined process for such approvals. The bill provides for the continuation of a current statutory requirement that has been extended by Congress at various points in the past, the last time in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992. Specifically, this provision extends from June 15, 1993, to September 30, 1994, the requirement that HUD consider a VA certificate of reasonable value on one or more properties in a housing subdivision to be an administrative approval for the entire subdivision. The bill also gives limited retroactive effect to this extension to cover administrative approvals made after June 15, 1993, but before enactment of this legislation.

Finally, the bill increases the fiscal year 1993 commitment authority for the FHA to insure mortgages, and for GNMA to guarantee mortgage backed securities. With regard to the FHA, HUD has informed the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development that their commitment authority will be reached well before the end of the fiscal year. HUD has warned that it would be unable to process any additional commitments for mortgage insurance under the single family program, whether for refinancing or for home purchases, if the authority is not increased. As for GNMA, HUD has estimated that it's commitment authority will also be reached before the end of the fiscal year. HUD attributes the increased activity with regard to GNMA to increased mortgage refinancing activity and new home sales. HUD has stated that the lack of additional commitment authority for GNMA would mean that mortgage-backed insurance activity would halt completely, thereby seriously reducing the availability of mortgage credit.

This bill specifically increases the commitment authority for the FHA from $65.1 billion to $92.1 billion in fiscal year 1993. For GNMA, the bill increases the commitment authority from $88 billion to $107.7 billion in fiscal year 1993. I would like to emphasize that this is an authorization provision. I understand that the Appropriations Committee will soon be addressing this issue in the upcoming conference on the fiscal year 1993 supplemental appropriations bill.

All of the extensions and authorizations provided by this legislation are needed and worthwhile. It is my hope, therefore, that this legislation will be considered in a quick and thorough manner.

SUMMARY OF THE HOUSING PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT OF 1993

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MANUFACTURED HOUSING

This provision extends the termination date for the National Commission on Manufactured Housing from October 1, 1993, to September 30, 1994. In addition, the provision requires the Commission to issue an interim report on its activities, and any evaluations and recommendations, on March 1, 1994, and extends the date for issuance of the Commission's final report to August 1, 1994. Finally, the provision authorizes to be appropriated for the Commission, for FY 1994, such sums as may be necessary. The Commission was authorized by the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to develop recommendations for modernizing the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974.

RECIPROCITY IN APPROVAL OF HOUSING SUBDIVISIONS AMONG FEDERAL AGENCIES

This provision will extend the current requirement for reciprocity among the federal agencies for housing subdivision approvals, thereby continuing the current streamlined process for subdivision approvals. Specifically, this provision extends from June 15, 1993, to September 30, 1994, the requirement that the Department of Housing and Urban Development consider a Department of Veterans Affairs' certificate of reasonable value on one or more properties in a housing subdivision to be an administrative approval for the entire subdivision. This provision also gives retroactive effect to this extension, by considering any administrative approval of a subdivision made after June 15, 1993, but before enactment of this Act, to be approved and lawfully made, provided it is otherwise in compliance with existing law.

FHA INSURANCE AUTHORITY

This provision increases the FY 1993 commitment authority of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) to insure mortgages from $65,905,824,960 to $92,146,000,000. HUD has projected that the current FHA commitment authority limit for FY 1993 will be reached before the end of the fiscal year.

GNMA GUARANTEE AUTHORITY

This provision increases the FY 1993 commitment authority of the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA) to guarantee mortgage backed securities from $88,000,000,000 to $107,700,000,000. HUD has projected that the current GNMA commitment authority limit for FY 1993 will be reached before the end of the fiscal year.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE HOUSING PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT OF 1993

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE

Provides that this Act is to be cited as the "Housing Programs Extension Act of 1993."

SEC. 2. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MANUFACTURED HOUSING

Amends Section 943(g) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, by extending the termination date for the National Commission on Manufactured Housing (National Commission) from October 1, 1993, to September 30, 1994.

Amends Section 943(d) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to extend the date for issuance of the National Commission's final report, from "9 months after the Commission is established" to August 1, 1994.

Amends Section 943(d) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to require the National Commission to submit an interim report, by March 1, 1994, to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and Congress, specifying the activities, and any evaluations and recommendations of the National Commission.

Amends Section 943(f) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, by authorizing to be appropriated for the National Commission, for fiscal year 1994, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 3. RECIPROCITY IN APPROVAL OF HOUSING SUBDIVISIONS AMONG FEDERAL AGENCIES

Amends Section 535(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 to extend from June 15, 1993, to September 30, 1994, the requirement that the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development consider the issuance by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of a certificate of reasonable value on one or more properties in a housing subdivision to be an administrative approval for the entire subdivision.

Provides that any administrative approval of any subdivision made after June 15, 1993, but before enactment of this Act, is to be considered approved and lawfully made, provided it is in accordance with the other provisions of Section 535(b) of the Housing Act of 1949.

SEC. 4. FHA INSURANCE AUTHORITY

Amends Section 531(b) of the National Housing Act to increase the limit on the fiscal year 1993 aggregate mortgage insurance authority of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) from $65,905,824,960 to $92,146,000,000.

SEC. 5. GNMA GUARANTEE AUTHORITY

Amends Section 306(g)(2) of the National Housing Act in increase the limit on the fiscal year 1993 aggregate mortgage-backed guarantee authority of the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA) from $88,000,000,000 to $107,700,000,000.

TRIBUTE TO ROMAN PUCINSKI

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a pillar of Chicago politics. Our former colleague here in Congress and my former colleague in the Chicago City Council, Roman Pucinski, is retiring from public life.

Roman Pucinski has spent a lifetime in service to the people of this country. His public service career began when he enlisted to serve in the Second World War in 1940. He went on to lead the first B–29 bombing raid over Tokyo in 1944. He received a Distinguished Flying Cross and an Air Medal with clusters for his service. Beginning with his election in 1958, Mr. Pucinski served 14 distinguished years representing the people of Chicago in Congress. Upon his retirement from Congress, Mr. Pucinski's service to the people of Chicago was far from over. He returned to his roots in Chicago becoming a city council alderman in 1973. He had a distinguished career representing the people of the 41st ward in the city council for the next 18 years.

Roman Pucinski's retirement from public life is a great loss to the people of Chicago and the Nation. However, we must be grateful that such a great man dedicated himself to serving the public good throughout his life. On behalf of Congress, the people of Chicago, and the people of this Nation, I want to thank Roman Pucinski for all his years of public service.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

HON. RICK LAZIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, subsequent to our vote of June 24, 1993, I would like to explain

my opposition to authorizing funds for the superconducting super collider [SSC]. This project, while scientifically meritorious, is just too expensive given our current balance sheet. Congress must finally face the reality that our financial resources are not infinite, and that we can continue deficit spending only at a real cost to our future welfare.

The questionable management and financing of the SSC does not warrant its $11 billion price tag. The administration's plan to stretch out the financing and construction of the SSC has dramatically increased its final cost. Such a strategy may ease the budgetary pain in the short term, but, for the long term, we simply do not know that those dollars—taxpayer dollars—will yield the greatest return if invested in the SSC. The time has passed—temporarily, we hope—that allowed us the luxury of sponsoring all the desirable, big-ticket science projects, however well-intentioned or noble.

It is also difficult to justify the expense of this supposedly, international scientific effort when the promise of foreign contributions remain unfulfilled. Supporters speak continually of the $1.6 billion in foreign investments, of which we have received only $65 million.

Fairness must also be a consideration in economic times such as these. The superconducting super collider has an average cost of $310,000 per researcher. For the price of one SSC scientist, the National Science Foundation could provide grants for 18 scientists involved in smaller research projects. Small science should not be shortchanged.

Voting against the SSC is not a vote against science. It is a vote for fairness and fiscal responsibility.

TRIBUTE TO CARTER G. WOODSON

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and extreme pleasure that I come forth today to acknowledge the late Mr. Carter G. Woodson, a celebrated African-American who devoted his life to the education and advancement of African-American history.

The son of a former slave, Woodson was a man of great knowledge with deep love for his heritage. Born on December 19, 1875, in New Canton, VA, Woodson moved to Huntington, WV, with his family when he was a boy. After graduating from Douglass High, a school for African-Americans, he continued his education at Berea College, the University of Chicago, and the Sorbonne. Woodson later graduated from Harvard University and became the second African-American to receive a doctoral degree from this distinguished institution.

Upon graduation at Berea College, Woodson returned to Huntington to serve as principal of his high school alma mater. Later, he again came back to the Mountain State to act as dean of West Virginia State College in Charleston, where he was instrumental in the school's advancement.

Known as the "father" of African-American history, Woodson was a remarkable scholar as well as a man of great experience and many accomplishments. With a great desire to learn and help others learn, he spent the majority of his time, from 1922 on, gathering and disseminating materials on African-Americans. With a mind full of new ideas, he founded both the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History and the Journal of Negro History and Associated Publishers, which published books about African-American history. Most notably, Woodson organized the first Negro History Week in 1916, which evolved into what is now known as Black History Month.

Since his death on April 3, 1950, Woodson has been nationaly recognized for his achievements. He has been featured on a U.S. postage stamp and has had libraries and schools throughout the Nation named for him. The Carter G. Woodson Foundation, which was created a few years ago, has established scholarships in Woodson's name and has set up a bibliographic center for books by and about him. Also, a life-size bronze statue of Woodson, which will stand in a small park near the former Douglass High School, is in the final stages of development.

I am sure that you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that Carter G. Woodson should be honored for his accomplishments. It is apparent that he was a man of great wisdom with many hopes and dreams for his fellow African-Americans. His numerous contributions to African-American history cannot go unnoticed. He is truly an inspiration to all.

TRIBUTE TO LAMONT "ALI" HACKETT

HON. LUCIEN E. BLACKWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to Mr. Lamont "Ali" Hackett. Mr. Hackett is an outstanding gentleman who has faithfully dedicated the past 20 years to helping others.

Throughout the city of Philadelphia, Mr. Hackett is well known for his ability to serve the community in a number of capacities. As a radio personality, community activist, singer, Golden Gloves Boxing Champion, and humanitarian, Lamont "Ali" Hackett has truly served the city of Philadelphia well.

As a disc jockey on Philadelphia's famous WHAT–AM radio, he has entertained a host of individuals throughout Philadelphia and the entire Delaware Valley area. The famous "Oldies But Goodies" music featured on his radio show has certainly made him a celebrated Philadelphia personality.

One of Mr. Hackett's most interesting qualities is his inspiring commitment to children. In addition, he has tirelessly worked to uplift the standard of living of underprivileged children in both Chester and Philadelphia, PA.

Also, Mr. Speaker, "Ali" Hackett must be commended because he has been a valiant leader in the struggle to end gang-related violence. He has worked with the Old Head's Association as a volunteer helping to redirect the lives of young Philadelphians who have been involved in gang activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here today to honor this great man. He is an exceptional individual who has set a fine example for both children and adults to emulate. I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Lamont "Ali" Hackett for his 20 years of dedicated service to his community.

KEMP'S GAME PLAN FOR GOP TRIUMPH

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1993, there was an article in the Washington Times, entitled "Kemp's Game Plan for GOP Triumph." I think that Cal Thomas made some excellent observations about what the Republican Party and Jack Kemp stand for. I would like for all of my colleagues to take some time to read this article and examine Jack's game plan to improve the future of our great country.

Jack Kemp believes the Clinton presidency is providing Republicans with an unexpected opportunity to take back the White House and the Senate and make substantial inroads in the Democratic majority in the House. The trick is not to blow it by allowing the party to fragment over social vs. economic issues.

Mr. Kemp has been criticized for overemphasizing economics while downplaying more divisive social issues such as abortion and gay rights. The rap on Mr. Kemp was summarized recently by conservative activist Paul Weyrich: "The problem is that he does not believe that there are any enemies. . . . He doesn't believe there are any evil forces."

Mr. Kemp does believe in enemies and evil forces, but he also believes the way Republicans have chosen to overcome them are less effective than they once were. He wants to hold to principle while changing tactics. Mr. Kemp thinks applying the rhetoric of the 1980s to the 1990s will harm the GOP's chance to regain not only control of government, but also control of the economic and social agenda.

Mr. Kemp sees "social issues" as a seamless garment that ought not to be limited to abortion and gay rights. "Education is a social issue," he tells me. "So (are) poverty, drugs, crime, teen pregnancy—these bother a lot of liberals and Democrats as well as conservatives and Republicans."

Mr. Kemp believes that the way he speaks about these subjects is as important as the positions he takes. "It's important to express it in a way in which you're not portrayed as uncivil or insensitive or judgmental or mean-spirited," he says. "It doesn't mean you're tolerant of evil. You can be intolerant of evil and still be tolerant of the plight of a person or family."

