

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 12, 1994

The House met at 12 noon.

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

O gracious God, from whom comes every good gift and every blessed assurance, we interrupt the tasks of the day and pause in this prayer to offer our thanksgivings of life and love. Especially this day we express our gratitude to those who have made our lives fuller and whose spirits have made our spirits more complete. We acknowledge that so much of our own vitality comes from friends who touch our hearts and enlighten our minds, whose enthusiasm and insight and wisdom brighten our days and are a blessing to all. For these and all Your benefits we offer this prayer of thanksgiving. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WELDON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4190. An act to designate the building located at 41-42 Norre Gade in Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands, for the period of time during which it houses operations of the United States Postal Service, as the Alvaro de Lugo Post Office.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 528. An act to provide for the transfer of certain United States Forest Service lands located in Lincoln County, Montana, to Lincoln County in the State of Montana;

S. 1614. An act to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the National School

Lunch Act to promote healthy eating habits for children and to extend certain authorities contained in such acts through fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes;

S. 1782. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), to provide for public access to information in an electronic format, and for other purposes; and

S. 2430. An act to facilitate recovery from the recent flooding in Georgia, Alabama, and Florida resulting from Tropical Storm Alberto by providing greater flexibility for depository institutions and their regulators, and for other purposes.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker, signed the following enrolled bill of Thursday, September 8, 1994:

S. 859, to reduce the restrictions on lands conveyed by deed under the act of June 8, 1926.

And the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Friday, September 9, 1994:

H.R. 3355, to control and prevent crime; and

H.R. 3474, to reduce administrative requirements for insured depository institutions to the extent consistent with safe and sound banking practices, to facilitate the establishment of community development financial institutions, and for other purposes.

### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE DELEGATION TO ATTEND THE CONFERENCE OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276a-1, and the order of the House of Sunday, August 21, 1994, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker on September 8, 1994, did appoint to the delegation to attend the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union to be held in Copenhagen, Denmark from September 12, 1994, to September 17, 1994, the following Member of the House:

Mr. WILSON of Texas.

### CALLING FOR VOTE BEFORE TAKING ACTION WITH REGARD TO HAITI

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I care deeply about our Constitution, and I care deeply about our President, and we need to find a way to deal with Haiti that respects both of them. The Constitution vests in Congress the power to decide whether to take this Nation to war. This is not a turf issue. Having Congress act is a means to a more important end, and that is making sure that the country understands and supports such a grave decision. That purpose was well-served by the debate and vote before going into the Persian Gulf war.

Based on what I have heard in the last few weeks at home, Mr. Speaker, a large majority in Colorado does not think we should invade Haiti. We should listen to them, and we should vote on this issue.

### NO JUSTIFICATION FOR INVASION OF HAITI

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is on the verge of committing United States troops to an invasion of our little neighbor, Haiti.

An invasion of that sad little island will be a disaster for everyone involved. We have no vital security interest there that justifies the risk of losing the lives of one American service man or woman.

Mr. Clinton claims to have tried everything to avoid this invasion but we have not even suggested that new elections be held under international supervision.

Mr. Clinton needs to go back to the drawing board on his Haitian policy.

Restoring Mr. Aristide to power is not the same as restoring democracy. Do not confuse one with the other.

Our interest in Haiti should be to relieve the suffering of the Haitian people caused by Mr. Clinton's embargo.

Saving the lives of the suffering Haitian children is a worthy goal; restoring Mr. Aristide to power is not.

We must stop Mr. Clinton's blind rush to waste American lives and prestige in a place where there is no threat to our vital interests.

### FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD RAISES INTEREST RATES FOR FIFTH TIME IN THE LAST 7 MONTHS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House

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

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

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board has once again raised interest rates. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth hike in the last 7 months.

Now the Fed said inflation is threatening and the economy is just too strong. Let me ask this question: If the economy is so strong, why is IBM laying off 3,000 workers, and why is K-Mart laying off 5,000 workers? The truth is I have never heard of companies laying off American workers when it was boom time.

I say the fact is we have got a new country club full of rich, high paid bankers who met in secrecy in back rooms without public hearings, raising our interest rates, killing American jobs, and Congress keeps listening to that song and dance. I say it is time for Congress to reevaluate this little country club whose piggy bank just keeps getting fatter and fatter while American workers keep getting a pink slip. Think about it.

#### PRESIDENT USING HAITI AS A MEANS TO DEMONSTRATE POLITICAL PROWESS

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, as an 8-year member of the Committee on Armed Services and a strong supporter of our men and women in the military, I am extremely concerned by what appears to be an unstoppable movement by our President to invade Haiti sometime this week or in the next several weeks. My constituents over the district work period asked me why he would do this, and they understand that the President is saying it is to restore order and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD a Survey of Freedom review which looks at all countries nationwide. There are 20 nations in the world with the same type of status as Haiti in terms of freedom, in terms of human rights. I would ask the President if he intends to invade all 20 of these nations.

I would think rather, Mr. Speaker, the reason for the President's action is what was stated by Dante Caputo, the U.N. Special Envoy to Haiti, when he wrote his memo to Boutros-Ghali. He stated in the memo, and I will put this in the RECORD this evening in a special order, that the movement by the President is politically desirable. He further states that this type of action is designed to show, after strong media criticism of the President, the President's decisionmaking capability and the firmness of leadership in the international matters.

Mr. Speaker, not one American life is worthy of this President using Haiti as a means to demonstrate his political prowess.

The 20 Worst Rated Countries: Afghanistan; Angola; Bhutan; Burma (Myanmar); Burundi; China; Cuba; Equatorial Guinea; Haiti; Iraq; Korea, North; Libya; Saudi Arabia; Somalia; Sudan; Syria; Tajikistan; Turkmenistan; Uzbekistan; and Vietnam.

The Six Worst Rated Related Territories: East Timor (Indonesia); Irian Jaya (Indonesia); Kashmir (India); Kosovo (Yugoslavia); Nagomo-Karabakh (Armenia/Azerbaijan); and Tibet (China).

#### MESSAGE TO CONGRESS: "DON'T RAM HEALTH CARE DOWN AMERICA'S THROAT"

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is returning from the August district work period with one clear message from their constituents: Don't ram a last minute, big-government health care bill through Congress and down America's throat. Nobody is denying the need for reform in our health care system. However, it would be a disaster to scrap what is still the worlds best, for election year political reasons. We need to make incremental changes in the specific areas that are not working.

I do not want to confuse this with just opening the door for further invasion of big-government but specifically needed changes.

Mr. Speaker, we must have the time to thoroughly digest this important legislation and debate the details. It is the responsibility of the majority leaders of this House to provide the elected membership of this body the opportunity to make an informed decision. Not as in the past to simply receive a last minute, backroom deal followed by a forced late-night vote.

□ 1210

#### ANSWERS ON HAITIAN POLICY REQUIRED BEFORE INVASION

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton and members of his Cabinet are beating the war drums for an invasion of Haiti, but they seem to be the only people who want an invasion.

I have spent the past 3 weeks in central Illinois, and I can tell you that there is very little support for an invasion of Haiti. If the President consulted with Congress on this decision, I believe he would find that many Members on both sides of the aisle oppose an invasion, as well as the vast majority of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, what does the United States have at stake in Haiti? What is our national security concern there? Is an invasion worth the loss of American lives? Is an invasion worth millions of dollars it will cost American taxpayers? What will we do after the invasion? When will our troops leave Haiti?

These are all questions which the President has not addressed. Congress and the American people deserve some explanation from the President before he invades Haiti. I hope the President will either make his case or stop beating war drums and stop this potential disaster before it happens.

#### ON A COLLISION COURSE IN HAITI

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, according to the media, cynics conclude that the President is planning to invade Haiti for a much-needed boost in his drastically falling popularity curve. While the White House denies this is the motivation, the fact is that they have not provided any other explanation that makes sense. Their latest excuse seems to be that the President has gone too far to back down.

Mr. Speaker, this is not some game of chicken. The White House now plans to put 20,000 American troops into harm's way in Haiti. That is no game. Congress cannot wait until we start taking casualties to debate the inappropriateness of using American force in Haiti. Since the President refuses to bring the debate to Congress, Congress should bring the debate to him. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 169 and help put Congress back in the Haiti debate.

#### HOUDINI IN THE WHITE HOUSE

(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, with the lowest approval rating in 20 years, it is no wonder President Clinton would like to divert the public's eyes as much as America would obviously like to avert them.

Like some latter day Houdini, the President seems to relish constructing ever tougher dilemmas and then conjuring up ever more miraculous escapes.

Regretfully, it is the American people these tricks are really tough on. They are the ones who must pay his higher gas taxes, his higher Social Security taxes, his higher income taxes, and his higher inflation.

In fact, it seems all this is still not enough of a challenge for the White House and that it wants to revise a routine not seen since the Carter administration—stagflation. This really

incredible trick has the economy go down while prices still go up.

So right on cue, at the moment of greatest crisis and the November elections, President Clinton wants to escape from his predicament by turning himself into a new Democrat. He intends to do it with the magic spell of family values.

America has seen this trick before and it should not be fooled again.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of 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 at the end of the legislative business day, but not before 5 p.m.

#### FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4391) to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 1995, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4391

*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 "Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995".

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Maritime Commission, \$18,900,000 for fiscal year 1995.

#### SEC. 3. INDEPENDENT ACTION.

Section 5(b) of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. App. 1704(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

"(8) provide that—

"(A) any member of the conference may take independent action on any rate, service item, or level of ocean freight forwarder compensation required to be filed in a tariff under section 8(a) upon not more than 10 calendar days notice to the conference; and

"(B) the conference will include the new rate, service item, or level of ocean freight forwarder compensation in its tariff for use by that member, effective no later than 10 calendar days after receipt of the notice, and by any other member that notifies the conference that it elects to adopt the independent rate, service item, or level of ocean freight forwarder compensation on or after its effective date, in lieu of the existing conference tariff provision for that rate, service item, or level of ocean freight forwarder compensation."

#### SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON DENYING COMPENSATION.

Section 10(c) of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. App. 1709(c)), is amended by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

"(5) deny in the export foreign commerce of the United States compensation to an ocean freight forwarder, or limit that compensation to less than 1.25 percent of the aggregate of all of the rates and charges applicable under the tariff assessed against the cargo on which the forwarding services are provided; or"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Maritime Commission [FMC] regulates international and domestic ocean common carriers to ensure that ocean transportation is available to shippers on a fair and nondiscriminatory basis and that the practices of ocean common carriers do not adversely impact the commerce of the United States. The FMC is also charged with protecting the rights of U.S. Shippers and carriers from discriminatory foreign shipping policies.

H.R. 4391 authorizes \$18,900,000 for the fiscal year 1995 expenditures of this Agency. This amount is identical to that appropriated last year, and slightly higher than the appropriations provided for fiscal year 1995.

This bill includes the text of H.R. 56, a bill introduced by Representative BENTLEY that corrects an inconsistency in a 1986 statute that provided protection to certain freight forwarders. The administration supports this change.

This is a fair bill and I urge the Members' support for it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4391 and applaud the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], as well as our ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], who is on his way to the House floor at this very moment. I also rise to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], and our ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], for their work on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation and has the full support of our committee. It went through the committee process unanimously and enjoys the support of both Republicans, Democrats, and the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I move for expedited approval of this bill. As our chairman pointed out, during our committee's deliberations we agreed to incorporate into this bill the text of legislation in-

troduced by our distinguished colleague, the honorable gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY], who has served in a leadership roll in this institution on Federal maritime issues. This provision will require that ocean carrier conferences equitably treat ocean freight forwarders. It simply expands the scope of language in the 1986 Tax Reform Act which provided certain benefits to freight forwarders who were also customs brokers. It is only fair to provide all freight forwarders these benefits, and not limit it to those forwarders who also perform the services of custom brokers.

I was pleased that the leadership in this body as well as the administration agreed to accept the language of our colleague, Mrs. BENTLEY, and I am happy to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4391, the Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995. H.R. 4391 authorizes the Commission an appropriation of \$18,900,000 and will provide the Commission with the financial means to fulfill its regulatory responsibilities to administer various statutes affecting ocean commerce.

The Commission is charged with enforcing U.S. shipping statutes to ensure an equitable trading environment in the ocean transportation industry.

U.S. exports and imports are highly dependent on ocean transportation costs and availability, and the Commission plays an indispensable role to ensure fair market access for American companies in the global transportation marketplace.

I would like to commend Congresswoman BENTLEY for her efforts to secure a provision in H.R. 4391 that would guarantee freight forwarders a minimum rate of compensation. This provision is of vital importance to the mom and pop businesses which are the backbone of our Nation's shipping industry.

I would also like to thank Chairman STUDDS, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. BATEMAN for their leadership, and I urge adoption of this important legislation.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, our good friend and colleague the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], who just arrived from the airport from his home in Texas.

□ 1220

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4391, legislation authorizing appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission [FMC] for fiscal year 1995.

The administration's request for the FMC was for \$18,700,000, which was \$200,000 less than the agency received last year. Based on testimony given to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it has been determined that this funding level was not sufficient to cover all of the FMC's necessary expenses. When H.R. 4391 was introduced by our committee leadership, the funding level was set at \$18,900,000 which represents level funding from last year.

While this legislation represents a modest \$200,000 increase over the administration's request, as the Chairman of the FMC, the Honorable Bill Hathaway testified, without this increase the agency simply would not have enough funds to even cover the salaries of their approved personnel.

Mr. Speaker, the programs carried out by this independent agency are critical to the long-term future of the U.S.-flag liner industry and we should provide them with sufficient resources to do their job.