The former nine-term congressman and one-term secretary of housing and urban development seeks a new way to address the abortion issue without compromising principle. Mr. Kemp would start at the fringes and work inward, restricting abortion in the third trimester, requiring parents to be notified before their minor child has an abortion, prohibiting federal funding of the operation, promoting adoption (a daughter and son-in-law recently adopted a child) and doing whatever is necessary to reduce the high

number of abortions, now averaging 1.6 million per year.

But Mr. Kemp believes Republicans will not be able to ride back into power on the single horse of social issues. They must be accompanied by a principled pragmatism that welcomes other riders, whether or not they pass an ideological litmus test.

"Bill Clinton persists in going down a moral, intellectual and economic cul de sac," he says. "It's more than the 'nanny state' he's trying to create. He wants government to be the mother, father, banker, investor and credit allocator. This is the most massive expansion of government in the life of the average individual in at least 50 years, perhaps in this century."

Mr. Kemp believes Mr. Clinton's lifelong goal was to be president, and now that he is, he doesn't have a clear agenda of what to do. "Hillary wants to do something," he says. "She has a clearer agenda than he does."

Mr. Kemp believes it is possible—in fact imperative—to marry economic and moral issues. In a speech last week to a group of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish leaders, who had authored the position paper "Call to the Common Ground for the Common Good," Mr. Kemp was forceful on the social issues. His manner was persuasive, not confrontational. He called the debate within the Republican Party between economic growth and cultural renewal a false choice: "The ideas are mutually reinforcing and interdependent. In fact, the very word 'economics' originally meant the study of the family and the home, not the distribution of material goods."

Democratic capitalism can succeed, he told them, "only on a foundation of strong moral principles. Investment is impossible without the virtue of self-denial and a willingness to postpone instant gratification: savings requires the faith to think in terms of the future rather than the present. Risk-taking and entrepreneurship are only undertaken with a self-confidence that comes by building moral character. Freedom itself depends on an individual sense of responsibility to oneself and one's family."

If Jack Kemp has moved, it's not away from any core beliefs or values. It is toward an effective way of expressing them and using them to restore his party to power.

If Mr. Kemp is successful, he might re-establish the dispersed Reagan coalition, and his party could win congressional seats next year. If so, Mr. Kemp will be well-positioned to take his enthusiasm and his agenda—which he might call (with apologies to ABC News) an American Agenda—into the White House in '96. It's quite a task, but quarterbacks are used to big challenges.

RECOGNITION OF THE C–17 AND THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AEROSPACE INDUSTRY WORKERS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1993, at 10:58 a.m., the first operational C–17, with the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Merrill McPeak at the controls, touched down on the runway at Charleston Air Force Base, SC, ushering in a new era of airlift capability for the United States. With the delivery of P–6, the sixth production C–17 Globemaster III, comes a quantum advance in America's ability to move large quantities of war fighting or humanitarian forces and supplies from the United States to small austere airfields. No other airlift aircraft in the United States arsenal of airlift will be able to move 160,000 pounds of troops and their equipment, 2,400 nautical miles without air refueling, and landing on a runway less than 3,000 feet long.

This magnificent contribution to America's "global reach" capability could not have been possible without the tireless and skilled dedication of the more than 8,000 aerospace industry workers living and contributing to the economic and community life in southern California. From the assembly workers on the floor of the main manufacturing plant in Long Beach to those who will be involved with the landing demonstrations at Twenty-nine Palms about a year from now, everyone of these fine Californians can be proud of the hand each had in making the C–17 a reality today and providing the Nation a new generation of airlifter for the force projection needs of the 21st century.

The complexion of conflict has changed over the course of these last few years. From now on, getting forces quickly from the forts in the United States to the foxholes in distant lands or humanitarian aid to those in need will be the challenge. The C–17, the Air Mobility Command's core airlifter and replacement for the ailing C–141, will be leading the way, and making sure that C–17's will be produced and delivered to meet that challenge will be the aerospace industry professionals in southern California.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS INTEGRITY ACT OF 1993

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced H.R. 2512, the Social Security Trust Funds Integrity Act of 1993.

This bill would restore the integrity of the trust funds by establishing a bipartisan Board of Trustees to administer and invest the funds, essentially preventing the Federal Government from using the funds to pay for new programs.

Currently, the Secretary of the Treasury, who serves at the pleasure of the President and is therefore subject to political pressures, can dip into those funds and spend them any way he sees fit. I would not only like to spare him this temptation, but absolutely prohibit these funds from being used for any purpose other than to benefit Social Security recipients.

Specifically, my bill would establish a Board of Trustees chaired by a Managing Trustee. These Trustees would be formally appointed by the President at the recommendation of several Members within the House and Senate and the five largest organizations representing seniors organizations. The Trustees would be subject to term limits.

These funds belong to the people who contributed to them, not the Federal Government. Beneficiaries have a right to see that their money is managed in their best interests, not political interests. There should be a separate and distinct wall between the funds and the big-spending liberals here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage every Member of this House to support my bill.

INTRODUCTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY BILLS

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with Congresswoman LOWEY, have introduced a package of Social Security bills that will help one of the most economically disadvantaged group in our country.

While, the economic circumstances of many older people have improved over the years there has also been increasing concern about those aged whose situations continue to deteriorate. Numerous studies have now documented the fact that aged poverty is increasingly concentrated among widowed, divorced, and disabled older women. Presently, about 75 percent of the elderly who live in poverty are women. In the year 2020, nearly all of the elderly living in poverty will be women and their numbers are not expected to decrease.

It is because of statistics like these that I have been working to improve the economic status for all older women. Over the past 4 years, in my position as the former chairman of the Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Retirement Income, I have gathered troubling data and testimony which reveals that income security during retirement will elude a substantial proportion of older women, both now and in the future.

According to the 1990 census, one in four persons aged 65 and over have annual incomes of $9,500 or less. For many older women in particular, the situation is even worse. Half of all elderly women living alone have incomes of less than $9,500 per year. During old age, the risk of being poor is 70-percent greater for a woman than it is for a man. While there are a number of factors for this disparity, but the main problem is an outdated retirement system and I believe, that there is a serious need to improve the overall nature of this system soon, or millions of women will become destitute in old age as the baby boom generation retires.

When measuring whether the Social Security System is adequate and equitable, I am greatly concerned that although our mothers, wives, and daughters are spending more time in the labor force, poverty among older women is projected to continue to grow well into the next century. The figures speak for themselves. A widowed woman is four times more likely, and a single or divorced woman five times more likely, to live in poverty after retirement than married women. Furthermore, older women are almost twice as likely as older men to have Social Security benefits as their only source of income.

This legislation takes an important first step toward addressing some of the inequities and inadequacies of the Social Security program.

Furthermore, it also recognizes the changing nature of the American workforce and the increasing role which women are playing in our economy. This package of legislation consists of:

Eliminating the 7-year waiting requirement for disabled widows.—This requires that a widow's disability have its onset within 7 years of the wage earner's death. The original rationale for this rule was that the widows should be able to earn their own worker benefits after 7 years. However, increased work force participation requirements to qualify for benefits means that widows in their late fifties could work every day after widowhood past the 7-year eligibility period and still not accumulate a work history sufficient to provide their own disabled work benefits.

Eliminating the 50 year age requirement for disabled widows.—A widow of any age who is unable to do substantial gainful activity needs the protection of Social Security. Unfortunately, she is not eligible under current law until age 50. When the concept of benefits for disabled widows was introduced in the Congress, the potential number of beneficiaries was unknown. To get some coverage for disabled widows into law, but also protect the system from an influx of beneficiaries, it was agreed that age 50 would be a temporary limit and the issue would be revisited when the program had stabilized. That was 1967.

Eliminating the 2 year waiting period for divorced spouses over age 62.—A divorced person age 62 and over can receive Social Security upon divorce if the former spouse is drawing Social Security, but must wait 2 years if the former spouse is still in the workforce. This 2 year waiting period can be a time of great deprivation with no alternative options available to her.

Working widows who delay receiving benefits should be given delayed retirement credits [DRC's] in addition to widow benefits.—Though an employed widow over age 65 is accumulating DRC's on her own work record, these will most likely be lost once she retires, since at that time she will draw the higher of her widow benefits on her own earnings record.

Projections indicate that unless we take action now, by the year 2020 more than 2 out of 5 women who live alone during retirement will have incomes below 150 percent of the poverty level and we cannot allow this to happen.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 60th wedding anniversary of Wilbur Grove Smith, Sr., and Virginia Wingard Smith of Savannah, GA. They were married on August 14, 1933, in Savannah, and have resided there for the entire 60 years of their marriage. They were married at home and took a honeymoon cruise from the docks along the Savannah River waterfront, a tradition that has since disappeared from our beautiful city.

Mr. Smith is originally from Johnstown, PA, and Youngstown, OH. Mrs. Smith is a native of Savannah.

Mr. and Mrs. Smith have 4 children, 10 grandchildren, and 10 great-grandchildren. Mrs. Smith is a homemaker and mother, along with being very active in church and civic organizations. Mr. Smith is retired from service to the U.S. Postal Service. They are members of St. Paul's Lutheran Church in Savannah.

I ask that the House of Representatives join me today in recognizing this 60-year marriage. This lovely couple is to be congratulated and honored. I am sure their family and friends will also join me in wishing them a happy anniversary. I hope they will have many more glorious years together.

TRIBUTE TO THE CLASS OF 1943 GRADUATING NURSES FROM THE AUBURN CITY HOSPITAL

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the nurses graduating class of 1943 from the Auburn City Hospital, now known as Auburn Memorial Hospital, located in Auburn, NY. This wonderful facility opened its doors to the public for the first time on April 20, 1880. Seven years later it established a training school for nurses.

Those we honor today graduated 50 years ago. Many joined the military of this great Nation and served with distinction during World War II. Their loyalty, dedication and courage reflect favorably upon them and the chosen career they represent. When one speaks to the veterans of that era you hear nothing but praise for the nurses who did so much for so many during those difficult times.

I am proud to honor the class of 1943 from the Auburn City Hospital. They deserve the recognition and thanks of all Americans for their great contributions to this Nation. Congratulations to Mildred Driscoll, Jean Kulakowski, Jane Ragusa, Barbara Banfield, Jean LaDue, Betty Ross, Bessie Buser, Virginia Hewitt, Margaret DiFabian, Helen Phillips and Betsy Ukolowicz. You are very special people who give so much and expect so little in return.

On behalf of all your family members and friends, a "well done" from a grateful nation. May God bless each of you every day of your life.

CANCER TREATMENT EXPERTS CALL FOR CONTINUATION OF SPACE STATION FUNDING

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the debate on funding for the U.S. space station continues, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues testimony of two distinguished professors from the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center in Houston, delivered before the Subcommittee on Space. This testimony, given by Charles A. LeMaistre, M.D., and Neal Pellis, Ph.D., help to illustrate the important role that the space station will play in researchers' efforts to find the causes and cures of cancer and other deadly diseases.

President of the internationally esteemed M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Dr. LeMaistre is also a professor of medicine and author of numerous articles on respiratory diseases, oncology, and the health risks of smoking. He is part president of the American Cancer Society, a frequent consultant to the National Institutes of Health, and chairperson or the NASA/NIH Joint Advisory Committee on Behavioral Research.

Dr. Pellis is associate professor in the department of surgical oncology at M.D. Anderson and holds adjunct professorships in the Department of Immunology and Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences at U.T. Healthy Science Center. A proficient lecturer, researcher, and author, Dr. Pellis has worked with NASA in researching the immunology of cancer and has performed experiments with NASA space shuttle missions.

These two men are not only experts in their disciplines, but they also have vast experience in the field of medical research in the low gravity environment of outer space. I hope that each of my colleagues will take the time to consider the points made by Drs. LeMaistre and Pellis, and I hope that they will help sway their opinions as we debate further the merits of our Nation's space program.

Their statements follow:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES A. LEMAISTRE, M.D., PRESIDENT, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS M.D. ANDERSON CANCER CENTER

Chairman Hall and members of the Subcommittee, I am Dr. Charles LeMaistre, President of the University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center. I appreciate the invitation to visit with you again about matters that affect the lives of all Americans.

Since I met with you almost exactly a year ago, NASA and the National Institutes of Health signed an agreement to stimulate new opportunities in the biomedical and behavioral research community. I am pleased to report that the NASA-NIH Joint Advisory Committee formed through this agreement has held a productive first meeting to discuss ways we can ensure the maximum return on our investment in space-based biomedical research. As chairperson of this Joint Advisory Committee, I assure you we will strive to capitalize on the strengths of each agency and to be mutually beneficial.