During our committee's deliberations, we agreed to incorporate into this bill the text of legislation introduced by our distinguished colleague from Maryland, the Honorable HELEN BENTLEY. This provision would require that ocean carrier conferences equitably treat ocean freight forwarders. It simply expands the scope of language in the 1986 Tax Reform Act, which provided certain benefits to freight forwarders who were also customs brokers. It is only fair to provide all freight forwarders these benefits, and not limit it to just those forwarders who also perform the services of customs brokers. I am pleased to support this language and compliment Congresswoman BENTLEY for her outstanding leadership in bringing this issue to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and I urge the Members of this body to join Chairman STUDDS and myself in supporting this legislation.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4391, the Federal Maritime Commission authorization for fiscal year 1995.

The FMC, an agency I once chaired, is responsible for the regulation of waterborne foreign and domestic offshore commerce of the United States and the assurance that the United States international trade is open to all nations on fair and equitable terms. The FMC is an agency too important not to have its authorization bill enacted by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this year's FMC authorization legislation is especially important because it contains language of tremendous value to freight forwarders and customs brokers throughout our country. Specifically, H.R. 4391 contains the text of H.R. 56, a bill I introduced

designed to extend the 1986 forwarder compensation law to all ocean freight forwarders—action which should have been done years ago.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, freight forwarders form an indispensable link between shippers and carriers in the movement of international cargo. Ocean freight forwarders are the people who arrange the space on ocean carriers for U.S. exports. It is a good analogy to say that freight forwarders are to cargo what travel agents are to people. They are, by and large, totally American small businesses, and like travel agents, are located in virtually every commercial center throughout our country.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1986 Congress passed a critical independent action amendment to the Tax Reform Act, essentially to protect U.S. freight forwarders against unfair practices by steamship conferences, which were granted antitrust immunity in the Shipping Act of 1984. The 1986 amendment established a minimum rate which the steamship conferences acting in concert must pay U.S. freight forwarders, and it permits individual steamship lines to negotiate compensation with freight forwarders.

The independent action provision in the Tax Reform Act was an important first step in protecting hundreds of freight forwarding companies and thousands of their employees throughout the United States and in establishing a more competitive climate in the export trade arena.

Nevertheless, the wording of the independent action provision limits its application to freight forwarders who are also customs brokers. This provision, which discriminates against freight forwarders who are not custom brokers—and runs contrary to common sense—was enacted due to the jurisdictional lines of the committee involved in passage of the measure in 1986.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the passage of the legislation we will be able to correct this discrepancy in the 1986 tax reform bill by placing all ocean freight forwarders on equal footing with respect to the receipt of compensation from ocean common carriers. My amendment provides a more consistent regulatory approach and could serve to eliminate any inequities caused by the current law.

There is no reason not to include all freight forwarders irrespective of whether they are customs brokers. H.R. 56 is noncontroversial legislation, supported by current FMC Chairman William Hathaway that should have been adopted by Congress back in 1986.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee leadership, especially Chairman STUDDS, Subcommittee Chairman LIPINSKI, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. BATEMAN for their critical assistance in enabling H.R. 56 to pass the House this year, my last year in the Congress. I would also like to thank our hard working and very capable committee staff on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge quick adoption of this important legislation.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4391, 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 appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 1995, and to amend the Shipping Act of 1984 to require that conference agreements authorize members of conferences to take certain independent actions and to prohibit conferences and groups of common carriers from denying or limiting in export foreign commerce compensation to ocean freight forwarders."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1994

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4308) to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to authorize appropriations for allocations under that act for wetlands conservation projects, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4308

*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 "North American Wetlands Conservation Act Amendments of 1994".*

#### SEC. 2. MATCHING, REPORTING, AND REVISING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) *MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—Section 8(b) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4407(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "In the case of a project carried out in Mexico, the non-Federal share of the United States contribution to the costs of the project may include cash contributions from non-United States sources that are used to pay costs of the project."*

(b) *REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 10(1) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 4409(a)(1)) is amended in subparagraph (B) by striking "and" after the semicolon, in subparagraph (C) by striking the period and inserting "; and", and by adding at the end the following:*

*"(D) wetlands conservation projects funded under this Act, listed and identified by type, conservation mechanism (such as acquisition, easement, or lease), location, and duration."*

(c) *REVISIONS TO PLAN.—Section 11 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 4410) is amended—*

*(1) in the first sentence—*

*(A) by striking "1991" and inserting "1998"; and*

*(B) by inserting "and Mexico" after "Canada"; and*

*(2) by striking the second sentence.*

**SEC. 3. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS IN WETLANDS CONSERVATION.**

The North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**"SEC. 19. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS IN WETLANDS CONSERVATION.**

"Not later than January 31, 1996, the Secretary, in cooperation with the Council, to further the purposes of the Act shall—

"(1) develop and implement a strategy to assist in the implementation of this Act in conserving the full complement of North American wetlands systems and species dependent on those systems, that incorporates information existing on the date of the issuance of the strategy in final form on types of wetlands habitats and species dependent on the habitats; and

"(2) develop and implement procedures to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of wetlands conservation projects completed under this Act."

**SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ALLOCATIONS UNDER NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION ACT.**

Section 7(c) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4406(c)) is amended by striking "\$15,000,000" and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting the following: "\$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 and 1996 and \$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 and 1998."

**SEC. 5. CONSERVATION OF COASTAL WETLANDS.**

Section 306(c) of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 3955(c)) is amended by inserting "in coastal wetlands ecosystems" after "wetlands conservation projects".

**SEC. 6. WILDLIFE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.**

The Partnerships For Wildlife Act (16 U.S.C. 3741 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 7103(3) (16 U.S.C. 3742(3)) by inserting "the States and of" after "under the leadership of";

(2) in section 7104 (16 U.S.C. 3743)—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'designated State agency' means the government agency, department, or division of any State that is empowered under the laws of the State to exercise the functions ordinarily exercised by a State fish and wildlife agency.";

(B) in paragraph (4) by striking "section 5(f)" and inserting "section 7105(g)";

(C) in paragraph (8)(A) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) in paragraph (8)(C) by—

(i) striking "section 3(5)" and inserting "section 3(6)"; and

(ii) by striking "(16 U.S.C. 1362(5))" and inserting "(16 U.S.C. 1362(6))";

(3) in section 7104 (16 U.S.C. 3743) by—

(A) redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(B) inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

"(8) The term 'State' means any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, or American Samoa.";

(4) in section 7105(d) (16 U.S.C. 3744(d))—

(A) in paragraph (3) by inserting "and" after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (4) by striking ";" and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (5);

(5) in section 7105 (16 U.S.C. 3744) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) NON-FEDERAL SHARE OF PROJECTS.—

"(1) STATE SHARE.—Of the total cost each fiscal year of each project carried out with amounts provided by the Secretary under sub-

section (a), at least 1/3 shall be paid with amounts from State, non-Federal sources, except that if designated State agencies from 2 or more States cooperate in implementing such a project at least 30 percent shall be paid with amounts from such State, non-Federal sources. Payments required by this paragraph may not be in the form of an in-kind contribution.

"(2) PRIVATE SHARE.—Of the total cost each fiscal year of each project carried out with amounts provided by the Secretary under subsection (a), at least 1/3 shall be paid with amounts from voluntary contributions by private entities or persons, except that if designated State agencies from 2 or more States cooperate in implementing such a project, at least 30 percent shall be paid from such sources. Subject to the approval of the Secretary, such contributions for a project may be in the form of, but are not required to be limited to, private cash donations, and the contribution of materials, equipment, or services necessary for the project.";

(6) in section 7105(g) (16 U.S.C. 3744(g))—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary shall deposit into the Fund amounts appropriated to the Secretary for deposit to the Fund, of which not more than 4 percent shall be available to the Secretary to defray the costs of administering this chapter and evaluating wildlife conservation and appreciation projects.";

(B) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(7) in section 7105(h) (16 U.S.C. 3744(h))—

(A) by striking "1995" and inserting "1998"; and

(B) by striking "to match the amount of contributions made to the Fund by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4308 was introduced by Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. WELDON, and myself. It reauthorizes the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through the year 1998, and makes important changes to further enhance the act's effectiveness. In addition, H.R. 4308 amends the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act to ensure that funds allocated to wetlands conservation projects are used for coastal wetlands ecosystems in coastal States. Finally, the bill reauthorizes the Partnerships for Wildlife Act through fiscal year 1998 at current authorization levels and amends the act to facilitate participation by non-Federal parties.

Wetlands are among the most biologically productive habitats on Earth, serving as breeding and wintering grounds for a diverse array of fish and wildlife species. In the last two centuries, however, more than 50 percent of the wetlands in the lower 48 States have been destroyed. The North American Wetlands Conservation Act was

enacted in 1989 to help reverse this disastrous decline by fostering innovative public-private partnerships to protect, enhance, restore, and manage wetland ecosystems throughout Canada, Mexico, and the United States.

By all appearances, the act has been a major success and exemplifies how the Federal Government can work cooperatively with private landowners to protect and restore wetlands. To date, more than \$110 million in Federal dollars has generated over \$212 million in partner funds, conserving more than 1.3 million acres of wetlands in the United States and Canada alone.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for their work to further enhance the act's effectiveness. We have produced a good bill and I urge all Members to join us in supporting it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4308, the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund [NAWCF] reauthorization. I would like to commend Chairman JOHN DINGELL, Chairman GERRY STUDDS, and ranking member JACK FIELDS for their hard work in bringing this important measure to the House floor.

On April 28, 1994, Congressman DINGELL and I introduced H.R. 4308, legislation to reauthorize and expand the NAWCF. The bill increases the authorized levels for NAWCF to \$20 million for fiscal years 1995 and 1996 and \$30 million for 1997 and 1998. It also strengthens the assessment requirements for the program, amends the Partnership for Wildlife Act, loosens the restrictions on funding for projects in Mexico, and requires that moneys derived from the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act are used for projects within the national coastal watershed boundary that benefit coastal wetlands ecosystems. This last provision is not intended to limit Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act moneys to saltwater or tidal marshes, but rather to ensure that projects benefiting from these funds are located within the coastal watershed and assist in the preservation of coastal wetlands ecosystems and the migratory birds species which depend on them.

As one of the two Members of the House of Representatives on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, which approves funding for NAWCF projects, I have seen first hand the tremendous impact NAWCF has had in protecting and enhancing ecologically critical wetland habitats throughout North America.

The NAWCF is one of the most successful and cost effective wetlands preservation initiatives in existence. The fund operates as a public-private

partnership, with Federal grant moneys being matched, often at rates as high as 4 to 1, by private, State, and local moneys. Since its inception in 1989, non-Federal partners have matched roughly \$100 million in Federal grants with over \$200 million of their own resources. To date, the NAWCF has led to the preservation, enhancement, or increased protection of almost 7 million acres of prime wetland habitat in North America.

As successful as the fund has been, much more still needs to be done. The 1993 estimate of North America's breeding duck population is 18 percent below the average of the last 40 years. For certain species, the numbers are far worse. Mallard populations are down 20 percent and the northern pintail population has declined by half.

Habitat loss has played a major role in the decline of these species. Only through the continuation and expansion of programs such as the NAWCF can we head off even greater losses.

Some important States within North America's migratory flyways have yet to set aside critical wetland habitat under the NAWCF program. My own home State of Pennsylvania is one such State.

Currently, I am working with the three counties—Chester, Montgomery, and Delaware—which comprise the Seventh Congressional District to ensure that migratory bird habitats within their boundaries are protected. The counties' participation is made possible by the passage of multimillion dollar open space bond acts in both Chester and Montgomery Counties. I am working to ensure that some of these funds, totaling over \$150 million, are used in combination with NAWCF moneys to create the first NAWCF migratory bird habitat protection project in Pennsylvania.

This summer, for the first time, projects that will benefit Pennsylvania's vanishing wetlands ecosystems have been proposed. One of the projects now being considered for funding under NAWCF in Pennsylvania is the Audubon Schuylkill River project.

The Audubon Schuylkill River proposal is a great example of why NAWCF has been such a success. The project proposal, which was drawn up by the Chester County Department of Parks and Recreation, leverages \$900,000 in NAWCF grant funding with contributions of land and money totaling \$924,700 from Chester County and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, and technical, monitoring, and management assistance from seven other partners. Through this joint effort, over 330 acres of prime wetlands and associated uplands will be preserved and an additional 200 acres of wetlands will be enhanced, resorted, or created. If approved, the project will reclaim breeding habitat for species such as the least

bittern, American bittern, black rail, bobolink, and the broad-winged hawk, along with 13 species of migratory waterfowl.

On September 23, 1994, I will be joined by members of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council in touring the project site. It is my hope that the Audubon Schuylkill River project will be the first in a long line of important wetlands restoration projects funded by NAWCF in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to thank Chairmen DINGELL and STUDDS and my committee's ranking member, JACK FIELDS, for their hard work and support in ensuring the timely passage of this vital bill. I encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4803.

□ 1230

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], whose arrival is extraordinarily timely.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], the chairman of the committee, and I also commend my dear friend and colleague, the ranking minority member, and also my very special friend who serves with me on the Migratory Bird Commission. They are great members and they are to be commended for what it is that they have done in presenting this bill to the House.

Mr. Speaker, there has been great and creative work done on the part of both the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], and I commend them for what they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4308, legislation to reauthorize the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

I want to commend the chairman of the committee, Mr. STUDDS, the ranking minority member, Mr. FIELDS, and one of the chief cosponsors of the bill, Mr. WELDON, for tireless and creative work that went into the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I observe this legislation goes well beyond the original straight reauthorization legislation I introduced. The program created by the statute we crafted several years ago is working well, with a few minor exceptions.

From its inception in 1989, this program has funded 289 wetlands conservation projects in 36 States, 10 Canadian provinces and 8 Mexican States, conserving more than 1.3 million acres of wetlands in Canada and the United States alone. The traditional manner of protecting wetlands is through outright purchase using Federal dollars. This program stretches dollars through cooperative agreements between the Federal, State and nongovernmental organizations. More than \$110 million in Federal North American Wetland Conservation Act has generated more than \$212 million

in so-called partnership funds. That kind of leverage—for Federal money—is hard to find. And it has been private conservation groups such as Ducks Unlimited and the Nature Conservancy that have made substantial commitments of their resources to make the program a success.

My biggest concern is that projects under this program utilize too many short term agreements. In my mind, long term conservation, which is terminology from the original statute, means protecting the resources for at least 25 years, and mostly, in perpetuity. The committee report reinforces this interpretation, and I expect future projects will take this admonition seriously.

The committee made other constructive modifications to my bill to reauthorize the program. Authorizing cash contributions from non-United States sources will create opportunities for more projects in Mexico. The enhanced planning and reporting will give the Council and the Commission more tools to plan future projects, and expand the scope of those projects. My one caution, however, is while project diversity is an important goal, the original intent of the program was, and still is, to protect migratory waterfowl. If we stray too far from this foundation, we may undermine the strength and purpose of the program.

I also want to thank the committee for taking my concerns into account in section 5 of the legislation, dealing with the conservation of coastal wetlands. Language was inserted making reference to official NOAA coastal zone boundary characterization reports that make almost 80 percent of Michigan eligible to qualify to receive project consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this is good legislation and reauthorizes a program marked by success. I urge its adoption.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4308, a bill that reauthorizes the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

The purpose of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act is to conserve wetland ecosystems and the species they support, which are primarily waterfowl. This act provides the financial assistance necessary for the implementation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, an agreement originally signed in 1986, to reverse our continent's loss of wetlands and to stem the decline in populations of migratory birds.

Wetlands are among the most productive habitats on earth—serving as breeding, nursing, and wintering grounds for an array of fish and wildlife. In the last two centuries, some wetlands in the lower 48 States have been lost. As a result, certain waterfowl and other migratory birds in Canada, Mexico, and the United States have declined. To aid in recovery of waterfowl populations, the United States and Canada signed the North American Waterfowl Management Plan in 1986. This plan is a strategy to increase continental waterfowl populations by restoring and protecting their habitats.

To achieve this, the plan relies upon partnerships of public agencies and private organizations, called joint ventures, to fund and implement wetland conservation projects.

The act seeks to promote public-private partnerships to protect, enhance, restore, and manage wetland ecosystems for migratory birds and other wetland-dependent species in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. Since the act's inception, 275 wetland projects in 36 States, Canada, and Mexico have been funded.

To date, such partnerships have invested over \$300 million to protect, restore, and enhance more than 1.2 million acres of wetlands, providing vital habitat for a rich diversity of wildlife species. The plan is recognized in the United States as a model for wetlands management and conservation partnerships.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a positive step toward protecting, restoring, and managing wetland ecosystems and the species dependent on these areas. I support its adoption.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the members of the committee who at this point remain uncommitted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4308, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ON MILITARY LANDS ACT OF 1994

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3300) to amend the Act popularly known as the "Sikes Act" to enhance fish and wildlife conservation and natural resources management programs on military installations, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3300

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 "Natural Resource Management on Military Lands Act of 1994".

#### SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF SIKES ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal

of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations", approved September 15, 1960 (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.), commonly referred to, and in this Act referred to, as the "Sikes Act".

#### SEC. 3. INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS, GENERALLY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a) (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "is authorized to" and inserting "shall";

(2) by striking "in each military reservation in accordance with a cooperative plan" and inserting the following: "on military installations. Under the program, the Secretary shall prepare and implement for each military installation in the United States an integrated natural resource management plan"; and

(3) by inserting after "reservation is located" the following: ", except that the Secretary is not required to prepare such a plan for a military installation if the Secretary determines that preparation of such a plan for the installation is not appropriate".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title I, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended—

(1) in section 101(b) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "cooperative plan" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plan";

(2) in section 101(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(4)) by striking "cooperative plan" each place it appears and inserting "integrated natural resource management plan";

(3) in section 101(c) (16 U.S.C. 670a(c)) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "a cooperative plan" and inserting "an integrated natural resource management plan";

(4) in section 101(d) (16 U.S.C. 670a(d)) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "cooperative plans" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plans";

(5) in section 101(e) (16 U.S.C. 670a(e)) by striking "Cooperative plans" and inserting "Integrated natural resource management plans";

(6) in section 102 (16 U.S.C. 670b) by striking "a cooperative plan" and inserting "an integrated natural resource management plan";

(7) in section 103 (16 U.S.C. 670c) by striking "a cooperative plan" and inserting "an integrated natural resource management plan";

(8) in section 106(a) (16 U.S.C. 670f(a)) by striking "cooperative plans" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plans"; and

(9) in section 106(c) (16 U.S.C. 670f(c)) by striking "cooperative plans" and inserting "integrated natural resource management plans".

(c) CONTENTS OF PLANS.—Section 101(b) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C) by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a comma; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(E) wetland protection and restoration, and wetland creation where necessary, for support of fish or wildlife,

"(F) consideration of conservation needs for all biological communities, and

"(G) the establishment of specific natural resource management goals, objectives, and timeframes for proposed actions";

(2) by striking paragraph (3);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) shall for the military installation for which it is prepared—

"(A) address the needs for fish and wildlife management, land management, forest management, and wildlife-oriented recreation;

"(B) ensure the integration of, and consistency among, the various activities conducted under the plan;

"(C) ensure that there is no net loss in the capability of installation lands to support the military mission of the installation;

"(D) provide for sustained use by the public of natural resources, to the extent that such use is not inconsistent with the military mission of the installation or the needs of fish and wildlife management;

"(E) provide the public access to the installation that is necessary or appropriate for that use, to the extent that access is not inconsistent with the military mission of the installation; and

"(F) provide for professional enforcement of natural resource laws and regulations"; and

(5) in paragraph (4)(A) by striking "collect the fees therefor," and inserting "collect, spend, administer, and account for fees therefor.".

(d) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Section 101 (16 U.S.C. 670a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide an opportunity for public comment on each integrated natural resource management plan prepared under subsection (a)."

#### SEC. 4. REVIEW OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FOR PREPARATION OF INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) REVIEW OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Secretary of each military department shall, by not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) review each military installation in the United States that is under the jurisdiction of that Secretary to determine the military installations for which the preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan under section 101 of the Sikes Act, as amended by this Act, is appropriate; and

(B) submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on those determinations.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall, by not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Congress a report on the reviews conducted under paragraph (1). The report shall include—

(A) a list of those military installations reviewed under paragraph (1) for which the Secretary of Defense determines the preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan is not appropriate; and

(B) for each of the military installations listed under subparagraph (A), an explanation of the reasons such a plan is not appropriate.

(b) DEADLINE FOR INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the submission of the report required under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Defense shall, for each military installation for which the Secretary has not determined under subsection (a)(2)(A) that preparation of an integrated natural resource management plan is not appropriate—

(1) prepare and begin implementing such a plan mutually agreed to by the Secretary of the Interior and the head of the appropriate State agencies under section 101(a) of the Sikes Act, as amended by this Act; or

(2) in the case of a military installation for which there is in effect a cooperative plan under section 101(a) of the Sikes Act on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, complete negotiations with the Secretary of the Interior

and the heads of the appropriate State agencies regarding changes to that plan that are necessary for the plan to constitute an integrated natural resource plan that complies with that section, as amended by this Act.

(c) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide an opportunity for the submission of public comments on—

(1) integrated natural resource management plans proposed pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) changes to cooperative plans proposed pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

#### SEC. 5. ANNUAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.

Section 101 (16 U.S.C. 670a) is further amended by adding after subsection (f) (as added by section 3(d) of this Act) the following:

“(g) **REVIEWS AND REPORTS.**—

“(1) **SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, by not later than March 1 of each year, review the extent to which integrated natural resource management plans were prepared or in effect and implemented in accordance with this Act in the preceding year, and submit a report on the findings of that review to the committees. Each report shall include—

“(A) the number of integrated natural resource management plans in effect in the year covered by the report, including the date on which each plan was issued in final form or most recently revised;

“(B) the amount of moneys expended on conservation activities conducted pursuant to those plans in the year covered by the report, including amounts expended under the Legacy Resource Management Program established under section 8120 of the Act of November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-511; 104 Stat. 1905); and

“(C) an assessment of the extent to which the plans comply with the requirements of subsection (b)(1) and (2), including specifically the extent to which the plans ensure in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(C) that there is no net loss of lands to support the military missions of military installations.

“(2) **SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.**—The Secretary of the Interior, by not later than March 1 of each year and in consultation with State agencies responsible for conservation or management of fish or wildlife, shall submit a report to the committees on the amount of moneys expended by the Department of the Interior and those State agencies in the year covered by the report on conservation activities conducted pursuant to integrated natural resource management plans.

“(3) **COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘committees’ means the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Armed Services and Environment and Public Works of the Senate.”.

#### SEC. 6. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS; ENFORCEMENT OF OTHER LAWS.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 106 as section 110; and

(2) by inserting after section 105 the following:

#### “SEC. 106. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF OTHER LAWS.

“All Federal laws relating to the conservation of natural resources on Federal lands may be enforced by the Secretary of Defense with respect to violations of those laws which occur on military installations within the United States.”.

#### SEC. 7. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 106 (as added by section 6 of this Act) the following:

#### “SEC. 107. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

“The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that sufficient numbers of professionally trained natural resource management personnel and natural resource law enforcement personnel are available and assigned responsibility to perform tasks necessary to comply with this Act, including the preparation and implementation of integrated natural resource management plans.”.

#### SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is further amended by inserting after section 107 (as added by section 7 of this Act) the following:

#### “SEC. 108. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) **MILITARY DEPARTMENT.**—The term ‘military department’ means the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

“(2) **MILITARY INSTALLATION.**—The term ‘military installation’—

“(A) means any land or interest in land owned by the United States and administered by the Secretary of Defense or the head of a military department; and

“(B) includes all public lands withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under public land laws and reserved for use by the Secretary of Defense or the head of a military department.

“(3) **STATE FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCY.**—The term ‘State fish and wildlife agency’ means an agency of State government that is responsible under State law for managing fish or wildlife resources.

“(4) **UNITED STATES.**—The term ‘United States’ means the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.”.

#### SEC. 9. SHORT TITLE.

Title I (16 U.S.C. 670a et seq.) is further amended by inserting after section 108 (as added by section 7 of this Act) the following:

#### “SEC. 109. SHORT TITLE.

“This title may be cited as the ‘Sikes Act’.”.

#### SEC. 10. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

(a) **COST SHARING.**—Section 103a(b) (16 U.S.C. 670c-1(b)) is amended by striking “matching basis” each place it appears and inserting “cost-sharing basis”.

(b) **ACCOUNTING.**—Section 103a(c) (16 U.S.C. 670c-1(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and shall not be subject to section 1535 of that title”.

#### SEC. 11. REPEAL.

Section 2 of the Act of October 27, 1986 (Public Law 99-651; 16 U.S.C. 670a-1) is repealed.

#### SEC. 12. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

Title I, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in the heading for the title by striking “MILITARY RESERVATIONS” and inserting “MILITARY INSTALLATIONS”;

(2) in section 101(a) (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)) by striking “the reservation” and inserting “the installation”;

(3) in section 101(b)(4) (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(4))—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “the reservation” and inserting “the installation”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “the military reservation” and inserting “the military installation”;

(4) in section 101(c) (16 U.S.C. 670a(c))—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking “a military reservation” and inserting “a military installation”; and

(B) in paragraph (2) by striking “the reservation” and inserting “the installation”;

(5) in section 102 (16 U.S.C. 670b) by striking “military reservations” and inserting “military installations”; and

(6) in section 103 (16 U.S.C. 670c) by striking “military reservations” and inserting “military installations”.

#### SEC. 13. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **PROGRAMS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.**—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 110 (as redesignated by section 6 of this Act) are each amended by striking “1993” and all that follows through “1993,” and inserting “1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997.”.

(b) **PROGRAMS ON PUBLIC LANDS.**—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 209 (16 U.S.C. 670o (a) and (b)) are each amended by striking “1993” and all that follows through “1993,” and inserting “1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3300, the Natural Resource Management on Military Lands Act, and promises to bring about real improvement in the conservation of fish, wildlife, and other natural resources on our Nation's military installations. Truth is indeed sometimes stranger than fiction, and in this case, the truth is that the bill we bring before you today has the bipartisan support of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Defense Department, and several conservation organizations.

There is no question that DOD installations—totaling more than 25 million acres nationwide—must be managed, first and foremost, to meet the needs of the military. This bill does nothing to interfere with those purposes—it simply requires installations with significant natural resources to develop and implement an integrated natural resource management plan that requires military activities be conducted in consultation with the military officials responsible for natural resource management. By fostering sound management of each installation's natural resources, we will help conserve these lands' biological diversity, preserve their suitability for troop training and other military exercises, and reduce the likelihood of costly environmental disasters. Quite simply, everyone stands to benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my good friend, the redoubtable gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], for his help in crafting this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join Mr. YOUNG and me in supporting this legislation and demonstrating that environmental protection can be consistent with our military training needs.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3300, the Natural Resource Management on Military Lands Act of 1993.

Since its enactment in 1960, the Sikes Act has authorized the Department of Defense to enter into cooperative agreements to conserve fish and wildlife resources on military installations. These installations encompass more than 25 million acres of valuable fish and wildlife habitat. This is equal to almost one-quarter of the land protected in the entire National Wildlife Refuge System. Clearly, these lands represent a substantial land base, providing habitat for our Nation's fish and wildlife resources. These lands must, to the extent practicable within the primary mission of national defense, be effectively managed for the protection of these resources.