These are especially challenging times as you in the Congress balance so many requests to fund programs that could improve the health and welfare for millions of Americans. One of the most promising new developments was the Biomedical Research in Space Act of 1992 (H.R. 3922), introduced last year by Chairman Hall and included in the NASA Reauthorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993. This recommendation was a big step in the right direction to facilitate transferring information acquired in space to solving critical problems on earth.

With this legislation now in law, we have new opportunities to seek earmarked funds for biomedical research in space. We cannot afford to lose the lead this country has in the space field. I was delighted to hear President Clinton's vow last week to "stay first in science and technology" and to "stay first in space" when he outlined his support for development of a modified Space Station.

Certainly, there are many examples of how research conducted in space has benefitted our health. I will mention only two areas that are vital to those of us in the cancer field:

(1) With the rapidly increasing depletion of the ozone layer, it is imperative that we monitor ultraviolet B radiation at the Earth's surface and from above. Scientists at M.D. Anderson are studying new ways to halt the rising epidemic of skin cancers—particularly the most serious form, melanoma—caused by excessive exposure to UV-B radiation.

New evidence also is accumulating about how chronic exposure to UV radiation can lead to reduced natural resistance to several forms of cancer and other major diseases. Animal research conducted at our institution and elsewhere suggest that prolonged UV radiation exposure plays a role in infectious diseases as well as cancer.

(2) We are all aware of studies showing serious health problems can result from humans living in isolation. Current and proposed studies in space will help us understand more about how our immune system works and what causes it to break down.

When I was here last June, I told you about one exciting experiment that M.D. Anderson would have on the Space Shuttle Endeavor. Today, I am pleased to introduce Dr. Neal Pellis, an immunologist and associate professor of surgery at M.D. Anderson, who designed the experiment. He will share with you the latest data gleaned from his group's project.

We both appreciate your time and interest. Doctor Pellis.

PERFORMANCE OF IMMUNE CELLS IN MICROGRAVITY

(By Neal R. Pellis, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Departments of Surgical Oncology and Immunology, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee I am Neal R. Pellis an Associate Professor and Cancer Immunologist from the Department of Surgical Oncology at the University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas. I thank you for the opportunity to appear here and present some of the exciting findings in our immunological research using the resources available through NASA and the Johnson Space Center (Aaron Cohen, Director). My laboratory and staff investigate the immunology of cancers with the aim of providing immunologically based strategies for the treatment and prevention of cancer. I am here today to speak in support of the biomedical research conducted under the sponsorship of and in collaboration with NASA. The investigations include ground based studies, shuttle missions and, proposed long term manned missions.

MICROGRAVITY AND IMMUNOLOGY

Resistance to infectious disease and to cancer relies upon the ability of the immune cells to migrate through the tissues to afflicted sites and to attack the foreign invader. Passage through tissue requires that the immune cells "crawl" through the "cement" that binds the cells together. This "cement" called matrix is comprised of many proteins including a major constituent, collagen. Thus in cancer and in infection we seek ways to promote tissue invasion by immune cells called lymphocytes. On the other hand in organ transplantation, we attempt to minimize tissue invasion to protect transplanted organs from rejection. In autoimmune disease the immune system attacks an otherwise normal organ or tissue. In all three settings it is clinically advantageous to be able to control the movement of lymphocytes in tissue. Thus, in some instances lymphocyte invasion of tissue is desirable while in others it is detrimental.

For the past two years we have conducted experiments on the promotion of cancer invasion by the patients own immune cells. Our investigations at the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center are summarized as follows: (1) As the immune cells approach the region growing cancer cells they cease movement failing to reach and destroy their target, (2) Experiments on immune cells using a NASA Bioreactor microgravity simulator (referred to as RWV or STLV) showed a significant impairment in their ability to migrate through the collagen that holds the cells of many tissues together, (3) The NASA Bioreactor may be used as a tumor free test model to identify potential therapeutic agents that specifically target the defect involved in the loss of tissue invasiveness by immune cells and (4) The observation of failed lymphocyte performance in the Bioreactor simulation of microgravity was confirmed in experiments on two shuttle missions (STS-54 and STS-56). Until recently we believed that this property was unique to cancer, but the observations in the simulators and in true microgravity suggested otherwise. Thus both simulated and true microgravity provide unique opportunities to investigate the arrest of lymphocyte movements into tissue.

It is well established that long-term space travel results in impaired immunity, yet research has not identified the cause. The recent findings that immune cell movement is diminished substantially in simulated space conditions prompted investigations in true microgravity. On Shuttle flight STS-54 of January 13, 1993, white blood cells from four different donors flew into orbit suspended in collagen and then the test system was activated on board to determine if the impairment observed in the bioreactor was a true prediction of the occurrences in space. The results presently under analysis in our laboratory are consistent with the predictions of the bioreactor. A repeat of this experiment at shorter time intervals confirmed the original observations and strongly suggest that immune cells do not "walk" well in space.

Numerous avenues of investigation will emerge from these observations: (1) Biochemical analysis of the molecules involved in attachment of immune cells to the matrix and identification of the effect of microgravity on the locomotory apparatus with the lymphocyte, (2) Changes in gene expression in microgravity, and (3) The effects of microgravity on the matrix itself. All will be analyzed using the bioreactor to mimic the loss of cellular movement observed in cancer patients. In addition, we now believe that the loss of immune cell movement in microgravity may be instrumental in the decline of immunity in long term space travel. The latter will have greater significance when considering deep space missions.

SIGNIFICANCE

The implications of these experiments are far reaching in the investigation of the effects of microgravity and low shear environments on the function of the immune system. The bioreactor is now a ground based testing modality for agents that promote the invasion of tissue by immune cells. These agents may then be entered into preclinical trials in animal model systems. Furthermore, the availability of sustained true microgravity in Shuttle missions and on Space Station offers the prospect of conducting long term investigations at the level of the intact animal. Ground based bioreactors enable economic investigation at the cellular level. As yet there is no simulation for sustained periods that can accommodate animals or humans. Application of our findings as well as those of other investigators is critically dependent on the availability of long term space missions to enable basic studies of the effect of microgravity on immunity to infection and cancer, or organ transplant rejection, and on the progression of autoimmune disease. Short term investigations on earth and long term studies in space will reveal the critical aspects of immune cell biology that form the basis for programs to develop genuinely novel approaches to the treatment of human disease.

SUMMARY

In addition to the investigation presented herein there are other disciplines within biology that are emerging with novel findings. The initial investigation of the effect of microgravity on cells has opened a new area of tissue engineering and cell biology. The staff at Johnson Space Center has convened a "seed" group of nearly twenty scientists from throughout the USA with diverse interests in cell biology and a common interest, the application of microgravity to the propagation of normal cells, cancer cells, and the production of organized tissues. Among the investigations is the propagation of colon cancer (Dr. J.M. Jessup, Harvard) cells to tissue visible pieces that clinically resemble the original cancer. Cancers such as ovarian carcinoma, resistant to propagation by conventional technology, are more readily grown in the microgravity bioreactor (Dr. Jeanne Becker, Tampa, FL). Normal tissues such as cartilage, cardiac muscle, and pancreatic islets are presently in the process of propagation using altered gravity culture systems. These examples not only represent early potential for technology transfer but also are the beginnings of a new level of understanding in cell biology.

The expenditures sought for basic biomedical research, ground based investigations using technological developments to simulate gravitational changes, unmanned, and manned space missions leading to Shuttle and Space Station programs should be envisioned as novel strategy available to us in advancing our knowledge in biological science. They are our forays into the frontiers of engineering, technology, chemistry, physics, biology, medicine, behavioral science, as well as the unknowns of space and space travel.

HONORING MARK BROXMEYER

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my constituents and the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs [JINSA] to honor Mark Broxmeyer, one of JINSA's most dedicated members and its current vice president.

Mark Broxmeyer has, through his ceaseless efforts as a member of the board and vice president of JINSA, established a program that has effectively kept the American public

informed about the necessity of an effective U.S. defense capability in the Middle East, as well as the important role Israel can play in supporting democratic initiatives in that part of the world.

Mr. Broxmeyer, a cofounder of Fairfield Properties, is a recognized leader in property management for both residential and commercial uses on Long Island. Of good heart and a most compassionate soul, Mr. Broxmeyer has blended his business acumen in providing employment opportunities and affordable housing. As a director of the Federal Home Loan Bank, a director of the Long Island Builders Institute, and chairman of the board of the Suffolk County Apartment House Council, Mark Broxmeyer effectively brought affordable, quality housing to neglected neighborhoods. In doing so, he has played a major role in invigorating the local economy.

The wide area of experience gained by Mr. Broxmeyer has guided him into addressing problems of major social concern. He has served as chairman of the KARITAS Foundation, raising over $300,000 for homeless and abused children, and was honored by United Cerebral Palsy as its "Man of the Year." In addition, he has served as Little League coach for the past 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unique that an individual uses his talents to benefit the community and its residents in such a wide field of endeavors, as Mark Broxmeyer has done. I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me now in extending to him our appreciation and gratitude.

THE CONGRESSIONAL PAY FREEZE ACT OF 1993

HON. JON KYL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Congressional Pay Freeze Act of 1993, a bill intended to send a very simple and straightforward message: No more pay raises for Members of Congress unless they have balanced the Federal budget first.

Mr. Speaker, the national debt is rising nearly $1 billion a day. That is about $41.7 million an hour; $694,000 a minute; $12,000 per second. The interest on that debt is eating us alive, and in just a few years will consume all personal income tax revenues.

Let me say that again. All personal income taxes will be required just to meet the interest on the debt in just a few years. Just interest. Nothing paid toward principle.

Taxing the American people into poverty is no solution. The only way to balance the Federal budget is to cut or freeze Government spending.

I introduced legislation 2 years ago and again earlier this year to cut House Members' annual pay by $15,000 and eliminate future cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's]. It is bottled up in committee.

If the leadership isn't willing to move that bill, then we at least ought to consider a pay freeze, and it is with that in mind that I offer this bill today. If Congress can't balance the budget, then Members of Congress should be the first to personally feel the pain of the financial burden they are passing on to future generations.

By the same token, if Congress can do its job responsibly, then it is reasonable that Members of Congress should have the opportunity to go to the American people and try to justify a pay raise.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Congress voted to forgo the 1994 COLA. I invite my colleagues to cosponsor the Congressional Pay Freeze Act and establish the principle that congressional pay should be frozen until the budget is balanced.

I ask that the text of the bill be reprinted in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. —

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 "Congressional Pay Freeze Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. PAY INCREASES NOT PERMITTED UNLESS THE BUDGET IS BALANCED.

(a) PAY INCREASES NOT PERMITTED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the rate of pay for a Member of Congress may not be adjusted to reflect any increase scheduled to take effect in a fiscal year if total budget outlays of the Government for the preceding fiscal year exceeded total revenues of the Government for such preceding fiscal year, as determined under subsection (b).

(b) METHOD FOR DETERMINING IF THE BUDGET IS BALANCED.—Not later than 2 months after the end of each fiscal year, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) determine whether total budget outlays of the Government for such fiscal year exceeded total revenues of the Government for such fiscal year and, if so, the amount by which the former exceeded the latter; and

(2) submit a written report to the Congress as to its findings under this subsection.

(c) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this Act, the term "Member of Congress" means an individual serving in a position referred to in section 601(a)(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31(1)).

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act—

(1) shall become effective as of—

(A) the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) if implementation of this Act based on the date under paragraph (1) is held to be unconstitutional, the first day of the first Congress as of which this section may constitutionally be given effect; and

(2) shall apply with respect to any pay adjustment scheduled to take effect on or after the effective date of this Act.

(b) INITIAL DETERMINATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, not later than 2 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, carry out the requirements of section 2(b) with respect to the last fiscal year ending before the effective date of this Act.

A 25TH ANNIVERSARY TRIBUTE TO THE YUCAIPA ELKS LODGE

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a very special celebration taking place in early August when the Yucaipa Elks Lodge marks its 25th year of service to its members and our community.

The Yucaipa Elks Lodge was chartered on August 6, 1968, at 4th Street and Yucaipa Boulevard over the Food Fair Market in Yucaipa. Of the 106 charter members of the lodge, 22 are still living and participating in its many activities. The lodge's second location was the Old Christian Church on California Street between First and Second Streets, now the location of Grenlunos Restaurant and Candy Store. In 1976, the lodge purchased the two-story Grange Hall at the corner of Second and Adams Streets where the Elks make their home today.