H.R. 3300 proposes several important changes to the Sikes Act. First, the scope of fish and wildlife resource planning would be broadened to include all natural resource management activities. I am aware that on certain military installations there is little, if any, integration of various activities, which results in inefficient management of those resources. Second, the bill would require a review of our military installations to determine which bases are appropriate for this type of natural resource planning. And, finally, the bill requires an annual review on the implementation of these integrated natural resource management plans.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment Chairman STUDDS and my colleague from Alaska, DON YOUNG, for their diligent efforts to improve the Sikes Act. I think the bill before us will assist in the wise stewardship of these lands by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], for both his leadership and for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the leadership of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], again, and our ranking Member, as well as the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], for the fine work they have done on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of both the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as well as the Committee on Armed Services, I am very concerned about the way we manage our military lands as it relates to the coordination of fish and wildlife conservation. The Department of Defense controls nearly 25 million acres of natural resources at approximately 900 military installations nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned, the Sikes Act, enacted by Congress in 1960,

authorizes a cooperative plan to carry out the planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of fish and wildlife conservation on military lands. Although DOD regulations stipulate that these plans be maintained for their installations, many are not being prepared, implemented, and there is not clear coordination and integration. This legislation, introduced by our colleagues, provides means to have that coordination and integration occur.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation. It is wise and sound, and has the support of both the military, as well as those who are concerned about the conservation of our fish and wildlife resources. Mr. Speaker, I ask all of our colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3300, the Natural Resource Management on Military Lands Act.

H.R. 3300 not only reauthorizes the Sikes Act but it enhances the stewardship of the 25 million acres of Federal lands managed by the Department of Defense [DOD]. Since its enactment in 1960, the Sikes Act has authorized DOD to enter into cooperative agreements with the Department of the Interior and State fish and wildlife agencies to conserve fish and wildlife on military installations. Unfortunately, while DOD regulations stipulate that fish and wildlife plans be maintained where appropriate, comprehensive natural resource management is far from a reality on many installations. All too often plans are not being prepared, implemented or, where implemented, lack coordination with or integration into other military activities.

There is no disagreement that military lands must be managed first and foremost to meet the military mission. However, there is growing recognition that sound natural resource management benefits the military mission and improves training lands, expanding opportunities for outdoor recreation and ultimately the conservation of the fish and wildlife resources which inhabit those lands.

H.R. 3300 proposes several important changes to the Sikes Act. First, the scope of existing conservation plans which deal exclusively with fish and wildlife would be broadened to integrated plans—with specific management goals and objectives—encompassing all natural resource management activities. Second, all military installations, except those without significant natural resources, would be required to prepare and implement integrated plans. And finally, a Department-wide review would be required of installation compliance, with a report to Congress on its findings.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman STUDDS for his involvement in developing the proposed changes embodied in H.R. 3300. I firmly believe that this bill will greatly assist DOD in the management of the natural resources found at approximately 900 military installations under its jurisdiction. I urge my colleagues to support adoption of this bill.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3300, 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.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUDDS. 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. 3300, as amended, the bill just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1240

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, June 10, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### FULL AND OPEN DEBATE URGED ON HAITIAN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I take out this special order today to continue the dialog that is so important for this Nation on what our policy should be in regards to Haiti. As an 8-year member of the Committee on Armed Services that has had the opportunity to travel to all of those commitments that we have made around the world with our troops, whether it be at Hurricane Andrew down in Florida Labor Day 2 years ago, or whether it be over in the Middle East leading up to and then involved in Desert Storm and the actions surrounding that activity, or whether it be our humanitarian effort in Somalia, I have had a chance to see our troops in action, to talk to them and to make sure that what we are doing is in fact in their best interest. Mr. Speaker, I am no fair-weather friend of our military. Those who know me on the Committee on Armed Services know that I am a strong supporter of use of military when it is appropriate especially to protect the freedoms and rights that we enjoy as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am extremely concerned with what is

happening inside the Beltway as it is very evident from comments being made to members of the President's Cabinet that we are preparing to go into Haiti for a major military involvement. We are aware that troops are already being sent, that they are gearing up, that the necessary supplies are being put together, and that in fact we will be within Haiti within the next several days, perhaps next several weeks. What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that up until now, the President has not signaled to us that he would want us to have a full and open debate on what our policy should be. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely outrageous. Whether we agree with the use of force in Haiti or not, we owe it to the American people as we did leading up to the invasion and the action in Desert Storm to have a full and open debate on this issue. This administration has not yet said it would come to Congress to request our support or our denial of such involvement.

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing from our colleagues on both sides of the aisle as we heard today saying that at the least this President needs to have the current situation in Haiti fully debated. Not only is that important but I feel strongly that the direction we are going in regard to Haiti is the wrong one. The President is telling the world that we are going in to restore democracy and protect human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD at this point the list from Freedom Review of this year of the 20 worst rated countries in the world of which Haiti is one:

The 20 worst rated countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Bhutan, Burma (Myanmar), Burundi, China, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Iraq, Korea, North Libya, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Vietnam.

The 6 worst rated related territories: East Timor (Indonesia), Irian Jaya (Indonesia), Kashmir (India), Kosovo (Yugoslavia), Nagorno-Karabakh (Armenia/Azerbaijan), Tibet (China).

Mr. Speaker, there are 19 other countries that have records and current situations just like Haiti. How do we as a Nation justify sending young American men and women into combat for one of those 20 countries when in fact the other 19 are as bad or perhaps worse in terms of human rights violations? But, Mr. Speaker, what bothers me the most, and I started this dialog back in August of this year, is what is coming out of the United Nations. I have put in the RECORD before, Mr. Speaker, comments and memos from Dante Caputo, the U.N. special envoy to Haiti, comments from meetings and memos he has sent to Boutros-Ghali, the U.N. Secretary-General.

Mr. Speaker, these documents lay out for the American people what is in fact the thought process within the United Nations, that the only reason that President Clinton is proposing to

send our troops into Haiti is not necessarily for the stated purpose but rather for political ends.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, let me read one of the memos from one of the meetings that was held on May 24 at the U.N. headquarters. The attendees were the Secretary-General and others, including Dante Caputo.

Mr. Caputo says:

The Americans will not be able to stand for much longer, until August at the latest, the criticism of their foreign policy on the domestic front. They want to do something; they are going to try to intervene militarily.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the United Nations knew back as far as May that we did not in fact hope or expect the sanctions to work, that in fact we had the game plan laid out all along. They even put the time frame in. They said that we would have to invade by the end of August. Then further on we go to an internal memo from Dante Caputo to Boutros-Ghali, and I quote from this memo:

In the same fashion, the President of the United States' main advisers are of the opinion that not only does this option (the military option) constitute the lesser evil, but that is politically desirable. Thus we think that the current opposition of public opinion to an armed intervention will change radically, once it will have taken place.

How outrageous, Mr. Speaker. He goes on to further state in his memo:

The Americans see in this type of action a chance to show, after the strong media criticism of the administration, the President's decision-making capability and the firmness of leadership in international political matters.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here 8 years and I have never seen political decisions impacting our military except on two occasions. The first was when the former Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin, told us in this body that he did not want to send the extra support necessary for our troops to Somalia because of the political atmosphere in Washington. As a result of that, we lost 20 young troops when they were attacked in Somalia and Mogadishu and could not defend themselves. We could not even get the bodies out.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second occasion. We should never be using political decisions and judgments in terms of committing out young men and women to military action. At the least, we should have a full and open debate on this issue and we should allow the American people to hear the arguments pro and con and we should look in detail at the U.N. communications that have occurred internally. Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to speak out on this.

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

MEMO FROM DANTE CAPUTO, U.S. SPECIAL ENVOY TO HAITI TO THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE U.N. BOUTROS BOUTROS-GHALI  
Attention: The Secretary General.  
From: Dante Caputo, RSSC.

Over the past fifteen days, I had the pleasure of meeting several times with Mr.

Talbot and other officials of the American State Department. I also had some meetings in Paris with M. Alain Juppé, Minister of Foreign Affairs and in Ottawa with Mr. André Ouellet, Minister of Foreign Affairs. Moreover, I was able to have some informal conversations with other areas of American political life.

The conclusions that I am drawing today are as follows:

1. The U.S. administration considers that an invasion of Haiti is its best back option.
2. The principal objection to this type of action comes from the fact that "if it is easy to initiate this type of action, it is more difficult to exit from it."
3. In order to resolve this dilemma, the U.S. administration will seek to act in the following manner:
  - (a) set up a unilateral action, a surgical action, with the eventual participation of several countries in the region so as to give it a certain legitimacy;
  - (b) put President Aristide back in power; and
  - (c) it will seek a quick replacement of the armed intervention forces by the [illegible] whose mandate and structure will have been redefined beforehand.

4. This strategy would allow it to capitalize on the experience with such an operation, transferring the political cost on the UN.

5. In the same fashion, the President of the United States' main advisers, are of the opinion that not only does this option constitute the lesser evil, but that is politically desirable. Thus we think that the current opposition of public opinion to an armed intervention will change radically, once it will have taken place. The Americans see in this type of action a chance to show, after the strong media criticism of the administration, the President's decision making capability and the firmness of leadership in international political matters.

6. The position of the friendly countries vis-a-vis this strategy is the following:

#### FRANCE

France is opposed to the use of force by it multilateral or unilateral. It is ready to participate in a MINUAH under the terms foreseen in July, 1993, that is to say, technical assistance and participation in forming a police force. In an explicit manner, France is opposed to participating in whatever activity that would imply direct police action.

France considers that it is urgent that a meeting of the Four Friends take place at the department head or under secretary level, preferably in New York.

France insists as well on Argentina's participation as a fifth friendly country given that it is a member of the Security Council.

#### CANADA

Canada does not wish to participate in a multilateral armed intervention force. Canada thinks that in the present situation, there is probably no other alternative to that which the U.S. administration will adopt. In this perspective, according to Minister Ouellet, our problem will consist of knowing how to "manage" this new reality. Canada seems equally disposed to participate in a MINUAH whose mandate will have been redefined. Canada also considers it urgent to call a meeting of the Four Friends.

7. The permanent U.S. Mission has undertaken the necessary steps so that the Security Council comes to a decision very soon on the MINUAH's mandate and structure.—May 23, 1994.

[Report of a discussion of the Secretary General with his Special Representative for Haiti at the United Nations Headquarters, Tuesday, May 24, 1994 at 6:30 p.m.]

Present: The Secretary General, Mr. Gharekhan, Mr. de Soto, Mrs. Green, and Mrs. Seguin-Horton.

Subject: The situation in Haiti. Possibilities for a military intervention by the United States.

The Secretary General says to Mr. Caputo that he is well aware of his last summary report.

Mr. Caputo explains that he did not dare present any options and policies to the Secretary General in this report. The fact is that he had lately a large number of informal consultations that are all going in the same direction: The Americans will not be able to stand for much longer, until August at the latest the criticism of their foreign policy on the domestic front. They want to do something; they are going to try to intervene militarily.

The Secretary General wonders if President Aristide could invoke Article 51 of the Charter in order to call for a military intervention.

Mr. de Soto says that the constitution prevents him from doing so.

MINUTES FROM MAY 24 MEETING BETWEEN DANTE CAPUTO AND BOUTROS-GHALI

Mr. Caputo thinks that after having asked for the intervention, Mr. Aristide will condemn it. Moreover, the United States, that wants to obtain the Security Council's blessing, is now actively studying the means to accord a legal protection to this affair.

Mr. de Soto recalls that this idea recently provoked a general protest among the OAS. What can the United Nations Secretariat do, either to avoid or to encourage this intervention?, asks the Secretary General.

Mr. Caputo predicts a disaster. The United States will make the UN bear the responsibility to manage the occupation of Haiti. "With Aristide as President during two or three years, it will be Hell!" It is not so much the armed intervention itself that we have to avoid. What we do not want, is to inherit a "baby". For the Americans' are fixing to leave quickly. They would not intervene if they had to remain.

Mr. Gharekhan asks Mr. Caputo what he understands by leaving "quickly" replies Mr. Caputo. Who is going to replace the Americans?, asks the Secretary General.

"Us", replies Mr. de Soto. France, according to Mr. Juppé, is opposed to it, confirms Mr. Caputo. As for Canada, it is committed to strictly limiting its contribution to the formation of a new Haitian police.

The Secretary General believes that in making an effort, the United States will be able to manage to obtain 2,000 French-African troops and a few troops from the Caribbean.

Mr. Caputo says that the United Nations would have to work with a complex force and that it would be difficult for it to mount an operation in a one-month period. Mr. Caputo knows that Argentina, for example, is not very favorable to this idea. He also doubts that Mexico, Brazil or Venezuela would be tempted.

This scenario would be fraught with consequences for the United Nations as well as for this region of the world. Dante Caputo emphasizes that it is harmful that at the conclusion of the cold war, no other answer can be found for such a crisis.

In answer to the Minister's question about the consequences of the American interven-

tion in Panama, Dante Caputo replies that it concerned a different time where the cold war was still taking place. Today, we are right in expecting that other types of means be activated. The United Nations will be perceived as being impotent before the region's problems. They will have to face up to a particularly difficult post-intervention situation.

The Minister remarks that actually, despite the goodwill of the United Nations, its credibility is jeopardized and the [Haitian] military leaders are "laughing at us". The Minister stresses the difficulties of a strict and effective implementation of planned sanctions and expresses its doubt over the possibility of a complete closing of the border.

The Minister shares Dante Caputo's appreciation of the need to make some arrangements in the event of a unilateral intervention. However, the Minister continues to affirm that Canada will not commit itself to hostile activities in Haiti. Canada is ready to favorably consider a United Nations request favoring a peace keeping operation with the view of consolidating a democratic regime, aid programs, and participation in a better equipped MUNUHA. Basically, the Minister concedes that only the United States can wrestle with the [Haitian] military leaders.

To improve our image relative to President Aristide, the Minister believes that the President should participate in the next meeting of the Four Friends. Regarding this meeting, Dante Caputo maintains that it would be preferable if it be held first of all without the President, and that he not participate except after the meeting. In the perspective of managing the post intervention situation, Dante Caputo thinks that it is important that President Aristide can consider himself to be an integral part of the Four Friends' action.

According to the Minister, President Aristide's credibility risks to be stained, if he restored after the U.S. intervention.

The Minister questions himself over the composition, nature and on the willingness of the countries that would be ready to participate in the MINUHA.

Dante Caputo emphasizes that France expressed the wish to participate in the formation of a police force in Haiti and is reticent to do "monitoring". Ambassador Prôchette then recalls the difficulties encountered at the moment of recruiting the components of the operation's police force in 1993. Dante Caputo remarks that the question of this police force's role and mandate should be determined as a function of the whole and notes that the countries interested in taking part remain few, in addition to Canada, the United States, Argentina, and France.

The fundamental question remains the post-intervention role, multilateral action being put aside, indicates Dante Caputo. Ambassador Prôchette replies that in effect, the United Nations will not vote for this type of action, but could be in favor of a "green light" for a coalition of States that would invite countries interested in topping the [Haitian] military leaders if a very serious incident unfolded. Dante Caputo adds that this American initiative could be blocked by an internal decision process.

The Minister concludes the meeting by recalling that this is an emergency, that Canada wants to play a role, and that he will be guided by the advice and suggestions of Dante Caputo.—Juliette Rémy, May 23, 1994.

The Secretary General recalls that in the past, the United States was able to show that it could mount a multinational force, if

only in appearances. "Must we say that we think that a military intervention in Haiti would be negative?"

According to Mr. Caputo, it must first be proposed that the President of the Security Council ask for a closing of the border between Haiti and the Dominican Republic. This measure will have a certain economic and psychological impact.

The Secretary General wonders how it is possible to really close this border. A very clear commitment on the part of the Dominican authorities must be required, replies Mr. Caputo. The Secretary General thinks that the Dominican government does not have the means to prevent infiltration.

Mr. Caputo considers that the land or sea routes can be controlled if the authorities accept to play the game. In this regard, Mr. Caputo informs the Secretary General that the Americans have proposed to him to accompany them tomorrow to meet President Balaguer in Santo Domingo. Mr. Caputo has not yet replied, but he thinks that he must accept this offer in order to show that he is being active on the diplomatic front.

Replying to a question from the Secretary General, Mr. Gharekhan makes the point that the Security Council specifically mentioned the border in his presidential declaration.

Mr. de Soto thinks that the other friends of Haiti must be made to participate at this meeting, if only through their ambassadors in Santo Domingo.

Nobody can tell if such an operation will succeed or fail, notes the Secretary General.

In addition to closing the border, continues Mr. Caputo, we will have to keep the same political framework set up two months ago if the United States requests.

The Americans are still deeply divided on the Haitian question, there are supporters and detractors of President Aristide.

Mr. de Soto wonders if in fact Mr. Caputo should not go to Port au Prince to challenge the military leaders and try to convince Mr. Cédras, who pretends to be a "negotiator".

Mr. Caputo affirms that he is ready to go to Haiti. The problem is that if his visit fails, and that if it is accompanied by demonstrations by the BRAPH and by a definite "no" from Mr. Cédras, we risk provoking an armed intervention.

Mr. Gharekhan thinks that, in effect, the Americans could feel justified to intervene.

According to Mr. de Soto, this would be the case if it were already August, but if we try now, we still have time, he says.

Mr. Caputo declares that he likes this idea because the United Nations seems to be making every possible effort on the diplomatic front on the condition, of course, of obtaining a meeting with Mr. Cédras. In reply to a question from the Secretary General, he has the means to contact him.

Moreover, Mr. Caputo points out that the French insist a lot on including Argentina in the Group of the Secretary General's Friends. Argentina, who was rather tepid two or three months ago, now seems interested in the question.

The French find in effect that the Argentina's presence would allow a better balance ..... Security Council, among the Group of Friends. Venezuela would not be excluded for as much.

Aware of the risk of displeasing Brazil who is also a member of the Security Council, the Secretary General proposes to use the criteria of Argentina's active participation in the search of a solutions to the Haitian problem. Isn't Argentina a frigate that sails in the region to check on the embargo's enforcement?

Mr. Gharkaham believes that he remembers that Mr. Goulding was totally opposed to this idea.

In answer to the Secretary General's question, Mr. de Soto says that Mr. Goulding thinks that including Argentina would bother Brazil.

Mr. Caputo suggests consulting Brazil. Mr. de Soto points out that Mr. Lulu da Silva, Brazil's presidential candidate, has come out in favor of intervention . . .

Summarizing the situation, the Secretary General proposes to act in the following manner: 1) Mr. Caputo reports tomorrow at Santo Domingo to discuss the border; 2) He makes contact with Mr. Cédras to set up an appointment with him; 3) He goes to Haiti to strengthen his credibility; 4) The Secretariat contacts Brazil to announce the decision to invite Argentina to be part of the Group of Friends; 5) The Secretariat invites Argentina.

Mr. de Soto emphasizes that the MINUAH mandate exists. The United States has met with officers from the [illegible] Department for Peace Keeping to study means of renewing, redefining, and strengthening the Mission. Replying to the Secretary General, Mr. de Soto indicates that the initial mandate foresees 700 to 800 men. The United States is in the process of broadening the scope of MINUAH to a mission, not only of technical assistance, but also one of peace keeping. This would thus be a way to discourage the United States to intervene in showing them how difficult it is to set up the Mission that it would like to see following its intervention.

Mr. Gharakhan thinks that the Secretariat cannot highlight this difficulty since the United States has the means to obtain the necessary troops.

According to Mr. de Soto, the Security Council's hacking can be politically costly to the United States insofar as it will cause the United States to make concessions.

The Secretary General points out that the United States can even choose to leave forces behind.

Mr. de Soto says that the closest analogy is the one of Panama. The United States knows that the Latin American countries will protest out of principle while at the same time they will be relieved to get rid of Mr. Cédras.

Suggesting to proceed by stages, the Secretary General concludes that they agree on the five points mentioned above. These points already will allow for movement. Mrs. Green, having asked if Mr. Aristide was going to be contacted, the Secretary General replies in the affirmative. He agrees to telephone Mr. Aristide. He suggests to put off until later the more substantial reflections on the question, but keeps in mind the fact that there is a risk of escalation. It should not be forgotten that the Haitian people suffer because of those sanctions.—Fabienco Seguin-Horton, May 25, 1994.

NOTES OF MAY 19 MEETING BETWEEN DANTE CAPUTO AND CANADIAN FOREIGN MINISTER, ANDRE OUELLET

Present: Mr. Stanley E. Gooch, Assistant Vice Minister, Latin American and Caribbean Desk; Mrs. Louise Fréchette, Permanent Canadian Representative at the United Nations.

After being warmly welcomed by the Minister, Dane Caputo stresses, first of all, the different options for a solution and relates, for the Minister's benefit, the reactions observed in Paris and Washington. The first option consists of waiting for sanctions put in place to produce the desired effect: the mili-

tary leaders' departure. In this regard, France and the United States have the same worry of seeing that the border between the Dominican Republic and Haiti be hermetically sealed.

However, stresses Dante Caputo, the United States would not be ready to wait several months for this to produce the desired effect. The second option, consists of using the sanctions as an instrument to support a political strategy. France is in favor of such a scenario and, in this regard, supports the idea of a high level meeting of the Secretary General's Four Friends Countries. The third option consists of using unilateral force, multilateral force, or a combination of the two. France is opposed to this. Concerning the United States position, such as laid out by Strobe Talbot, Dante Caputo thinks that time is short, and that the situation today cannot last beyond July. Dante Caputo emphasizes that Haiti represents a test case for which the United States has to have found a solution before November. The United States supports the return of a reinforced MINUAH (Self defense, protecting sites) without specifying the probable means for the [Haitian] military leaders' departure.

Dante Caputo gives his personal impression of the strategy that the United States would get ready to implement. According to him, the United States cannot wait any longer to obtain the benefits of an action in favor of Haiti for a just cause; it would intervene punctually in order to then cede its place to the MINUAH.

This scenario would be fraught with consequences for the United Nations as well as for this region of the world. Dante Caputo emphasized that it is a shame that at the end of the Cold War, another response cannot be given to a crisis of this type.

To the minister's question on the consequences of the American intervention in Panama, Dante Caputo responded that it was a different time, when the Cold War was still a reality. Today, one has the right to expect other types of means to be implemented. The United Nations will be perceived as being powerless regarding the problems of the region. It would have to deal with a particularly difficult post-intervention situation.

To the minister's question on the existence of another alternative, Dante Caputo answered that the U.S. has served as a restraint for a diplomatic solution, creating a situation where intervention has become almost inevitable.

The minister remarked that in fact, despite the good will of the United Nations, its credibility is being questioned and the military is "laughing at us." The minister underlined the difficulties of a strict and effective implementation of the sanctions planned and shared his doubt regarding the possibility of a total closure of the border.

The minister shared Dante Caputo's view regarding the need to take steps in the case of a unilateral intervention. Nevertheless the minister stated that Canada will not engage in activities hostile to Haiti. Canada is ready to favorably study a U.N. request for a peacekeeping operation, with a view to consolidating a democratic regime, assistance programs, and participation of a better equipped U.N. Mission for Haiti. Basically, the minister conceded that just the U.S. can engage in arm wrestling with the military.

In order to improve our image regarding President Aristide, the minister felt that the president should participate in the upcoming meeting of the four friendly nations. Regarding this meeting, Dante Caputo stated that it would be preferable for it to take place

initially without the president and that he not participate except subsequent to the meeting. In the perspective of the question of the post-intervention situation, Dante Caputo felt that it is important that President Aristide be able to consider himself an integral part of the action of the four friendly nations.

According to the minister, if he is reestablished after the U.S. intervention, President Aristide's credibility risks being blemished.

The minister asked about the composition, nature and will of the countries that would be willing to participate in the U.N. Mission for Haiti.

Dante Caputo emphasized that France has expressed the desire to participate in the formation of the police in Haiti and shows a reluctance to doing monitoring, Ambassador Fréchette then recalled the difficulties encountered at the time of recruitment of the elements of the police for the 1993 operation. Dante Caputo remarked that the question of the role and mandate of these policemen should be determined according to the panorama and noted that the countries interested in participating are few, namely Canada, the U.S., Argentina and France.

The basic question is the post-intervention role, multilateral action being rejected, Dante Caputo indicated. Ambassador Fréchette responded that in fact, the U.N. will not vote for this type of action but it could be in favor of a "green light" for a coalition of states that would invite the countries interested in removing the military from government, if a very serious incident took place. Dante Caputo added that this American initiative could be blocked by an internal decision-making process failing.

The minister concluded the meeting by recalling that there is urgency, that Canada is anxious to play a role and that it will be guided by the advice and suggestions of Dante Caputo. In the probable case where the sanctions did not have an immediate effect and worked in favor of the military, the minister remarked that it would then be necessary to explain why the sanctions are being maintained against Haiti.—Juliette Remy, May 23, 1994.

#### DO NOT INVADE HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, as talk of invasion of Haiti escalates and indications become more obvious that action is ongoing towards that direction, it is quite clear that Congress has to take up its responsibility to get into the debate, to get into the deliberation that is required under the representative form of government that we have in this Nation.

It is quite clear that we do not have any need to have a debate on the War Powers Act, and it is quite clear that we really do not even need to have a debate on what the President or the White House motivations might be in calling for an invasion of Haiti. But if we are going to use men and women in uniform to go on a mission in harm's way, then we have to have a justification that stands up for the means of our national security, and we need to have an explanation for the parents

and the families of those men and women in uniform of what it is that is so important that we who have the responsibility are willing to risk their lives for their Nation. That is a mighty heavy responsibility, and it is one that was carried out I think with an extraordinary amount of honor and prestige and wisdom and feeling and thoughtfulness in this body before the Desert Storm matter.

I think it is exactly the type of thing that is called for now. We need to bring to the people's house on this floor the debate and the deliberation, if truly the White House is going to persist in this course of talking about putting our soldiers and sailors and marines and Air Force people and Coast Guard in harm's way in Haiti, which most of us think and most of our country thinks is a friendly neighboring county to the south of Florida slightly in the Caribbean which, in fact, it is. It has a long history of friendship with the United States and we are clearly set out on a question of an invasion that does not appear to follow any justification whatsoever.

Some who have tried to speculate on motivation, I think are missing the target of what it is that happens to us when we get involved in a shooting war with a country like Haiti. I do not wish to go into the motivation, as I have said. I think we can probably rule out common sense and we can certainly rule out anything like a comprehensive consistent foreign policy. But what we have to look at is the consequences. I think that there is some real irony that some of the policy that is being talked about with regard to Haiti, the blockade using Navy ships, the tight embargo of trade and commerce which is choking the nation to death, those elements as policy actually make some sense. But unfortunately they are being applied to the wrong place. If they were being applied to Castro's Cuba, then it would make some sense.

I believe there is an argument to make for a blockade against Fidel Castro. I believe there is an argument to make against a strong economic embargo forcing our allies or persuading and urging our allies, Mexico, Venezuela, Spain, Germany, Canada, Jamaica, other countries with whom we have close working and trade relationships, to share our goal of drawing the line in the sand and saying it is time for Fidel Castro to go. After all, here we are talking about asking General Cedras and his two colleagues in the military junta which is a temporary military junta, to go, and it is right that we do that. They do not belong there. They need to leave and democracy needs to be restored in Haiti.