The Yucaipa Elks Lodge today has 398 members who play an active role in and provide a great many services to the community. Each year, the Yucaipa Elks sponsor an "Essay on America" contest for 8- to 13-year-olds and Flag Day observance to promote patriotism. The lodge also sponsors Cub Scout and Girl Scout packs, scholarships for graduating seniors, public bingo, a "Young at Heart" dance, and a "Hoop Shoot" basketball tournament. In addition the Elks also play an important role in the lives of our veterans providing transportation each month from the Pettis Veterans Hospital for dinner.

The Elks have established themselves as among the most outstanding service organizations in the country with over 2,000 active lodges. Founded in 1868, the Elks serve as a patriotic American fraternal organization with its guiding principles being brotherly love, justice, charity, and fidelity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and many friends of the Yucaipa Elks Lodge as they celebrate 25 years of outstanding service to our community. It is fitting that the House of Representatives pay tribute to these special Elks today.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN H. MARTIN

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to the distinguished Dr. John H. Martin. John, a dear friend of mine fought the good fight but lost. On June 18, 1993, John H. Martin, director of the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories died of cancer. His death is a tremendous loss to all who knew him, and will create a terrible void in the science world, to which he contributed so greatly.

John was an inspiration in everything he did. Despite his disability caused by polio, he accomplished so much. John did not let his

physical disability interfere with his drive and zest for hands-on research. He simply ignored it. He set his mind on reaching goals and reached every one. When others said it could not be done, John persevered and saw to it that it could be.

His love and passion for the marine sciences was illustrated throughout his career, including his pivotal role in creating the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, the Nation's largest and diverse marine sanctuary. His determination, though, was never stronger than when he fought to get the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories rebuilt after it was destroyed by the Loma Prieta earthquake. This world renowned laboratory is unparalleled in its studies of marine life and atmospheric sciences and is scheduled to break ground this fall.

His dedication to the sciences was only matched by his drive to advance humanity. He was a fair-minded person and well-liked and highly respected by everyone. He was a great teacher and engaged his students and colleagues in a way that few teachers can. He understood well the link between the sciences and humankind.

Dr. Martin served on the board of trustees of the Monterey Bay Aquarium. He played an integral role in generating enthusiasm for the aquarium foundation's Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute, which along with Moss Landing Lab is among 11 institutions that form a coalition on the bay. That his memorial service was held at the Monterey Bay Aquarium speaks for itself. There is no other for which such a service would be fitting.

I had the distinct pleasure of working with John and the privilege of calling him my friend. John did what we would all like to do, he made this world a better place. I know that his vision will continue to be fulfilled for years to come, and I will do my best to facilitate the realization of John's dreams.

A TRIBUTE TO A SPECIAL PLACE: THE CHILDREN'S INN AT NIH

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, there is on the campus of the National Institutes of Health [NIH] in Bethesda, MD, in my Eighth Congressional District, a very special place for children and families. It is the Children's Inn at NIH, and it provides hope and comfort for children from all 50 States. These children come to NIH with illnesses that are currently beyond conventional medicine.

The Children's Inn [TCI] is a family centered, homelike environment that promotes the healing of pediatric patients, gives them a sense of normalcy, and helps prevent or alleviate family dysfunction. As the Children's Inn literature states so poignantly, "When you are sick, there is no place like home. But if you can't be home, there is no place like the Children's Inn at NIH."

I am proud that NIH and the Children's Inn are part of my congressional district. I take particular pride in the fact that more than 200 of my constituents are among the inn's active volunteers contributing their time and talent, not only in the daily operations of this facility but also in a variety of outreach, fundraising, and developmental efforts. I know that many Members of the House and their spouses are among the active supporters of the Children's Inn and know firsthand the indispensability of its volunteers.

The Children's Inn is celebrating its third birthday. On July 2, 1990, the inn greeted its first guests. Since that time, more than 1,500 children and their families have stayed there, many on a number of occasions, while receiving innovative treatment at NIH. They stay without cost because of the inn's private, nonprofit fundraising efforts and the substantial contribution of volunteer time. Thus far, more than 52,000 hours of volunteer service have been rendered—more than 2,000 hours each month.

Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing more compelling than a sick child. I know of no greater need than to be with your loved ones when you are seriously ill. I know of no place more humane in meeting that need than the Children's Inn at NIH. As they celebrate another milestone in the life of this unique house, it is a pleasure for me to extend heartiest congratulations to the founders and the TCI board of directors on their vision in creating this special place and to its dedicated staff on their commitment to its operation.

And let me congratulate especially the more than 200 volunteers in my district who contribute so graciously and enormously to its spirit and function as a place of hope and promise. They represent voluntarism at its best.

Happy birthday, TCI.

McCORNACK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HUMAN DIGNITY PLEDGE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A HUMAN DIGNITY ZONE

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1993, I had the honor of attending an assembly sponsored by the students, staff, and parents of McCornack Elementary School in Eugene, OR. The gathering marked the celebration and dedication of the Human Dignity pledge.

The fabric of American society is a patchwork of cultures and ethnicities sewn with one common thread—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Inherent in that promise is the right of an individual to live a life free of bias and discrimination.

The children of McCornack Elementary, in response to anti-Semitic graffiti scrawled on their school walls, have transformed a message of hate into a pledge of peace. The following is the pledge adopted by the students:

We the people of the McCornack School pledge to create a Human Dignity Zone free of discrimination.

We believe that people should judge others by their hearts and actions, not by their appearance, religion, disabilities, or abilities.

All people are created equally and worthy of respect.

We should live together in peace and harmony and love the world and everyone in it because differences make us special.

We are all the same in different ways, so we will treat others with dignity, kindness, and respect—the way we would like to be treated.

Diversity exists; only bigotry and hate can be invented. The students of McCornack Elementary School have shown us that, we too, must make a pledge to promote harmony and peace. They've demonstrated the importance of valuing the characteristics that make us different in our own special ways. But above everything, they've made themselves responsible for the creation of a community based on mutual respect, kindness, and dignity.

OPPOSITION TO THE NOMINATION OF DANIEL K. TARULLO

HON. TOM LEWIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am in opposition to the nomination of Daniel K. Tarullo to the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs. I do not come here today to assail Mr. Tarullo personally, nor to act as an obstructionist, but to raise legitimate questions regarding the appropriateness of this nomination.

Specifically, I am deeply concerned about Mr. Tarullo's work on behalf of foreign governments as an international counsel and a registered foreign agent at the law firm of Shearman & Sterling.

Mr. Speaker, the influence of foreign countries on the Government of the United States has become a most serious issue. Long before Pat Choate or Ross Perot, the Founding Fathers of this Nation were concerned about this issue. Allow me to quote a letter written in 1795 from George Washington to Patrick Henry, "It is my ardent desire * * * to see that the United States may be independent of all, and under the influence of no other country."

I believe that if we are serious about proving to the American public that Congress is committed to closing the revolving door that exists for lobbyists, foreign interests, and Government officials, this nomination must be reconsidered. The revolving door does not just swing in one direction. Efforts are being made by Congress to ensure that Government officials leaving office do not peddle their influence on behalf of foreign governments after their careers in public service. However, in the case of the nomination of Mr. Tarullo, the administration has shown that it is perfectly willing to place a registered foreign agent directly into a public position.

On April 14 of this year, I along with five of my colleagues from Florida, wrote to President Clinton urging him to reconsider the nomination of Mr. Tarullo based on his work as a registered foreign agent. On April 23, I received a response from Howard G. Paster, Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs. Allow me to quote from this letter.

Mr. Tarullo spent most of his professional life as a law professor and not as a practicing attorney. The nomination of Mr. Tarullo was

based wholly on his expertise in the field of law and the President's confidence in his integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I take issue with this response. Indeed, Mr. Tarullo did spend a portion of his professional life as a law professor, but according to Mr. Tarullo's biographical summary, he has been out of law school for 16 years, and served as a law professor for 6 years. The White House refused to address the concerns that we raised regarding Mr. Tarullo's work at Shearman & Sterling. They failed to acknowledge that in his most recent position he worked for the Government of Mexico in its trade negotiations with the United States during the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] negotiations.

In 1992, Shearman & Sterling was paid over $4 million to serve as the lead counsel to the Mexican Government for the NAFTA. As a member of this law firm, Mr. Tarullo has represented the Mexican Ministry of Commerce and Industrial Development during the negotiations of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. According to reports filed with the Department of Justice, their activities on behalf of the Mexican Government involved providing advice and assistance "on U.S. laws and international agreements relevant to those negotiations; on the negotiations themselves; and on the congressional approval of the negotiations and implementation of the agreement."

Given the enormous lobbying effort undertaken by the Mexican Government on the NAFTA, I find it incredibly alarming that a person paid to do work on behalf of the Government of Mexico should be placed in this position.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of Mr. Tarullo's recusal for 1 year from any particular matter specifically involving the NAFTA. However, I believe this recusal is merely a veil to hide a fundamental conflict of interest.

In addition to their work on behalf of the Mexican Government, Mr. Tarullo's firm has also been involved with providing advice concerning the United States Government's import ban against Chilean grapes. Shearman & Sterling has also represented the Mexican Coffee Institute, a state-owned instrumentality of the Mexican Government, in a litigation matter in California.

In addition, Shearman & Sterling also worked on behalf of the airbus consortium, providing advice and assistance regarding U.S. trade law and policy as it affects the world market for civil aircraft. I would like to point out that the Clinton administration has decided to make the airbus subsidy issue an important focus of its international trade policy. In a speech given to the employees of Boeing on February 22, 1993, President Clinton stated, "It's your country, and I'm doing my best to give it back to you."

Based on Shearman & Sterling's work on behalf of the airbus consortium, the employees of Boeing should be concerned with this nomination. Based on Mr. Tarullo's work on behalf of the Mexican Government, those concerned with NAFTA should be concerned with this nomination. Irrefutably, the American public should be concerned with this nomination.

Given the responsibilities Mr. Tarullo will be asked to assume and the trade areas in which he will have jurisdiction, Mr. Tarullo's past efforts on behalf of the Mexican Government reflect the kind of conflict of interest of which the American public have grown tired. Therefore, we as policymakers should guard against this type of impropriety.

Mr. Speaker, this nomination cannot be justified by a mere 1 year recusal. This pivotal position would be better served by one who can truly work for the public interest, not by a person with an extensive list of foreign clientele.

A TRIBUTE TO DUANE ROBERTS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention today the fine work and outstanding public service of Duane Roberts, known to many in our community as an entrepreneur's entrepreneur. Duane is being honored by the California Inland Empire Council of the Boy Scouts of America, and will be recognized as the recipient of the Distinguished Citizen of 1993 Award at a dinner in his honor in July.

Duane Roberts has been a longtime business and community leader widely regarded for inventing and reinventing ideas. Indeed, at the young age of 19, while working for his family's business, Duane created the first commercially made frozen burrito. His product has resulted in a booming frozen Mexican food industry, now approaching $1 billion in annual sales.

His early success has translated into wonderful success at the corporate level. From his beginnings as a Cub Scout, Duane established the Entrepreneurial Capital Corp., a successful holding company that now oversees 10 prominent companies.

More than his success itself, what Duane has done with his success is worthy of reflection and admiration. A philanthropic man by nature, Duane says that he was "inspired by my parents to give something back to the community." To say the least, he has done that—and more. In honor of his mother, Duane founded and endowed the Mary S. Roberts Foundation in 1989, a nonprofit corporation committed to benefiting children with special needs, families of victims of crime, and to promote the protection and care of domestic animals.

In recognition of his work, Duane was honored in 1992 with the first Humanitarian Award by the Inland Empire's Valley Group. In addition, he was recognized earlier this year by the Riverside Humane SPCA with the Albert Schweitzer Humanitarian Award.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and the many friends of Duane Roberts in recognizing him for his highly regarded work, dedication, and selfless service to our community. It is indeed fitting that the House of Representatives join the California Inland Empire Council of the Boy Scouts of America in paying tribute to him today.

SPEECH OF GORDON M. WARD

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Gordon M. Ward, the president of the National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, the largest maritime labor union in the country, recently spoke before the Port of Washington, DC, chapter of the Propeller Club of the United States.

Although I was unable to attend the Propeller Club luncheon, I, nevertheless, took the time to read Mr. Ward's speech, and I found his perspective most refreshing and his views most encouraging.

A native of the State of Maine, Mr. Ward graduated from the Maine Maritime Academy in 1959. Over the past 30 years, he has sailed in very licensed shipboard engineering capacity, most recently for Puerto Rico Marine Management, Inc., where he served as Chief Engineer for 12 years.

Mr. Ward sailed aboard nearly every type of modern cargo vessel, including break bulk, tankships, ore carriers, roll-on/roll-off, and container vessels. He has worked ashore in tanker chartering and, during the 1970's, he was an instructor at the Calhoon MEBA Engineering School where he taught a variety of marine engineering-related subjects.

In December 1990 Mr. Ward was elected chairman of the Licensed Division of District No. 1, MEBA/NMU. Today, as president of a newly restructured National MEBA, he heads a union comprised of over 30,000 members, including the 8,000 members of District No. 1, of which he also is the president.

Above all else, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the Ward family, including his wife, Lynn, and three children live in Timonium, MD, and, therefore, are constituents in my Second Congressional District.

Although Mr. Ward has not been a Washington insider, his career has given him a unique position from which to witness and experience, firsthand, the changes under which the U.S. merchant marine has gone through. He brings to his relatively new position as head of 30,000 maritime seamen a new vision to the longstanding problems facing the U.S. merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the text of Mr. Ward's speech before the Port of Washington, DC, chapter of the Propeller Club of the United States and I want to encourage all my colleagues to take the opportunity to read it carefully. Having done so, I believe they will have a better understanding of the serious problems threatening the future viability of the U.S. merchant marine; and from this better understanding, hopefully, a greater desire and stronger will to protect and promote this critical industry will emerge.

GORDON M. WARD, SPEAKING BEFORE THE PROPELLER CLUB, JUNE 23, 1993

It is a privilege and a pleasure to address the Propeller Club, particularly at such an important time for the American merchant marine. However, the fact that I am here today may be a bit of a mixed blessing. To become a union president at this juncture in

the history of our industry is a little bit like walking into the lion's den.

There is an old parable about a man who, upon being thrown to the lions in the coliseum, falls on his knees to pray just as the biggest lion advances toward him. The lion then stops, falls on his haunches, and puts his forepaws together and begins to pray himself. The man shouts out "thank God, I'm saved," whereupon the lion says "not so fast, I'm just saying grace." Now, I know there are a few lion's here in Washington who have their paws together who need to be told "not so fast," and that is why I'm here today.

As most of you know, I am relatively new to Washington. But I am not new to our industry. I have spent over thirty years in this industry, starting in 1956 at the Maine Maritime Academy. We even had quite a few passenger ships back then. I have also seen a lot of positive changes in our industry—containerization, intermodalism, supertankers, extensive use of computer technology, and what can only be called an incredible growth of productivity.

Up until my election, I was a chief engineer—aboard a large containership and before that, aboard several roll-on, roll-off vessels. I know from immediate firsthand experience that today's merchant marine job is hard and technically demanding.

In today's maritime environment, it is extremely important to have highly competent, technologically-trained people to crew the ships. The multi-million dollar vessels operated by my members and others, if handled improperly, can cause heavy loss of life, and, as we have seen in recent years, terrible environmental damage with billion-dollar price tags. There is little room for error.

I also have seen directly the competition we face in the foreign trades. Our international shipping competition is usually subsidized, particularly in terms of capital equipment; and it is often able to employ third world seamen under third world conditions and wages.

The kind of competitors we face in international shipping will always mean an uphill battle for the U.S.-flag, no matter how efficient we are. The fleets of the advanced industrial nations, such as those of our NATO allies—with whom our vessels are competitive—have already been decimated. While other Western nations reflag their fleets, the United States, according to General Fogelman and others with the same critical views, is the only super power remaining. Yet I believe we must question whether or not we, indeed, will be a super power, either militarily or economically, if we do not have a viable, commercial merchant marine that is readily available in times of national emergencies.

In this competitive environment, the United States has been able to maintain a relatively stable merchant fleet over the last decade—in terms of tonnage, if not in jobs and ships. Some of our critics say that maritime programs have not worked. But we would probably have no fleet at all if it were not for these programs and laws—the Jones Act, cargo preference, and ODS—laws that help balance our ships against competitors who play by a different set of rules. Together, these programs and laws provide the critical difference. We must fight for these laws and programs as if our survival depends on them—because it does.

In these battles, the opponents of our industry will find labor united. Licensed and unlicensed, the Seafarers, the Masters, Mates and Pilots, the American Maritime Officers, the National Maritime Union, and my own district No. 1—MEBA have all worked closely to preserve our industry and its essential programs. In this regard, I want to thank the officials and members of these maritime labor organizations and their affiliates for the spirit of cooperation they have shown. It is more essential this year than ever, and I know it will continue.

In our industry, I think that it is safe to say labor often is the glue that maintains support in Washington for these critical programs. Whether within our unions or in the legislative/educational associations that have been set up as a result of our collective bargaining contracts, teams have been maintained that track and act on our industry's issues with hard work, professionalism, and continuity. The unions, through our memberships, have been willing to provide broad-based grass roots support for the maritime programs we have worked for here.

I noted a few moments ago that opponents of our industry would find labor united on our critical issues. I am most happy to say that they will also find the MEBA united.

As most of you know, earlier this month, the different parties in district 1 reached a settlement agreement. Under this settlement, national MEBA now comprises mix districts, with districts one through four representing some 20,000 mariners. Districts five and six represent approximately 12,000 government and transportation industry related workers.

The agreement restores D1—MEBA to its pre-merger status with its membership, property and benefit plans intact. The agreement provides that title to real property belonging to the NMU before the merger will be transferred to it, as District No. 4—NMU.

D1—MEBA retains jurisdiction over all collective bargaining agreements for the licensed officers of my district. The political action funds will be divided fairly between districts 1 and 4. Although the funds are being divided, we plan to work closely with all of our union colleagues.

It has not been easy to reach this settlement. But I think that all of us realized that the challenges facing our industry as a whole this year were too serious to receive anything less than our full energy and attention.

Today I want to discuss who of these challenges because they are preeminent, and they are urgent.

The first is maritime revitalization, which is crucial to the future of our industry. This program must succeed, and we will succeed. With it, we can breath new life into our industry for several decades. Without it, approximately one-hundred U.S.-flag, U.S.-crewed vessels could leave the fleet. But it is more than the loss of one-third of our fleet, as bad as that would be.

If these vessels flag out, our industry will lose what I call its critical mass. To put it shipboard terms, when the power from the main engine is reduced and the propeller slows, before the ship stops, it loses steerage. The engine is running, but the ship is rudderless. The unions, stripped of jobs, and the remaining companies will be too few in number to maintain legislative steerage, if you will, over other essential laws and programs.

This may sound like an exaggeration, but I don't think it is. Does anyone seriously believe that cargo preference and the Jones Act will be far behind if we lose jobs and ships on the scale that the loss of maritime reform implies? Does anyone seriously believe that we will still have the clout to keep these laws when our industry is stripped of some of its most established companies and its unions' members forced to seek work ashore or enter into new professions? Can one or two companies or one or two unions keep in effect the Jones Act and cargo preference? The sobering reality is "No." Survival of the fittest may work in certain cases. But in politics you need a broad base and you need allies.

So the fight this year for maritime revitalization is not just about one or two companies or a subsidy program that provides several thousand jobs. It's really about every company and every job. Let no one think that they can stand on the sidelines, watch others fight for them, and sit this one out. And let no one think that they can flag most of their ships out and just keep a few to carry cargo preference—in other words, the privileges of being American with none of its responsibilities. History will not be kind to any of us if we let this industry die on our watch. We are all in this together.

That is why maritime labor has united on this issue. To be sure, no bill will be perfect, but I hope that we can, as an industry, with our allies in the Congress, craft a solution that provides enough incentive for everyone to get on board. And not just sign on, but work for it too, because it is going to take that kind of combined effort in a year when the Federal budget is under assault from all sides. In this regard, I am pleased that President Clinton has reconsidered the decision of some of his subordinates not to seek maritime reform this year. It will be far better for this process if we work with the administration.

As the maritime reform process unfolds this year, I see several key areas that we need to address: funding, regulatory changes, shipbuilding, and DOD support.

First is funding. Here there is no easy answer, but I find it hard to believe that somewhere in the Federal budget one cannot find $200 million a year to keep some 100 ships in our fleet— particularly since a good part of that $200 million figure will be returned each year in direct taxes to the Treasury. Then the after tax income—earned by U.S. citizens employed aboard these ships—will be spent in communities around the United States creating more jobs, more income, and more taxes.

The second area is that of bringing U.S. Coast Guard shipbuilding standards in line with international standards.

There are many factors affecting our merchant marine's inability to compete internationally. One area where the administration can take quick and decisive action is in the elimination of duplicative Coast Guard regulations employed in vessel construction.

No segment of our industry is more dedicated to vessel and crew safety than are the maritime unions, but we have come to realize that the standards imposed by and strictly enforced by the Coast Guard place our vessel operators at a distinct disadvantage. I believe placing U.S. operators on a level playing field with their foreign competitors by employing IMO standards will chip away at the differential in construction costs, without placing our vessels and our men and women at risk.

I encourage the administration and Secretary Peña to push the Coast Guard in that direction, because they have, again, just last week, expressed a reluctance to do so.

The third key area is shipbuilding. Here we will need the wisdom of Solomon to find a solution. There is no question that the U.S.-

flag ship operating industry cannot be linked to U.S. shipbuilding without government help. But shipbuilding is also an important American industry with strong support and vital to our Nation. The simple fact, economically and politically, is that there is going to have to be a shipbuilding component somewhere this year. It is time to work together. I don't pretend to have all of the answers, but one thing is clear. We had better be open to solutions and encourage them. We cannot pursue our own course and say "It's their problem, not ours."

The fourth key area in the maritime revitalization process concerns the need for Department of Defense support on this issue. There are many fine officers and officials in DOD that genuinely believe in the merchant marine. General Fogelman of Transcom, who spoke before this group last month, is definitely one of them. But since 1980, more than $7 billion has been spent to build a DOD-owned reserve fleet and more than $3 billion is planned additionally for the future. Furthermore, transportation Secretary Peña's maritime reform plan did not receive even DOD support in the previous interagency decision process. In this area, I also hope that we can work together.

The operational, commercial merchant marine is important to sealift. Even a relatively small amount of resources will create a large capability that can be put to DOD use in crisis or conflict. The operating merchant marine pays taxes, helps our balance of payments, provides a trained, experienced cadre of mariners, furnishes modern vessels with new technology, and gives the military instant access to vast intermodal capabilities that can move a container from Fort Sill to Riyadh and track it all the way. Reserve vessels provide none of these.

This civilian capability is a resource the Department of Defense ought to cultivate. A MEBA, we believe our entire industry is willing to work with defense to build the kind of productive partnership that can use a civilian capability for military requirements, when needed, while saving scarce military resources for combat teeth and tasks only the military can best perform.

In discussing maritime revitalization, I have stressed unity—within MEBA, among all maritime labor organizations, and within our industry as a whole. I have also emphasized cooperation, whether with shipbuilding interests or the Department of Defense. Let me add briefly one final word—"Flexibility."

As maritime revitalization unfolds, we are all going to have to give up something in order to build something better. We in maritime labor pledge to be an active part of this as well. We are willing to work with our companies to help them be competitive. This process, to be sure, must be a two-way street. But it is a process on which we pledge to work, and to work hard.

Before I close, I want to stress the second major issue we have faced and are facing this year: Cargo preference. As you all know, Government-generated cargo provides the essential margin to many of our ships.

As you know last evening, the Senate, during consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill, gave this industry a serious wake-up call when it approved a sense-of-the Senate amendment that calls for a cap on U.S.-Flag ocean transportation rates on food-aid shipments to Russia.

The sense-of-the-Senate resolution is not binding, but the anti-cargo preference vote sends a very clear message that our industry is in serious trouble and needs to double and triple its effort to defeat similar measures in the future.

There is an old saying that goes, if you tell a lie often enough, you will believe it yourself. What I found particularly disturbing about the very close vote on the Senate floor was, what I will call, the distortion of facts that Senators, who are longtime opponents to cargo preference, continue to state as if they are true. We have heard the same misinformation over and over, again.

Yesterday's vote tells me, at least, that those distortions now are being believed by some Senators, who previously supported us.

We need to do a better job in getting our message out. We need to do a better job in exposing these often-quoted distortions for what they truly are: lies. We need to do a better job in having more of our supporters prepared to counter these blatant attacks in the House and Senate. We must not place the burden of defending our industry on the shoulders of only a few Senate and House Members, as good as they have been in that task. I certainly do not blame any of our congressional supporters for Tuesday's defeat.

Now, more than ever, we must be on the alert. The victory on the Senate floor, as small as it may have been, will only serve to feed the near-fanatical mentality of those who are determined to get rid of the United States merchant marine in order to serve their own narrow, misguided goals.

Critics of cargo preference want to get rid of it any way they can, even though it means shipping American aid on Foreign ships, even though cargo preference affects just 4 percent of all U.S. Agricultural exports and even though it would increase our balance of payments deficit in the process. To these people, requiring even 1 out of 33 ships carrying American agricultural exports to fly the U.S. flag is just too great a burden to bear.