The issue is do we do it with the barrel of a gun, our guns? It has never really worked before and I do not think it would work in this case.

When we talk about Haiti today, to make myself perfectly clear, I think we need to do four things.

□ 1250

First, we need to stop the invasion talk and planning. If you invade Haiti you win, but what it is you win you cannot define at this point except a responsibility and an obligation for a long, long expensive involvement of nation-building and we have not even begun to define that.

Second, we should cancel the embargo. It is missing the target. It has missed the target. The junta has not left but it has made misery for the poor people of that country which is about 70 percent of that country.

We certainly should increase our humanitarian relief as a third step. We have supplies waiting to do that now. We cannot get through because of the embargo. People are literally dying from lack of medical attention and food in Haiti today, innocent people.

And finally, we should negotiate with the democratically elected members of their Congress. They call their Chamber of Deputies which were elected at the same time as Father Aristide was. So there are possible choices other than invasion which make much more sense, which will yield us better results and a lower cost. That seems to me to be a better foreign policy outline and certainly make more sense.

When we talk about comparing Haiti and Cuba it is ironic to me. Castro has been there some 35 years as an avowed enemy of the United States and a real threat. We have not told him to go, but we have told this military junta we are going to send men and women to throw them out. That just does not make sense.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 4:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 4:30 p.m.

□ 1636

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES RELATIVE TO PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2866, HEADWATERS FOREST ACT

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is planning to meet the week of September 19, to consider the bill, H.R. 2866, the Headwaters Forest Act. In order to assure timely consideration of the bill on the floor, the Rules Committee may report a rule that limits the offering of amendments.

The committee made an earlier request for the submission of amendments so that the House could consider the bill before the August break. However, the recess did not allow the committee to meet on the bill as planned. In order to assure the ability to request protection in the rule, the committee has established a new date for Members to submit amendments to the committee.

Any Member who is contemplating an amendment to H.R. 2866 should submit, to the Rule Committee in H-312 in the Capitol, 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation of the amendment no later than 12 noon on Wednesday, September 14, 1994.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as introduced.

We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting this rule.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4624, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4624) 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, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Friday, August 26, 1994, at page 24193.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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].

□ 1640

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

We bring back to the House today the conference report on the fiscal year 1995 VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill. As always, this was a very difficult bill to conference because it is a bill that demands very difficult choices.

I am pleased to report that the conferees reached agreement on all items

in conference, except for amendment No. 87 dealing with regulations on foreign reformulated gasoline. That amendment will be dealt with separately—after the conference report is adopted. It is my intention, at the appropriate time, to offer a motion to insist on the House position regarding amendment No. 87. This would delete the language in the Senate amendment.

I also want to mention that the motion for amendment numbered 123 dealing with emergency supplemental appropriations will contain a technical change.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have brought back a fair and balanced conference agreement. And, I want to point out that the conference agreement keeps the bill within the section 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

I would also point out that the conference outlay total is \$164 million below the amount passed by the House. I doubt that Members will have an opportunity to vote this year for an appropriations conference agreement that is \$164 million below the House-passed amount.

Let me turn now and highlight the major conference agreements.

For the Department of Veterans Affairs, the bill includes \$16.2 billion for the medical care account—an increase of \$111 million above the 1995 request. This increase represents the amount the VA estimates is needed to maintain the current services level in 1995. The conference agreement includes \$356 million for major construction projects, an increase of \$240 million above the 1995 request—and \$891 million for the general operating expenses account, including an increase of \$16.5 million to reduce the backlog of veterans benefits claims.

For the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the conference agreement totals \$24.7 billion, approximately the level as provided in 1994. The conference agreement includes up to \$400 million for new HUD programs, subject to enactment of authorizing legislation, and \$290 million for important and worthy projects.

The bill also includes \$4.6 billion for the Community Development Block Grant Program, an increase of \$200 million above the 1994 level; and \$1.12 billion, the Department's highest priority, for homeless assistance grants.

Turning to the Corporation for National and Community Service, the conference agreement includes a total of \$575 million, an increase of \$212 million—or 58 percent—above 1994.

The conference agreement also includes \$125 million for the recently authorized Community Development Financial Institutions Program. This important Presidential initiative will help to address the urgent problems of declining economic and social infrastructure, loss of jobs, lack of private enterprise, and deteriorating housing facing many American communities today.

For the programs of the Environmental Protection Agency, we are providing \$7.24 billion, an increase of \$622 million—or more than 9 percent—above the 1994 level. The conference agreement includes \$1.2 billion for the clean water State revolving fund, \$700 million for the safe drinking water State revolving fund, \$110 million for a new colonias program, and funds for grants for communities with special needs.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], for his assistance in making funds available for water infrastructure projects. Without Chairman MINETA's cooperation and the cooperation of other members of the Public Works Committee, there might not be any funding available for water infrastructure activities.

For the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the conference agreement provides \$822 million. This includes \$130 million for FEMA's Emergency Food and Shelter Program.

Turning next to NASA, the conference agreement totals \$14.377 billion, including \$2.1 billion for the space station and \$400 million for the construction of two new aeronautical wind tunnel facilities. The \$400 million has been included because of the conferees' belief that the Nation's future manufacturing base in commercial aviation and aeronautics hinges in large part on the availability of these new wind tunnels. I would also point out that these funds are contingent upon the administration supporting this effort and requesting the additional funds needed to complete the wind tunnels.

For the National Science Foundation, the conference agreement includes \$3.36 billion. This is an increase

of more than 11 percent above the 1994 level.

The conference agreement also includes supplemental appropriations—\$225 million in HUD's CDBG Program for the Los Angeles earthquake, offset by reductions in existing funds; and \$180 million in HUD's CDBG and HOME Programs to assist States, local communities, and businesses recover from the flooding and damages caused by Tropical Storm Alberto and other disasters.

Mr. Speaker, the joint explanatory statement of the committee on conference (House Report 103-715) contains the following technical errors in amendment numbered 28:

On page 16, the \$1,000,000 for the Henry Ford Health System is for health care delivery in Michigan, not Mississippi.

On page 17, the \$300,000 for development of a recreational center is to be awarded to the city of Philadelphia, PA, not the city of Chester, PA.

On page 21, the \$300,000 for Martin County, KY is for lead-based paint removal.

On page 21, the \$2,000,000 for De Paul University's library is for services in Illinois, not North Carolina.

On page 21, the \$2,000,000 for the Twin Cities Opportunities Industrialization Center is for a facility in Minnesota, not Illinois.

On page 22, the \$750,000 is for the Delta Foundation in Greenville, MI, not Michigan.

On page 22, the \$150,000 is for the Microenterprise Assistance Program in San Antonio, TX, not California.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the subcommittee for their active and interested participation in the deliberations that resulted in the development of this bill.

I want to especially thank the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, Mr. JERRY LEWIS, for his cooperation and assistance. It is a pleasure working with him.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the members of our subcommittee staff. We have been fortunate to have an excellent subcommittee staff. They have worked some long, hard hours and they have helped us develop what I think is a very fine bill.

Mr. Speaker, the administration supports this bill. I hope that the Members will support this conference agreement.

**H.R. 4624 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,  
and Independent Agencies, 1995**

	FY 1994 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE I</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS</b>						
<b>Veterans Benefits Administration</b>						
Compensation and pensions.....	17,526,448,000	17,826,892,000	17,826,892,000	17,826,892,000	17,826,892,000	+100,448,000
Readjustment benefits.....	1,050,800,000	1,286,800,000	1,286,800,000	1,286,800,000	1,286,800,000	+236,000,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	15,370,000	24,780,000	24,780,000	24,780,000	24,780,000	+9,360,000
Guaranty and indemnity program account (indefinite).....	466,192,000	362,864,000	362,864,000	362,864,000	362,864,000	-103,298,000
Administrative expenses.....	56,231,000	70,526,000	65,226,000	65,226,000	65,226,000	+8,965,000
(By transfer).....	(99,000)					(-99,000)
Loan guaranty program account (indefinite).....	25,136,000	18,864,000	18,864,000	18,864,000	18,864,000	-6,472,000
Administrative expenses.....	70,718,000	59,371,000	59,371,000	59,371,000	59,371,000	-11,345,000
Direct loan program account (indefinite).....	20,000	22,000	22,000	22,000	22,000	+2,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	
Administrative expenses.....	2,863,000	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,020,000	-1,843,000
(Loan level).....	(798,000)	(187,000)	(187,000)	(187,000)	(187,000)	(-611,000)
Education loan fund program account.....	1,032	1,061	1,061	1,061	1,061	+29
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3,571)	(4,000)	(4,034)	(4,034)	(4,034)	(+463)
Administrative expenses.....	195,000	195,000	195,000	195,000	195,000	+8,000
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	53,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	+1,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(2,477,000)	(1,964,000)	(1,964,000)	(1,964,000)	(1,964,000)	(-513,000)
Administrative expenses.....	751,000	787,000	787,000	787,000	787,000	+16,000
(By transfer).....	(2,000)					(-2,000)
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account.....	158,000	218,000	218,000	218,000	218,000	+62,000
<b>Total, Veterans Benefits Administration.....</b>	<b>19,214,721,032</b>	<b>19,452,084,061</b>	<b>19,448,684,061</b>	<b>19,448,684,061</b>	<b>19,448,684,061</b>	<b>+231,963,029</b>
<b>Veterans Health Administration</b>						
Medical care.....	15,622,452,000	16,121,756,000	16,232,756,000	16,232,756,000	16,232,756,000	+610,304,000
(Transfer out).....	(-2,500,000)					(-2,500,000)
Emergency funding.....	(20,198,000)					(-20,198,000)
Medical and prosthetic research.....	252,000,000	211,000,000	252,000,000	252,000,000	252,000,000	
Health professional scholarship program.....	10,368,000	10,368,000	10,368,000	10,368,000	10,368,000	
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	68,500,000	69,258,000	69,806,000	69,806,000	69,806,000	+1,306,000
(By transfer).....	(2,500,000)					(-2,500,000)
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	
Transitional housing loan program:						
Loan program account (by transfer).....	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	
Administrative expenses (by transfer).....	(52,000)	(54,000)	(54,000)	(54,000)	(54,000)	(+2,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	
General post fund (transfer out).....	(-56,000)	(-61,000)	(-61,000)	(-61,000)	(-61,000)	(-2,000)
<b>Total, Veterans Health Administration.....</b>	<b>15,953,838,000</b>	<b>16,412,900,000</b>	<b>16,565,450,000</b>	<b>16,565,450,000</b>	<b>16,565,450,000</b>	<b>+611,612,000</b>
<b>Departmental Administration</b>						
General operating expenses.....	826,749,000	843,285,000	887,909,000	893,285,000	890,600,000	+63,851,000
(By transfer).....	(2,000)					(-2,000)
National Cemetery System.....	70,507,000	72,863,000	72,863,000	72,863,000	72,863,000	+2,156,000
Office of Inspector General.....	31,436,000	32,550,000	32,219,000	31,819,000	31,819,000	+363,000
Construction, major projects.....	369,000,000	115,465,000	101,985,000	208,000,000	355,612,000	-13,366,000
(By transfer).....	(14,000,000)					(-14,000,000)
Emergency funding.....	(45,800,000)					(-45,800,000)
Construction, minor projects.....	153,540,000	153,540,000	153,540,000	153,540,000	153,540,000	
Parking revolving fund.....	1,363,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	16,300,000	16,300,000	+14,947,000
Grants for construction of state extended care facilities.....	41,080,000	37,397,000	37,397,000	47,397,000	47,397,000	+6,317,000
Grants for the construction of state veterans cemeteries.....	5,242,000	5,378,000	5,378,000	5,378,000	5,378,000	+136,000
<b>Total, Departmental Administration.....</b>	<b>1,498,907,000</b>	<b>1,261,678,000</b>	<b>1,292,471,000</b>	<b>1,428,382,000</b>	<b>1,573,309,000</b>	<b>+74,402,000</b>
Procurement savings.....		-20,742,000	-20,742,000	-20,742,000	-20,742,000	-20,742,000
<b>Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs.....</b>	<b>36,667,466,032</b>	<b>37,105,920,061</b>	<b>37,283,863,061</b>	<b>37,419,774,061</b>	<b>37,564,701,061</b>	<b>+897,235,029</b>
(By transfer).....	(16,962,000)	(61,000)	(61,000)	(61,000)	(61,000)	(-16,901,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(4,348,571)	(3,225,000)	(3,225,034)	(3,225,034)	(3,225,034)	(-1,123,537)
<b>Consisting of:</b>						
Mandatory.....	(19,063,764,000)	(19,319,832,000)	(19,319,832,000)	(19,319,832,000)	(19,319,832,000)	(+236,068,000)
Discretionary.....	(17,563,702,032)	(17,786,088,061)	(17,964,031,061)	(18,099,942,061)	(18,244,869,061)	(+861,167,029)