Critics like these will never change. Instead we should continue to focus on our friends, on those in the Congress and in American agriculture who support American farmers, as they deserve to be supported, but who also realize that our Nation needs a strong merchant marine as well. We have worked productively with them in the past. Let's keep this bridge strong in the future.

For the rest of this year, we must expect more attacks on cargo preference. But we must also work to strengthen executive branch adherence to existing cargo preference laws. In this regard, I want to praise the Merchant Marine Committee, DOT, MARAD—and especially Ms. Joan Yim, the acting administrator—for the active role they have taken. The industry now has a sense, after many years, that interagency momentum has begun to turn in our direction.

Maritime revitalization and cargo preference are two major issues on our plate right now. There will, no doubt, be others.

Before I leave all of you today to go about your individual business, I would like to tell you about a temptation facing every newcomer to this city. That is the temptation to become a highly-regarded cynic—to join a large fraternity of professional skeptics. Since many more projects and plans fail than do succeed, there is much mileage to be gained from such a position. This temptation is, therefore, difficult to resist, especially given that the rewards to the skeptic are so regular, yet to the optimist, so rare.

But I remain an optimist. My recent union experiences have only reinforced that optimism. From my perspective, I see a new MEBA, working together with a maritime labor community, united as never before. From there, I can look out over an industry which has found a new consensus in the maritime revitalization process.

The process includes all of you here today—labor, industry, and government. Each of us has the responsibility—and the opportunity—to put aside past differences and perceptions to help to bring about the rebirth of this great and unique industry—an industry, on which, the defense and the economic security of the United States depends. Again, it has been both a privilege and a pleasure to have been here today. Thank you.

A TRIBUTE TO MARSHA TUROCI

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention today the fine work and outstanding public service of my good friend Marsha Turoci. Marsha, who serves as the vice chairman of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors in California, is being honored by the California Inland Empire Council of the Boy Scouts of America. She will be recognized as the recipient of the Distinguished Citizen of 1993 Award at a dinner in her honor in July.

Prior to her service on the county board, Marsha worked as a businesswoman, immersed herself in volunteer activities in the high desert, and raised her three children. She began her political work as a field representative in the Victor Valley for County Supervisors Bob Older and John Joyner. She first ran for the office of county supervisor in 1988 and was subsequently reelected in 1992.

Marsha's work on behalf of San Bernardino County is well known. Shortly after taking office, Marsha was thrust into a most difficult situation resulting from the closure of George Air Force Base. To say the least, she has emerged as a leader in attempting to bring our high desert communities together to work and plan for an economically prosperous future for our region. Her role will continue to be critical as the negotiation process continues between our cities of the Victor Valley and the Department of Defense.

Marsha continues to demonstrate leadership on a number of other fronts including the future of hazardous waste disposal and the future of low-level nuclear waste in our county. Through all this work, Marsha has fought for and been successful in securing San Bernardino County's fair share of services and capital improvements.

Over the years, Marsha has been appropriately recognized for her efforts receiving the Inland Business Journal Woman of Achievement Award, the 1989 Victor Valley Business and Professional Women, Woman of Achievement Award, the County Supervisors Association of California Award, the 1985 Optimists Club Law Enforcement Award, and the Hesperian of the Year Award in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and the many people who know Marsha so well and admire her so much. Her tireless efforts on behalf of the people of San Bernardino County are appreciated by us all. It is especially fitting that the House join the

California Inland Empire Council of the Boy Scouts of America in paying tribute to her today.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CINEMA ARTS CENTRE, HUNTINGTON, NY, ON THEIR 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Cinema Arts Centre: Marion O. Hoffman and New Community Cinemas on their 20th anniversary.

The Cinema Arts Centre: Marion O. Hoffman and New Community Cinemas [CAC] will celebrate its 20th anniversary with a gala opening of its newly renovated facility on July 17, 1993.

The cinema was founded in Huntington, Long Island, in 1973. A year later, the cinema became a New York State not-for-profit corporation.

The cinema has had a colorful history over the last 20 years and is approaching an even more exciting future. The cinema serves not only as a community forum for the discussion of a broad range of social issues, but also as an independent organization where the film arts, in all their rich diversity, become an important part of cultural life on Long Island.

The completion of the renovation/expansion project signals the opening of the CAC as a self-contained facility. CAC is coming into its own as the regional presenter of the host film and video through its exhibition programs, cinema seminars, and workshops.

CAC's audiences have discovered the genius of many a director's work and have remained steadfast in their pursuit of a broad cinematic perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me now in congratulating the Cinema Arts Centre on its 20th anniversary, and in extending best wishes and special thanks to Charlotte Sky and Vic Skolnick, codirectors of CAC, for their ongoing dedication to providing an open community-oriented environment, which continues to be an important part of the cultural life in Huntington and throughout Long Island.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. JOHN R. NUNNALLY, JR.

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize Maj. John Robert Nunnally, Jr.—Bob to us—for his distinguished and exemplary service to the U.S. Air Force and this great Nation as deputy chief of the House Air Force Liaison Office from May 17, 1991, to July 8, 1993.

In this capacity, Bob quickly established a solid reputation with Members and staff alike for his extensive knowledge of Air Force programs and issues, as well as national defense strategy. His wit and charisma have made an indelible impact on us. Bob has aided us immeasurably in our day-to-day operations. His effectiveness on Capitol Hill is legendary. His credibility and candor made him an invaluable resource. His expertise in Airland Battle, gleaned from combat duty with the Army in Desert Storm, has been an invaluable asset.

I have had the pleasure of traveling with Bob on several occasions. He is the military escort of choice. In the challenging arena of international travel, he has a way of making the difficult look effortless and the impossible a reality. He has earned our trust, our respect, and our gratitude. Because of Bob's credibility and goodwill, the Air Force and the Department of Defense will long reap the benefits of his tenure on the Hill.

My colleagues and I bid Major Nunnally, his wife, Sue, and their son, Will, a fond farewell and wish them the very best for continued success in their next assignment at the Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell Air Force Base, AL.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. EDWARD P. BARRY, JR.

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to someone who has been a vital part of California's South Bay community for many years—Gen. Edward P. Barry, Jr. General Barry will retire from his distinguished 32-year military career this summer.

At first glance, Ed Barry does not seem to fit the profile of a local pillar. His Boston accent makes a Kennedy sound like a midwesterner. Nevertheless, General Barry has overcome this handicap and made an enormous contribution to our area.

As the commander of the Los Angeles Air Force Base, and one of the leaders in the Air Force's drive to make space a vital part of our Nation's military arsenal, General Barry has played a critical role in making the U.S. military the strongest fighting force the world has ever seen. We all watched with amazement as the United States fought with unparalleled technological precision during the gulf war. A large part of that precision is due to the space-based assets built in the South Bay with technology perfected over the past 25 years. From the tracking systems that guided our troops movements to the surveillance systems that robbed the Iraqis of their ability to maneuver, the rest of the world got a clear demonstration of the technological miracles that California's aerospace community and General Barry helped build.

As our military moves into a new era, the systems that General Barry helped perfect will emerge as being even more important. As our military budget shrinks, the ability to gather vital information and strike with great precision will become even more critical. Although many of our space systems are often part of the unseen military, the advantage that they give our soldiers on the front lines cannot be underestimated.

Congratulations General Barry upon your retirement. Our thanks for your service to our country, and best wishes in your next chapter.

CHESTERTON HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH AND DEBATE TEAM

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the outstanding achievements of an exceptional group of talented and dedicated young men and women, the Chesterton High School speech and debate team. On this day, I would like to bring to light their outstanding feats, and commemorate their ongoing legacy of excellence.

On Friday, June 18, 1993, the Chesterton speech and debate team captured the national championship title. This feat is especially extraordinary considering the fact that it is the school's fifth consecutive national title. Having placed in the top 10 of the Nation for the past 15 years, the Chesterton speech and debate team has demonstrated that they are simply the best.

This year's team members include Cassie Dommer, who was fourth in the Nation in the oratory division for the second year in a row; Lincoln-Douglas debaters Tonya Hise and Glen Babcock, who made it through eight and six rounds respectively; domestic extemporaneous speakers Michelle Jatkiewicz and Jenny Bennett; and foreign extemporaneous speaker Sophia Arshad. The policy debate team members were Jason Aubrey, Jim Jabo, and Sara Pluta. Additional competitors include Scott Bozik, Wendy Acton, and Carrie Grimes. Paul Gotch made it through 10 rounds in the drama division to round out the effort. All team members have shown the yearning to aspire to heights attainable only through endless hours of allegiance and steadfast research that provided each of them with the valuable information necessary to compete at such a lofty level.

The speech and debate team's accomplishments would not have been possible if not for the supreme dedication and guidance of the Chesterton speech and debate team coaching staff. The staff includes: drama and oratory coach, Barbara Funke; policy debate coach, Jim Cavallo; Lincoln-Douglas and Congress coach, Carolann Biel; and speech and debate director, Robert Kelly. They were assisted in their guidance by former Chesterton competitors Mike Gotch, Rob Hunt, Jim Franson, coach Bonnie Leckie, and former speech and debate director, Joe Wycoff. This superb coaching staff shared the National Forensics League's prestigious Communicator of the Year Award.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again extend my most heartfelt congratulations to the Chesterton High School speech and debate team and their coaching staff. I am extremely proud and honored to acknowledge this collection of budding future leaders who have shown the gumption to engulf themselves totally in this endeavor. They have shown tried and true that the cream unquestionably rises to the top.

TRIBUTE TO HESSIE STEWART

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Hessie Stewart, Jr., upon his retiring with 36 years of dedicated service from the Chicago Police Department. Mr. Stewart was honored by his superiors and colleagues this past Saturday, June 26, 1993, at a celebration dinner in Chicago.

During his tenure on the vice squad, Hessie received an Honorable Mention Award that credited him for his assistance in helping catch several men who robbed the Kedzie Avenue CTA Barn in 1964. This was the largest cash robbery in 50 years in the State of Illinois to that date. Officer Stewart continued his work with the 25th District, now the 11th District, where he worked with the tactical unit which dealt directly with gang members involved in drug activities and other sorts of criminal behavior.

In addition, Hessie served as a bodyguard to my late husband Congressman George Collins, as well as to myself for a combined total of 18 years.

After retiring, Hessie Stewart plans to serve as a counselor to inner city individuals who are chemically dependent. He states that:

> I hate to leave the Department with the present condition of the city—drugs, violence, and gangs—but I hope and pray that peace will come to Chicago, as well as the Nation.

I proudly add my name to those paying tribute to Hessie Stewart, a Chicago law enforcement officer who has served his community, his city and his Nation with distinction and honor.

TRIBUTE TO THE HUNTINGTON FIRE DEPARTMENT ON THE CELEBRATION OF THEIR 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the volunteer firefighters, both past and present, of the Huntington Fire Department.

This July 17, 1993, will mark the 150th anniversary of the Huntington Fire Department, which will celebrate its century and a half of fire protection to the citizens of Huntington and its surrounding communities with a parade and block party. Joining in the commemoration will be community representatives from the fire departments all over Nassau and Suffolk Counties. In addition, the Huntington Fire Department is publishing a 200-page yearbook depicting its history from 1843–1993.

During the past 150 years, the Huntington Fire Department's volunteer firefighters have shown courage and devotion while valiantly responding to all types of emergencies. They have won the praise and the respect of the community they serve.

With a membership of dedicated firefighters, the record of the Huntington Fire Department in public service and fire protection is one to be envied: For 24 hours a day 365 days a year, for 150 years, whenever the alarm sounded, these noble people left their homes and went to the aid of their neighbors. The brave firefighters of the Huntington Fire Department are prepared to risk their lives every day to help save the lives of others and to protect the homes and property of their neighbors from the harm and destruction caused by fire.

For these actions, the Suffolk County community cannot express sufficient gratitude to those devoted individuals who recognize that the preservation of life and property is a massive responsibility, and who make that responsibility their own by serving as volunteer firefighters.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me now in saluting these volunteer firefighters who have demonstrated the ultimate dedication and commitment, and who work so diligently for the safety of their communities. Let us publicly acknowledge the heroic good works performed by the Huntington Fire Department as it celebrates its 150th anniversary.

LAKE CITY ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize the outstanding efforts of the Lake City Army Ammunition Plant of Independence, MO. On April 22, 1993, the Lake City Plant, commanded by Col. Joseph Daves, received three awards from the Department of Defense for their success in the area of reducing hazardous waste. The awards recognize the achievements of Lake City's programs to recycle and reduce hazardous waste, solid waste, and air emissions.

Among the awards won by the hazardous waste minimization team of Lake City Army Ammunition Plant was the 1992 Secretary of the Army Pollution Prevention and Recycling Award in the team category. The award recognizes the successful efforts of the Lake City team in the area of preventing pollution at the source. This includes practices that reduce or eliminate the creation of pollutants through increased efficiency in the use of raw materials, energy, and water, and efforts to recycle materials that would otherwise become wastes. Some of Lake City's accomplishments include reducing hazardous waste by 41.7 million pounds, a reduction of 91 percent, reducing solid waste by 3.6 million pounds, reducing air emissions by 3.47 tons, and recycling 17.4 million pounds of production related materials. Lake City also received the Secretary of Defense Honorable Mention for Pollution Prevention and Recycling Award, and the Secretary of the Army Hazardous Waste Minimization Award.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when waste disposal is of major concern to this country and the world, it is efforts such as those of the Lake City Army Ammunition Plant that need recognition as an example to others. I know that other Members will join me in recognizing and commending the excellent work of the Lake City Army Ammunition Plant.

TRIBUTE TO JOSE RAMIREZ AND LEONARDO TORRES

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Jose Ramirez and Mr. Leonardo Torres from the city of Brownsville, TX.

To many, the thought of saving another human being's life is heroic, but to Jose Ramirez and Leonardo Torres, their act of valor and heroism was not out of personal glory, but out of human compassion. Their unselfish act meant saving the lives of two women and their six children, whose ages range from 4 months to 5 years old.

On May 20, 1993, Jose Ramirez and Leonardo Torres rescued Maria Luna Delgado and Hermelinda Lopez, along with their six children from a car that fell into a resaca in Brownsville, TX. The two women and their children were driving along the road when their vehicle plunged into the depths of the rasaca. In desperation, the two women tried to pull their children from the submerging car, but to no avail. The feat of saving their children trapped in the car seemed impossible. When suddenly, two strangers, Jose Ramirez and Leonardo Torres, jumped into the muddy waters of the rasaca and pulled the women and children to safety, sparing them sure death.

Please join me in congratulating Jose Ramirez and Leonardo Torres on their heroic effort. May we all learn from their example that the greatest act of valor is compassion for one another.

END THE BAN

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as the Clinton administration moves to implement new policies to protect the rights of homosexuals in the Armed Forces, I would like to share the following letter from one of my constituents, Mr. A.B. Kelly III, who was discharged from the Marine Corps on the grounds of homosexuality. His letter is a moving testimony which thoughtfully articulates the importance of ending the ban against homosexuals in the military.

ST. LOUIS, MO, *May 7, 1993.*

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON AND CONGRESS, I am a veteran who supports an end to the ban on gays, lesbians, and bisexuals in the military. Individuals should be judged on their performance, not their sexual orientations. If we allow this type of discrimination to continue, who will be next—Jews, women, Muslims, people with blue eyes, African-Americans? Clearly, this is not the country which I call America.

Yes, I have a personal interest in this ban. My grandfather, A.B. Kelly Sr. whom I am named after, fought in World War II. As an African-American, he fought in a segregated military to free Jews and other Europeans from the evils of Hitler, only to return home to a segregated country in which he was not free.

His main hope was that our society would not forget the tragedy of a segregated and intolerant military. But this hope still goes unnoticed, it seems. America is forgetting its past regarding the military. Judging Americans on their skin color, gender, and sexual orientation is deplorable.

I joined the United States Marine Corps on June 12, 1988, one week after graduating from high school, because of my grandfather's memories and father's love for this country. I was sent to Marine recruit station in San Diego, California. After graduating I went to Naval Air Station in Meridian, Mississippi for job training. I graduated with the class highest score and then was ready for the fleet. Before I went to the fleet I returned to my hometown of St. Louis, Missouri to see my father, A.B. Kelly Jr.

My father, A.B. Kelly Jr., was drafted during the Vietnam War. He has constantly showed me what it means to be an American. I remember as a child two distinct habits of my dad.

One was how he would put out the American flag on each Memorial, Veteran, and Fourth of July, in memory of our past and in hope for a better future. Second, he would constantly remind my sisters and I what it meant to be an American—not being judgmental of others, respecting your fellow Americans, in addition to giving back to your country what it has given to you, and believing in your country. My dad is still echoing these ideals, even as he grows older. He has relayed to me that he supports lifting the ban on gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, for, as he put it, "Discrimination in any form is wrong."

So, as I began my new life as a Marine, I believed that I could give back to my country and also know that I made a difference. Unfortunately, I was faced with the truth of military life, while I was stationed at the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point, North Carolina. Whether on or off duty, I watched as female Marines were harassed, and not just verbally. African-American Marines were being harassed as well. This led a few of us to form a peer support group for African-American and Latino-American Marines. But I had no idea that people in my squadron were trying to find out my sexual orientation, until my roommate, whom I knew since boot camp, told me a frightening thing.

He said in very specific terms that his office supervisor, who was a Staff Sergeant, was trying to get him moved out of our room due to rumors that I might be homosexual. I thought at the time what did I do to warrant this? It became obvious when I recalled my last workday.

I was asked by other marines in my office to join a deployment to the Philippans'. These marines were all higher rank than me, and married. They insisted that I would have a great time because of the prostitution in the Philippans'. They said that women would cost less than 20 dollars and detailed the things that women prostitutes would do "sexually to me." During this discussion, I felt extremely insulted by the fact that they would even come to me suggesting that I have sex with any prostitutes. I declined the deployment. But this was not the first time I was put on the spot. Before that they would bring pornography magazines into the office and try to get us involved in this show, but I constantly separated myself from this. I chose to work and ignore their sexism. I personally felt that this was no place to be discussing women, or men for that matter, bodies or positions. Not everyone, though, participated in these games. Only those who were married.

I remember my first week stationed at Cherry Point. My roommates and I had a long discussion concerning privacy, and sexuality. All three of us disclosed some very private information, in which one relied that he was bisexual. So I felt obligated to tell both of my roommates that I was a homosexual. One of my roommates along with others from the base, joined me at bars whether they were homosexual, or heterosexual bars. I vividly remember them telling me how surprised they were to find out that so many marines from Cherry Point were homosexual, but really was it a surprise. I constantly reminded them that the image of homosexuals were never truth, as they witnessed.

Within the next three months things began to change in my office on base. After I received the good conduct medal I was being brought up on charges, which seemed to stem from someones hatred toward my being. This gentleman, who was my direct supervisor, told me he wanted me out of the military at any cost. I really didn't understand why, until I became sick one day. This subsequently led to my first charge of AWOL, which I proved that I was at the military hospital on base. This gentleman also proceeded to stop payment on my military pay checks, which caused me serious financial problems. This in turn made my personal bank account bounce checks. This Staff Sergeant then proceeded to charge me with writing bad checks. During this time my roommate told me that the Staff Sergeant was going to get me kicked out of the military unless I confessed to being homosexual. I tried to get relocated into another office or squadron but was denied.

I did feel I was living a lie not to state who I was. I also remembered how I believed in integrity, so I requested mass to the commander of Marine Aviation Logistics Squadron (MALS)-13. I was constantly told that I needed to tell my problem before it left the office, or risk suffering the consequences. I made it as far as the assistant commander, which he told me that I requested mass to tell him I was homosexual. I was very surprised, and yet glad that the "lie" was over.

But, it still dismayed me as to how he knew I was homosexual, unless everything that my roommate told me was true. Were they going to do their best to destroy me? Did one of my roommates tell his Staff Sergeant that I was gay to get me kicked out? I don't really know the answer, but I do know it was sickening what some tried to do with me. The whole squadron knew what was discussed in this meeting. My office didn't even speak to me except for some after hours in private areas, which I won't relay at this time. Five months later I was discharged with an Honorable, due to homosexuality after only serving 2 years.

Being 23 years old I still value my time in the military. Besides the fact that I was denied equality, and even though both of my senators from the state of Missouri (i.e. Senator Danforth, and Senator Bond) support this discrimination, I am proud of serving my country. I had some truly good experiences with most marines that were and still are truly deserving of serving our country. It seems that the military is forgetting that we homosexuals, and bisexuals are Americans. Lets remember we are Americans, too.

Sincerely,

A.B. KELLY III.

NONPOINT SOURCE WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT OF 1993

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Prevention Act of 1993, the sequel to what is now section 319 of the Clean Water Act [CWA], Nonpoint Source Management Programs. I hope to include this legislation in the Clean Water Act reauthorization later this year.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 set the Nation on its current cleanup course. The first line of that landmark legislation, in section 101(a), declared it the objective of the act "to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters."

Until now, municipalities and industries have borne the brunt of this commitment. Since 1972 American citizens, as Federal and State taxpayers, have spent $75 billion to clean up municipal point sources. Through 1989, industry, and citizens as consumers, have spent over $130 billion on cleaning up industrial point sources, including $67 billion in capital expenditures and $63 billion in operating costs. Ninety percent of municipalities, and 95 percent of industry, currently comply with the act.

Despite that costly sacrifice, and high compliance rates, fully one-third of the Nation's rivers, half our estuaries, and more than half our lakes are not meeting designated uses. Only about half our river miles, two-thirds of lake acres, and three-quarters of our estuaries have even been assessed, meaning that a much more significant though unknown number of water bodies are impaired, and more are threatened.

The major cause of this failure to meet the standards in nonpoint sources of pollution [NPS]—or poison runoff—the unfinished agenda of the 1972 act.

As author of the current Nonpoint Source Management Program, I developed and, on March 18, circulated a discussion draft of new legislation which would treat nonpoint sources with the same determination as we have addressed point sources. The draft has received wide circulation and discussion. Much comment has come in, and has been reflected in the revised version I have introduced today.

BUILDING ON EXISTING LAW AND AUTHORITY

Congress stated, in the 1987 amendments, "it is the national policy that programs for the control of nonpoint sources of pollution be developed and implemented in an expeditious manner so as to enable the goals of this act be met through the control of both point and nonpoint sources of pollution."

The goals of restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity

of the Nation's waters, protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and aquatic life, and recreation in and on the water, are already being implemented by EPA in the agency's current criteria writing and other work applying to both point and nonpoint sources. My bill does not expand this existing, if far-reaching, authority.

The legislation builds on existing law and programs, including section 319, the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 [CZARA], and the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation and Water Quality Programs.

It relies on shared responsibility: The Federal Government provides guidance and financial support. The States and, to the extent possible, local jurisdictions and organizations, would be the main implementors, along with the individual land owners and operators.

It tracks closely the recommendations of Water Quality 2000, including site-level plans, voluntary and enforceable State programs, and reliance on the expertise of USDA and other agencies for technical assistance and funding.

It adopts and extends to the rest of the country what Coastal States are already doing under CZARA: Employing management measures, backed by enforceable mechanisms.

It accepts site-level plans developed under the Department of Agriculture's Conservation and Water Quality Programs.

The bill's goal is full restoration and protection of the Nation's waters, defined as the attainment and maintenance of water quality standards; the protection and propagation of a balanced, indigenous population of aquatic and aquatic-dependent species, aquatic ecosystem biodiversity, and habitat restoration and maintenance; protection of public health; restoration and maintenance of recreational activities in and on the water; and protection of underwater sediments through pollution prevention activities. These are the mandates of the 1972 act. The bill's emphasis on balanced indigenous populations, aquatic biodiversity, and habitat maintenance are clearly part and parcel of the 1972 mandate to restore and maintain the biological integrity of America's waters reflect authority the Environmental Protection Agency already has, and is already employing in its criteria writing, under the 1972 language.

THE PROGRAM

The working unit is the target watershed, defined as those watersheds identified under various CWA programs, and others which serve as sources of drinking water which are vulnerable to NPS pollution. States are to revise their current management programs, prioritize their target watersheds, divide them into fifths, and implement watershed implementation programs, starting with a new fifth each year.

The watershed implementation programs would begin with a watershed management conference called by the Governor. Representatives of all stakeholders in the watershed would take active part: Nonpoint sources, point sources, water users including drinking water suppliers, Federal, State, and local government and nongovernment agencies, and other interested parties. From the management conference would come an understanding of the problem, agreement on the causes, on who's responsible, and who should clean up.

Site-level plans. Those landowners and operators participating in the WIP would develop and implement site-level plans under State, not EPA, guidance. Those already implementing USDA site-level programs under the Conservation Reserve Program, the Water Quality Incentives Program, the Integrated Farm Management Program Option, or the Organic Certification Program, and under CZARA, would automatically be in compliance with this bill, at least for those pollutants and land areas included in the plans. Technical and financial assistance would be provided by the Soil Conservation Service, and other available Federal, State and local programs. Land owners/operators working under CZARA would also be in compliance with my bill.