**H.R. 4624 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,  
and Independent Agencies, 1995**

	FY 1994 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE II</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT</b>						
<b>Housing Programs</b>						
Homeownership and opportunity for people everywhere grants (HOPE grants).....	109,190,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	-59,190,000
Reversion of FY 1992 and FY 1993 HOPE funds.....	-250,000,000					+250,000,000
Reversion.....	-86,000,000					+86,000,000
HOME investment partnerships program.....	1,275,000,000	1,100,000,000	1,275,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,400,000,000	+125,000,000
National homeownership trust demonstration program.....		100,000,000		50,000,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000
Annual contributions for assisted housing.....	9,312,900,000	10,283,918,000	11,473,019,000	10,800,000,000	11,063,000,000	+1,770,100,000
Transfer from UDAG.....		(100,000,000)		(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+100,000,000)
Reversion.....	-100,000,000					+100,000,000
Emergency funding.....	(225,000,000)					(-225,000,000)
Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts.....	4,556,108,000	4,292,000,000	3,705,000,000	2,992,000,000	2,536,000,000	-2,022,108,000
Reversion.....	-78,000,000					+78,000,000
Advance appropriation for next fiscal year.....	800,000,000	800,000,000	800,000,000			-800,000,000
Rental housing assistance:						
Reversion of budget authority, indefinite.....	-40,000,000	-38,000,000	-38,000,000	-38,000,000	-38,000,000	+2,000,000
Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite.....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
Reversion of prepayment recaptures.....	-45,515,000	-86,000,000	-86,000,000	-86,000,000	-86,000,000	-20,485,000
Rent supplement program:						
Reversion of budget authority, indefinite.....	-32,438,000					+32,438,000
Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite.....	(-1,544,846)					(+1,544,846)
Homeownership assistance:		8,875,000	8,875,000	8,875,000	8,875,000	+8,875,000
Reversion of budget authority, indefinite.....		-184,000,000	-184,000,000	-184,000,000	-184,000,000	-184,000,000
Congregate services.....	25,000,000	8,267,000	8,267,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	
Payments for operation of low-income housing projects.....	2,820,808,000	2,496,000,000	2,900,000,000	2,900,000,000	2,900,000,000	+279,192,000
Severely distressed public housing.....	778,240,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	-278,240,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing.....	266,000,000		266,000,000	315,000,000	290,000,000	+25,000,000
Community partnerships against crime.....		265,000,000				
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account.....	1,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+2,000,000
Limitation on direct loans.....	(25,000,000)	(22,388,000)	(22,388,000)	(22,388,000)	(22,388,000)	(-2,612,000)
Youthbuild program.....		50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000
National cities in schools community development program.....	10,000,000					-10,000,000
Housing counseling assistance.....	12,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+38,000,000
Flexible subsidy fund.....	35,747,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+14,253,000
Emergency funding.....	(100,000,000)					(-100,000,000)
Federal Housing Administration:						
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
Limitation on guaranteed loans.....	(84,599,845,000)	(100,000,000,000)	(100,000,000,000)	(100,000,000,000)	(100,000,000,000)	(+15,400,355,000)
Limitation on direct loans.....		(180,000,000)	(180,000,000)	(180,000,000)	(180,000,000)	(+180,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	262,810,000	308,846,000	308,846,000	308,846,000	308,846,000	+46,036,000
Offsetting receipts.....	-267,021,000	-308,846,000	-308,846,000	-308,846,000	-308,846,000	-41,825,000
FHA - General and special risk program account:						
Limitation on guaranteed loans.....	(18,436,205,000)	(20,885,072,000)	(20,885,072,000)	(20,885,072,000)	(20,885,072,000)	(+2,448,867,000)
Limitation on direct loans.....		(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(+220,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	192,252,000	197,470,000	197,470,000	197,470,000	197,470,000	+5,218,000
Program costs.....	147,371,000	188,395,000	152,000,000	188,395,000	188,395,000	+41,024,000
Subsidy - multifamily.....	-41,967,000	-134,098,000	-134,098,000	-134,098,000	-134,098,000	-92,139,000
Subsidy - single family.....	-45,172,000	-81,673,000	-81,673,000	-81,673,000	-81,673,000	-36,501,000
Subsidy - Title I.....	-18,293,000	-24,460,000	-24,460,000	-24,460,000	-24,460,000	-6,167,000
<b>Total, Federal Housing Administration.....</b>	<b>231,960,000</b>	<b>145,636,000</b>	<b>109,241,000</b>	<b>145,636,000</b>	<b>145,636,000</b>	<b>-86,354,000</b>
<b>Government National Mortgage Association</b>						
Guarantee of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
Limitation on guaranteed loans.....	(185,000,000,000)	(142,000,000,000)	(142,000,000,000)	(142,000,000,000)	(142,000,000,000)	(-43,000,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	8,036,000	8,824,000	8,824,000	8,824,000	8,824,000	+788,000
Offsetting receipts.....	-266,300,000	-262,700,000	-262,700,000	-262,700,000	-262,700,000	+8,600,000
<b>Total, Housing Programs (net).....</b>	<b>19,163,766,000</b>	<b>19,708,620,000</b>	<b>20,751,526,000</b>	<b>18,695,635,000</b>	<b>18,567,635,000</b>	<b>-568,131,000</b>
<b>Homeless Assistance</b>						
Homeless assistance grants.....		1,250,000,000	1,120,000,000	1,120,000,000	1,120,000,000	+1,120,000,000
Emergency shelter grants program.....	115,000,000					-115,000,000
Supportive housing program.....	334,000,000					-334,000,000
Section 8 moderate rehabilitation, single room occupancy.....	150,000,000					-150,000,000
Shelter plus care.....	123,747,000					-123,747,000
Innovative homeless initiatives demonstration program.....	100,000,000					-100,000,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>822,747,000</b>	<b>1,250,000,000</b>	<b>1,120,000,000</b>	<b>1,120,000,000</b>	<b>1,120,000,000</b>	<b>+297,253,000</b>

**H.R. 4624 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,  
and Independent Agencies, 1995**

	FY 1994 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Community Planning and Development</b>						
Community development grants.....	4,400,000,000	4,400,000,000	4,800,000,000	4,800,000,000	4,800,000,000	+200,000,000
Emergency funding.....	(500,000,000)					(500,000,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	
Capacity building for community development and affordable housing.....	20,000,000					-20,000,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>4,420,000,000</b>	<b>4,400,000,000</b>	<b>4,800,000,000</b>	<b>4,800,000,000</b>	<b>4,800,000,000</b>	<b>+180,000,000</b>
<b>Policy Development and Research</b>						
Research and technology.....	35,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	44,000,000	42,000,000	+7,000,000
<b>Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity</b>						
Fair housing activities.....	25,000,000	33,375,000	33,375,000	33,375,000	33,375,000	+8,375,000
<b>Management and Administration</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	464,053,000	477,994,000	457,994,000	443,219,000	451,219,000	-12,834,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(444,872,000)	(495,355,000)	(495,355,000)	(495,355,000)	(495,355,000)	(+50,483,000)
(By transfer, GNMA).....	(8,036,000)	(8,624,000)	(8,624,000)	(8,624,000)	(8,624,000)	(+786,000)
<b>Total, Salaries and expenses.....</b>	<b>918,983,000</b>	<b>962,173,000</b>	<b>962,173,000</b>	<b>947,368,000</b>	<b>956,368,000</b>	<b>+38,435,000</b>
Office of Inspector General.....	36,115,000	36,427,000	36,427,000	36,427,000	36,427,000	+312,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(10,180,000)	(10,981,000)	(10,981,000)	(10,981,000)	(10,981,000)	(+771,000)
<b>Total, Office of Inspector General.....</b>	<b>46,305,000</b>	<b>47,388,000</b>	<b>47,388,000</b>	<b>47,388,000</b>	<b>47,388,000</b>	<b>+1,083,000</b>
Office of federal housing enterprise oversight.....	10,700,000	15,451,000	15,451,000	15,451,000	15,451,000	+4,751,000
Offsetting receipts.....	(10,700,000)	(15,451,000)	(15,451,000)	(15,451,000)	(15,451,000)	(-4,751,000)
<b>Administrative Provisions</b>						
Procurement savings.....		-3,538,000	-3,538,000	-3,538,000	-3,538,000	-3,538,000
FHA mortgage insurance limits.....		-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
GNMA REMICs.....			-180,000,000	-180,000,000	-180,000,000	-180,000,000
GNMA REMICs II.....				-30,800,000	-30,800,000	-30,800,000
Non-judicial foreclosures.....				-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
<b>Total, title II, Dept of Housing and Urban Development (net).....</b>	<b>24,966,881,000</b>	<b>25,901,078,000</b>	<b>26,815,784,000</b>	<b>24,745,518,000</b>	<b>24,853,518,000</b>	<b>-313,163,000</b>
Appropriations, fiscal year 1995.....	(24,776,634,000)	(25,389,078,000)	(26,303,784,000)	(25,033,518,000)	(24,941,518,000)	(+164,884,000)
Advance appropriations for next year.....	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)			(-800,000,000)
Rescissions.....	(-809,953,000)	(-288,000,000)	(-288,000,000)	(-288,000,000)	(-288,000,000)	(+321,953,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-3,544,848)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(+1,544,848)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(290,089,800,000)	(284,939,072,000)	(284,939,072,000)	(284,939,072,000)	(284,939,072,000)	(-25,150,778,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(483,100,000)	(515,140,000)	(515,140,000)	(515,140,000)	(515,140,000)	(+32,040,000)
Consisting of:						
Advance appropriation available.....	720,000,000	800,000,000	800,000,000	800,000,000	800,000,000	+80,000,000
Appropriations available from this bill.....	24,199,881,000	25,101,078,000	26,015,784,000	24,745,518,000	24,853,518,000	+488,837,000
<b>Total, title II, fiscal year 1995.....</b>	<b>24,888,881,000</b>	<b>25,901,078,000</b>	<b>26,815,784,000</b>	<b>25,545,518,000</b>	<b>25,453,518,000</b>	<b>+568,837,000</b>
<b>TITLE III</b>						
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
<b>American Battle Monuments Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	20,211,000	20,265,000	20,265,000	20,265,000	20,265,000	+54,000
<b>Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,500,000	4,250,000		4,250,000	500,000	-2,000,000
Rescission.....	-770,000					+770,000
FY 1994 rescission.....	-1,730,000					+1,730,000
<b>Total.....</b>		<b>4,250,000</b>		<b>4,250,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>+800,000</b>
<b>Community Development Financial Institutions</b>						
Community development financial institutions fund program account.....		144,000,000		125,000,000	125,000,000	+125,000,000
<b>Consumer Product Safety Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	42,286,000	40,009,000	43,486,000	40,509,000	42,509,000	+223,000
<b>Corporation for National and Community Service</b>						
National and community service programs, operating expenses.....	370,000,000	610,368,000	490,368,000	610,000,000	575,000,000	+205,000,000
Rescission.....	-5,000,000					+5,000,000
Office of the Inspector General.....		1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>385,000,000</b>	<b>611,368,000</b>	<b>491,368,000</b>	<b>612,000,000</b>	<b>577,000,000</b>	<b>+212,000,000</b>

**H.R. 4624 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,  
and Independent Agencies, 1995**

	FY 1994 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Court of Veterans Appeals</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	9,159,000	9,429,000	9,289,000	9,429,000	9,429,000	+270,000
<b>Department of Defense - Civil</b>						
<b>Cemeterial Expenses, Army</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	12,736,000	12,017,000	12,017,000	12,017,000	12,017,000	-721,000
<b>Environmental Protection Agency</b>						
Research, prevention and program activities.....			1,800,300,000			
Research and development .....	338,701,000	363,960,000		360,000,000	350,000,000	+11,296,000
Abatement, control, and compliance.....	1,392,536,000	1,522,286,000		1,427,000,000	1,417,000,000	+84,465,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(283,000,000)		(250,000,000)	(298,772,500)	(298,772,500)	(+13,722,500)
Subtotal .....	1,691,236,000	1,886,146,000	1,800,300,000	1,777,000,000	1,767,000,000	+75,784,000
Program and research operations .....	850,825,000	963,255,000	936,000,000	922,000,000	922,000,000	+71,375,000
Office of Inspector General .....	27,647,800	28,989,000	28,542,000	28,542,000	28,542,000	+894,100
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund .....	18,278,000	15,384,000	15,384,000	15,384,000	15,384,000	-894,000
Transfer from Leaking Underground Storage Tanks .....	899,100	899,000	899,000	899,000	899,000	-100
Subtotal, OIG .....	44,596,500	45,042,000	44,596,000	44,596,000	44,596,000	
Facilities and nationwide support .....			174,700,000			
Buildings and facilities .....	18,000,000	43,870,000		43,870,000	43,870,000	+25,870,000
Subtotal .....	18,000,000	43,870,000	174,700,000	43,870,000	43,870,000	+25,870,000
Hazardous substance superfund .....	1,480,853,000	1,466,203,000	1,436,000,000	1,200,000,000	1,436,000,000	-48,853,000
Transfer to OIG .....	-16,278,000	-15,384,000	-15,384,000	-15,384,000	-15,384,000	+894,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(280,000,000)		(308,000,000)	(308,000,000)	(308,000,000)	(+28,000,000)
Subtotal, Hazardous substance superfund .....	1,464,575,000	1,462,819,000	1,419,816,000	1,184,816,000	1,419,816,000	-44,959,000
Leaking underground storage tank trust fund .....	75,379,000	76,684,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	-5,379,000
Transfer to OIG .....	-899,100	-899,000	-899,000	-899,000	-899,000	+100
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(7,400,000)		(8,150,000)	(8,150,000)	(8,150,000)	(+750,000)
Subtotal, LUST .....	74,709,800	78,015,000	69,331,000	69,331,000	69,331,000	-5,378,800
Oil spill response .....	21,239,000	23,473,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-1,239,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(7,850,000)		(8,420,000)	(8,420,000)	(8,420,000)	(+770,000)
Water infrastructure / State revolving fund .....	2,477,000,000	2,650,000,000	2,732,000,000	3,400,000,000	2,982,000,000	+485,000,000
Rescission .....	-22,000,000					+22,000,000
Pesticide registration fee .....		-5,000,000				
Procurement savings .....		-7,525,000	-7,525,000	-7,525,000	-7,525,000	-7,525,000
Subtotal, EPA .....	8,819,979,900	7,158,065,000	8,988,017,000	7,453,887,000	7,240,887,000	+620,907,100
<b>Executive Office of the President</b>						
Office of Science and Technology Policy .....	4,490,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	+531,000
Office of National Service .....	180,000					-180,000
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality .....	875,000	997,000	997,000	997,000	997,000	+322,000
Total .....	5,285,000	5,978,000	5,978,000	5,978,000	5,978,000	+863,000
<b>Federal Emergency Management Agency</b>						
Disaster relief .....	292,000,000	320,000,000	320,000,000		320,000,000	+28,000,000
Emergency funding .....	(4,709,000,000)					(-4,709,000,000)
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:						
State share loan .....		2,418,000	2,418,000	2,418,000	2,418,000	+2,418,000
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(+150,000,000)
Administrative expenses .....	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	
Community disaster loan .....			1,980,000			
(Limitation on direct loans) .....			(3,000,000)			
Administrative expenses .....			50,000			
Salaries and expenses .....	180,409,000	187,608,000	185,000,000	182,000,000	182,000,000	+1,591,000
Office of Inspector General .....	4,360,000	4,500,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	+50,000
Emergency management planning and assistance .....	212,980,000	220,345,000	220,345,000	212,980,000	215,980,000	+3,000,000
Emergency funding .....	(15,000,000)					(-15,000,000)
Rescission .....	-2,000,000					+2,000,000
Emergency food and shelter program .....	130,000,000		130,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000	
Administrative provision REP savings .....	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	
Procurement savings .....		-1,441,000	-1,441,000	-1,441,000	-1,441,000	-1,441,000
Subtotal, Federal Emergency Management Agency .....	786,289,000	702,000,000	831,322,000	498,907,000	621,907,000	+35,618,000
<b>General Services Administration</b>						
Consumer Information Center .....	2,074,000	2,008,000	2,008,000	2,008,000	2,008,000	-86,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(2,415,000)	(2,364,000)	(2,454,000)	(2,454,000)	(2,454,000)	(+39,000)