Categories and subcategories of sources could be exempted from the requirement for site-level plans if they do not contribute significantly to the overall degradation of the watershed. Landowners and operators who can demonstrate severe economic hardship could also be exempt.

Management measures used in site-level plans would be cost-effective, site-specific, economically achievable measures. Landowners and operators could choose individual measures and practices under the EPA/NOAA's Guidance Specifying Management Measures for Sources of Nonpoint Pollution, or those under USDA's WQIP and the Integrated Farm Management Program; or other measures which provide equal or greater water protection.

EPA would approve the States' revised management plans, but would not see or approve site-level plans, or receive a list of those participating.

SCHEDULE

Eight years after the WIP is approved, the State would assess the watershed and, if full restoration and protection have not been achieved, would require additional measures, either by owner/operators already implementing plans, or by other sources. These additional measures must be sufficient to assure the attainment of full restoration by the end of the 12th year. Monitoring in subsequent years would assure that full restoration and protection are maintained.

GOOD ACTORS BAD ACTORS

The bill encourages good actors, those who have and are implementing approved site-level plans, while requiring States to have enforcement fall-back for bad actors who refuse to clean up and try to profit while the good actor competitors comply. The bill requires States to develop enforceable mechanisms—as are already required for Coastal States under CZARA. As long as an owner/operator has developed and is implementing a State-approved site-level plan, he or she would not be subject to enforcement until after the 12th year of the Watershed Implementation Program, when water quality standards become enforceable except for violations caused by floods and other natural disasters.

FUNDING

To encourage the States to implement the programs, and enable them to do so, the bill authorizes $500 million per year, and sets aside from each State's apportionment 20 percent or $200,000, whichever is greater, for administration. States have rightly complained of ever-increasing Federal mandates with no concomitant increase in Federal funds. They must have adequate resources. These funds would be used for existing section 319 purposes, including enforcement, technical assistance, financial assistance, education, training, technology transfer, and demonstrating projects.

The bill thus contains strong incentives for States to participate in the program, as well as provisions for States which may not be willing to comply. Under the point source enforcement program, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System [NPDES], EPA can take over and run a State's permit program if the State no longer meets the requirements of the program. However, I did not believe it appropriate for EPA to become involved in implementing site-level plans under a nonpoint program. Therefore, while EPA could, under my bill, develop a nonpoint source management program for a State, it would not be able to implement the program. Further, no new pollutant burdens could be added until nonpoint sources are brought under control. A noncomplying State would not be able to approve new—as opposed to simply extension of existing—NPDES permits, nor could the State or the Corps of Engineers issue new section 404 dredge and fill permits, either statewide or, if other watershed are complying, in a single noncomplying watershed, until EPA finds the State is meeting requirements.

FEDERAL NONPOINT PREVENTION PROGRAM

The bill also establishes a Federal nonpoint source control program, directly under the President, for lands owned or managed by the Federal Government.

WATER QUALITY CRITERIA

It requires EPA to establish water quality criteria for those nonpoint pollutants for which such criteria have not yet been set.

ANTIDEGRADATION POLICY

It codifies existing Federal antidegradation policy.

NEW NONPOINT SOURCES

It contains provisions to assure that new NPS are identified prior to any action being taken, and that state-of-the-art controls are used on these new sources before they cause pollution.

CITIZEN MONITORING PROGRAM

And, finally, the bill creates a Citizen Watershed Monitoring Program to assist States in monitoring their waters. The States would by contract, cooperative agreement, or other means develop citizen programs, provide training, and implement quality control and assurance measures to make sure that the data gathered by citizens are useful to the State. The nonpoint and other amendments to the CWA will put heavy monitoring burdens on States, and I believe a citizen program, properly designed and run, can assist States in this effort.

My bill is tough on pollution. But the 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act was not exactly polluter-friendly. It set an interim goal if fishable/swimmable waters by 1983, and a national goal of elimination of all discharges

by 1985. It required industry to install best practicable technology [BPT] by 1977—5 years after enactment—and best available technology [BAT] 3 years after effluent guidelines were promulgated. Where State water quality standards required higher levels of treatment, those standards had to be met by July 1, 1977.

We have not met the goals and objectives of the 1972 act, in part because of delays in the issuance of various effluent guidelines, in part because permits still allow the discharge of many tons of point source pollutants in to our waters, and in very large part because of nonpoint sources.

I fully expect the 1993 Clean Water Act amendments to continue progress toward the goals and objectives of the 1972 act, reducing point source discharges, and vigorously pursuing the control and prevention of nonpoint source pollution.

Unless Congress and the American people are willing to strike from the statute the commitment to clean water promised the American people two decades ago, we can do nothing less.

Attached is a summary of the bill.

NONPOINT SOURCE WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT OF 1993—SUMMARY

GOAL

To achieve the objective of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the nation's waters, by closing last gap in that Act, and controlling and preventing nonpoint sources of pollution.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Stability and continuity; least disruption to, maximum coordination with, on-going programs—Section 319, Clean Water Act (CWA); Section 6217(g) of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA); USDA's water quality programs.

Shared responsibility: States and, to extent possible, local jurisdictions and organizations, to be main implementors, along with individual land owners/operators; Federal government to provide guidance and financial support.

Base program on watersheds, targeting those which are impaired or threatened.

DISCUSSION

The bill tracks the recommendations of Water Quality 2000 for a strengthened and expanded national nonpoint source pollution prevention program including enforceable state programs, site-level plans, reliance on the expertise of USDA and other agencies for technical assistance, and funding from a revolving loan fund. It builds on existing Section 319 Clean Water Act Nonpoint Source Management programs; adopts the management measures developed under the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments as well as that Act's enforceable mechanisms; and uses the site-level approach of various Department of Agriculture programs.

The bill is fair and necessary, if America is to achieve the goal of clean water. American consumers, taxpayers and industry have paid hundreds of billions of dollars for point source controls, but the goal remains illusive because of nonpoint source pollution. The nation can continue to charge taxpayers and industry for ever-more-costly wastewater treatment and for maintenance of navigation on silt-choked rivers; can continue to inflict losses on commercial fishing and shellfishing, and recreational water uses; and perpetuate degradation of our water resources and the wild and aquatic life dependent on them; or address the problem of nonpoint sources, the last remaining gap in the Clean Water Act's programs.

DESCRIPTION

Schedule:

Within 1 year of enactment, EPA to publish implementing regulations and guidelines.

Within two years of publication, States to revise nonpoint management programs, identifying and prioritizing target watersheds to be included in program, dividing them into fifths for implementation over a 5-year period. Target watersheds defined as those identified under the Section 319 Nonpoint Source Management Program; Section 304(l) (Toxic Hot Spots); Section 305(b) State biennial reports; and vulnerable drinking water supplies not otherwise identified.

EPA has 6 months to approve or disapprove all or portion of program.

Revised program to include watershed implementation plans, based on site-level plans developed in cooperation with land owners and operators, and other interested parties including point sources on the watershed.

Implementation is an iterative process, with a goal of full restoration and protection of America's waters within 15 years for all fifths.

First 8 years after approval—management measures; if full restoration and protection not achieved.

9th through 12th years—additional measures to achieve full restoration and protection by end of 12th year.

Monitoring to assure full restoration and protection maintained.

Enforcement: based on "good actors, bad actors."

State is required to have enforceable mechanisms.

Land owner/operators: o/o must develop and implement site-level plans;

after 12th year, water quality standards become enforceable;

"good actor" provisions: compliance with USDA conservation and water quality programs; with CWA NPS program and Sec. 402; with enforceable provisions of CZARA; constitute compliance with this Act, act as shields against enforceable mechanisms.

State: must revise and submit Nonpoint Management Program under Sec. 319; if State does not submit, EPA designs program BUT does not implement; if State does not submit or implement: no funds; permits for new or increased discharges cannot be approved under Sec. 402, CWA; no permits under Sec. 404 of CWA.

Funding: $500 million per year for fiscal years 1 994–1997 from General Revenues; 20% or $200,000, whichever is greater, for State Administration; 5% for Indian Tribes.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Creates a Federal nonpoint control program directly under the President.

Expands water quality criteria and standards to cover nonpoint pollutants.

Contains provisions for new sources of NPS.

Creates a Citizen Monitoring Program to assist states in monitoring.

TRIBUTE TO BEN SKALL

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend and former colleague, Mr. Ben Skall, as he receives an award from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for his years of service to that agency.

Ben has had a successful career in both the private and public sectors. For 32 years, he was the president of Skall's Menswear, a chain of quality menswear retail stores located in Ohio and Pennsylvania. He was active in local government and served as vice mayor and councilman for the city of University Heights, OH. My own association with Ben came when we served as colleagues in the Ohio State Senate.

It was in 1984 that Ben joined HUD as the Senior Advisor to the Deputy Undersecretary in the Office of Intergovernmental Relations in Washington, DC. In 1987, he moved to the Cleveland HUD office and served with distinction as the Acting Manager/Deputy Manager. He had responsibility for all multifamily and single family housing functions in 35 of Ohio's 88 counties, including subsidized housing for elderly people and Government-insured mortgage loans.

Ben's professional associations and awards are far too numerous to recite, but they exemplify the enormous degree of commitment which he has made to his State and country through the years. To my good friends Ben and Vera Skall, I send my best wishes as Ben receives this award from HUD. I wish I could be with you on your big day and I sincerely hope that our friendship and professional association will continue for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. THOMAS RANDY O'BOYLE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1993

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I pay tribute to Maj. Thomas R. O'Boyle for his distinguished service to the U.S. Air Force and this great Nation as a liaison officer from May 16, 1992 to July 15, 1993. In this capacity, Randy quickly established a solid reputation for excellence with both Members and staff. His ability to speak, with authority, on a diverse array of Air Force programs and issues has aided us immeasurably. His background in special operations and his combat experience, gleaned from service in both Just Cause and Desert Storm, made him an invaluable resource to us. Randy's sound judgment and keen sense of priority are trusted attributes that have greatly benefited both Congress and the U.S. Air Force. His can-do attitude has made a measurable difference in the demanding arena of international travel. He has served with great distinction and has earned

our respect and gratitude for his many contributions to our Nation's defense. My colleagues and I bid Maj. Randy O'Boyle a fond farewell and wish him the very best for continued success as he begins his next assignment as a naval command and staff college student at the Naval War College in Newport, RI.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 29, 1993, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 30

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Force Requirements and Personnel Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1994 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on the health care programs of the military services.
SD-562

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act.
SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
Clean Air and Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), focusing on S. 1162, to authorize funds for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for the NRC's Inspector General, S. 1166, to strengthen the NRC's enforcement powers, and S. 1165, to ensure citizens' petitions cannot be denied without the possibility of judicial review.
SD-406

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume oversight hearings to examine the Blue Cross/Blue Shield's Empire Insurance Plan of New York.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to improve the methods for meeting the health needs of the minority disadvantaged.
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for foreign assistance, focusing on refugee programs.
SD-138

Armed Services
To hold hearings on the nominations of Ambassador Charles W. Freeman, Jr., of Rhode Island, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Regional Security Affairs, Edwin Dorn, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, and other pending nominations.
SR-222

JULY 1

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of Tara Jeanne O'Toole, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety and Health, and Robert Riggs Nordhaus, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
Clean Water, Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Clean Water Act, focusing on toxic pollution prevention and control programs.
SD-406

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the financial management of the Department of Defense.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on the challenges and opportunities for the conduct of monetary policy.
SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to toy safety, and on S. 680, to require warning labels on the packaging of children's toys and games with small parts, balloons, small balls, or marbles, and to require bicycle helmets to meet Consumer Product Safety Commission standards, and S. 799, to require that 4-galloon to 6-galloon buckets distributed in commerce bear a permanent label warning of a potential drowning hazard to young children.
SR-253

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to examine the future of workers and the workplace with the advancement of technology.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 843, to improve reemployment rights and benefits of veterans and other benefits of employment of certain members of the uniformed services, and pending legislation on VA health care programs.
SR-418

Joint Organization of Congress
To resume hearings to examine congressional reform proposals.
S-5, Capitol

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on the nomination of Victor P. Raymond, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Policy and Planning).
SR-418

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposals to redesign the Space Station.
SR-253

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of Thomas W. Payzant, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.
SD-430

JULY 13

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to authorize funds for programs of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act.
SR-253

JULY 14

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1086, to foster the further development of the Nation's telecommunications infrastructure through the enhancement of competition.
SR-253

CANCELLATIONS

JULY 1

2:00 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1021, to assure religious freedom to Native Americans.
SR-485