**H.R. 4624 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,  
and Independent Agencies, 1995**

	FY 1994 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Department of Health and Human Services</b>						
Office of Consumer Affairs .....	2,159,000	2,166,000	2,166,000	2,166,000	2,166,000	+7,000
<b>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</b>						
Human space flight .....		5,719,900,000	5,592,900,000	5,573,900,000	5,573,900,000	+5,573,900,000
Science, aeronautics and technology .....		5,901,200,000	5,901,200,000	5,901,200,000	5,901,200,000	+5,901,200,000
Recession .....				-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
National aeronautical facilities .....				400,000,000	400,000,000	+400,000,000
Mission support .....		2,554,587,000	2,549,587,000	2,556,587,000	2,554,587,000	+2,554,587,000
Research and development .....	7,549,300,000					-7,549,300,000
Recession .....	-83,000,000					+83,000,000
(By transfer from DOD) .....	(90,000,000)					(-90,000,000)
Advance appropriation, fiscal year 1995 .....	20,000,000					-20,000,000
Space flight, control and data communications .....	4,853,500,000					-4,853,500,000
Recession .....	-32,000,000					+32,000,000
Construction of facilities .....	517,700,000					-517,700,000
Recession .....	-25,000,000					+25,000,000
Research and program management .....	1,691,508,000					-1,691,508,000
Recession .....	-18,000,000					+18,000,000
Reappropriation .....	18,000,000					-18,000,000
Office of Inspector General .....	15,391,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,800,000	18,000,000	+809,000
Procurement savings .....		-59,003,000	-59,003,000		-59,003,000	-59,003,000
<b>Total, NASA .....</b>	<b>14,527,399,000</b>	<b>14,240,684,000</b>	<b>14,000,684,000</b>	<b>14,441,487,000</b>	<b>14,378,684,000</b>	<b>-150,715,000</b>
<b>National Credit Union Administration</b>						
Central liquidity facility:						
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(900,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(900,000,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds) .....	(945,000)	(901,000)	(901,000)	(901,000)	(901,000)	(-44,000)
<b>National Science Foundation</b>						
Research and related activities .....	1,996,500,000	2,348,297,000	2,218,823,000	2,300,000,000	2,280,000,000	+281,500,000
Recession from prior appropriations .....	-5,000,000		-36,000,000		-36,000,000	-30,000,000
United States polar research programs .....	158,100,000					-158,100,000
United States Antarctic logistical support activities .....	82,800,000					-82,800,000
Critical technologies Institute .....	1,500,000					-1,500,000
Major research equipment .....		70,000,000	108,000,000	150,000,000	128,000,000	+128,000,000
Academic research infrastructure .....	110,000,000	85,000,000	100,000,000	300,000,000	250,000,000	+140,000,000
Recession .....	-5,000,000					+5,000,000
Education and human resources .....	599,800,000	585,974,000	585,974,000	605,974,000	605,974,000	+38,374,000
Salaries and expenses .....	118,300,000	130,058,000	123,986,000	123,986,000	123,986,000	+5,986,000
Office of Inspector General .....	3,997,000	4,380,000	4,000,000	4,380,000	4,380,000	+383,000
National Science Foundation headquarters relocation .....	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	
<b>Total, NSF (net) .....</b>	<b>3,017,797,000</b>	<b>3,198,909,000</b>	<b>3,108,083,000</b>	<b>3,454,520,000</b>	<b>3,360,520,000</b>	<b>+342,723,000</b>
<b>Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation</b>						
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation .....	32,000,000	38,667,000	38,667,000	38,667,000	38,667,000	+8,667,000
<b>Selective Service System</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	25,000,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	-2,070,000
<b>Total, title III, independent agencies (net) .....</b>	<b>25,467,376,900</b>	<b>26,212,795,000</b>	<b>25,574,280,000</b>	<b>26,744,020,000</b>	<b>26,658,467,000</b>	<b>+1,191,090,100</b>
Appropriations .....	(25,626,678,900)	(26,212,795,000)	(25,609,280,000)	(26,786,020,000)	(26,703,467,000)	(+1,076,598,100)
Recessions .....	(-179,500,000)		(-36,000,000)	(-45,000,000)	(-45,000,000)	(+134,500,000)
Advance appropriation, fiscal year 1995 .....	(20,000,000)					(-20,000,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(580,485,000)	(2,354,000)	(577,024,000)	(623,798,500)	(623,746,500)	(+43,281,500)
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(825,000,000)	(825,000,000)	(778,000,000)	(775,000,000)	(775,000,000)	(+150,000,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds) .....	(945,000)	(901,000)	(901,000)	(901,000)	(901,000)	(-44,000)
<b>TITLE IV</b>						
<b>CORPORATIONS</b>						
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:						
FBIIC Resolution Fund .....	1,171,000,000	827,000,000	827,000,000	827,000,000	827,000,000	-344,000,000
FDIC affordable housing program .....	7,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000		15,000,000	+8,000,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>1,178,000,000</b>	<b>842,000,000</b>	<b>842,000,000</b>	<b>827,000,000</b>	<b>842,000,000</b>	<b>-336,000,000</b>
Resolution Trust Corporation: Office of Inspector General .....	34,314,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	-2,314,000
<b>Total, title IV, Corporations .....</b>	<b>1,212,314,000</b>	<b>874,000,000</b>	<b>874,000,000</b>	<b>859,000,000</b>	<b>874,000,000</b>	<b>-338,314,000</b>
<b>TITLE V</b>						
<b>GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>						
National Aeronautics and Space Administration procurement reform .....				-19,703,000		

**H.R. 4624 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1995**

	FY 1994 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE VI</b>						
<b>FY 1994 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENT APPROPRIATIONS</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT</b>						
<b>Community Planning and Development</b>						
Community development grants.....		225,000,000		355,000,000	355,000,000	+ 355,000,000
(By transfer, FY 1994).....				(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+ 50,000,000)
<b>Total funds available.....</b>		<b>(225,000,000)</b>		<b>(405,000,000)</b>	<b>(405,000,000)</b>	<b>(+ 405,000,000)</b>
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
<b>Federal Emergency Management Agency</b>						
Community disaster assistance loan.....				12,500,000	12,500,000	+ 12,500,000
<b>Total, title VI, FY 1994 Emergency Supplemental.....</b>		<b>225,000,000</b>		<b>367,500,000</b>	<b>367,500,000</b>	<b>+ 367,500,000</b>
(By transfer, FY 1994).....				(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+ 50,000,000)
<b>Grand total (net).....</b>	<b>88,313,637,932</b>	<b>90,318,793,081</b>	<b>90,547,927,081</b>	<b>90,118,109,081</b>	<b>90,118,109,081</b>	<b>+ 1,804,348,129</b>
Appropriations, fiscal year 1995.....	(88,283,289,932)	(88,581,793,081)	(90,070,927,081)	(90,081,809,081)	(90,083,896,081)	(+ 1,800,396,129)
Appropriations, fiscal year 1994.....		(225,000,000)		(367,500,000)	(367,500,000)	(+ 367,500,000)
Advance appropriations for next year.....	(820,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(800,000,000)			(-820,000,000)
Rescissions.....	(-786,463,000)	(-286,000,000)	(-323,000,000)	(-333,000,000)	(-333,000,000)	(+ 456,463,000)
(By transfer).....	(108,882,000)	(100,081,000)	(81,000)	(100,081,000)	(100,081,000)	(-8,801,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(580,485,000)	(2,354,000)	(577,024,000)	(823,798,500)	(823,748,500)	(+ 43,281,500)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-3,544,848)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(+ 1,544,848)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(854,348,571)	(1,000,813,034)	(1,203,813,034)	(1,200,813,034)	(1,200,813,034)	(+ 548,284,463)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(290,089,850,000)	(284,899,072,000)	(284,899,072,000)	(284,899,072,000)	(284,899,072,000)	(-25,180,778,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(484,045,000)	(518,041,000)	(518,041,000)	(518,041,000)	(518,041,000)	(+ 51,898,000)
Emergency Funding.....	(5,814,798,000)					(-5,814,798,000)
<b>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP</b>						
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	-5,943,000	-211,935,000	13,246,000	445,746,000	445,746,000	+ 451,889,000
Mandatory.....	20,254,784,000	20,148,832,000	20,148,832,000	20,148,832,000	20,148,832,000	-107,832,000
Discretionary.....	68,053,130,932	69,960,028,081	70,414,341,081	70,415,023,081	70,417,100,081	+ 2,363,998,129

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by recognizing the stamina and legislative skill of my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio. We have forged a working relationship on this subcommittee that makes the bill reflect the finest kind of bipartisan and legislative workmanship. I want also to thank all of our colleagues on the subcommittee for their participation and their willingness to work through the many issues which we face in formulating this bill. And I especially want to take this time to note how much I will miss working with our colleague DEAN GALLO who has decided to leave us at the end of the 103d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we bring to you today a conference report which allocates roughly \$90.6 billion in both mandatory and discretionary expenditures. About \$70.4 billion of that total is for discretionary spending in the two Cabinet agencies and 21 independent agencies, boards, and commissions that fall within this bill's jurisdiction. The conference report before you this afternoon is actually \$164 million less in total spending than the original bill which this House approved by a vote of 344-84 in late June.

We have taken the additional step of incorporating emergency funding related to the continued costs of the Northridge earthquake and Tropical Storm Alberto within our annual bill so as to reduce the need for a separate disaster related emergency supplemental in the early days of the next Congress.

Some of the budgetary pressure that makes things so tight is the result of the growth of government—most particularly in the form of new programs proposed by the current administration. The single largest increase for any agency within this bill—an increase of 55 percent—is for the Corporation for National and Community Service which was initiated just last year. And, frankly, there are some at the White House who are disappointed with our decision to trim \$35 million from the President's actual request for the National Service program.

Additionally, this report shepherds in the initial funding of \$125 million for the Community Development Financial Institutions program created on a bipartisan and nearly unanimous basis by this Congress just last month (Public Law 103-XXX).

When we began our hearings in preparation for formulating our bill this year there was serious concern about the survival of the International Space Station Alpha Program and the very mission of NASA itself. This conference report contains the funding necessary to move forward with Ameri-

ca's manned exploration of space in a fashion that will make it possible for us to incorporate Russia as a partner and take every advantage of Russia's life sciences experience with the existing MIR station.

The chairman and I share the strong desire to influence NASA in the most realistic direction when it comes to expectations about future funding. This conference report caps space station costs at \$17.4 billion through assembly complete in the year 2002. Overall, NASA's total agency funding for fiscal 1995 is \$14.4 billion—a real reduction of \$150 million from last year. For an agency which has doubled its annual funding from about \$7.2 billion in 1984 to \$14.5 billion last year, with substantial increases each and every year, this is drawing a new and very significant line.

This conference report also allocates funding for the programs of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Since the chairman and I assumed our responsibilities 2 short years ago, we have awaited enactment of bills to reauthorize the Clean and Safe Drinking Water Acts. Earlier this year and last year as well, we set aside moneys for local communities to deal with unmet needs that result from Federal mandates for wastewater treatment and water infrastructure.

This conference report allocates those moneys subject to dates determined in the agreements reached with the House Public Works Committee. We continue to hope that conditioning release of these moneys to dates in the near future will break the deadlock surrounding floor consideration of the various clean water authorization bills and approaches. Absent that, we have an agreement in consultation with the leadership in the authorization committee, that local communities should not have to wait any longer for the EPA to release these funds to hardship communities for projects consistent with the spirit of existing law.

Last, I want to mention two amendments on which we spent the bulk of our time in the conference. The first involves increases in the FHA credit limit. I am wholeheartedly in favor of making first-time home ownership easier for young families because of high median home prices in southern California. I am also in favor of the increases because I believe new home construction and sales are important drivers in improved overall economic recovery and performance.

This House has twice approved the proposed increase in high-cost areas to \$172,675. We approved it in late June when this bill originally passed the House and it is also contained in the House passed version of the comprehensive housing reauthorization bill which we passed on July 22. In the interest of comity between the chambers, we deferred these increases and accepted the

Senate provision which deals instead with the floor for FHA loans which has not been increased since 1980.

In accepting this provision, House conferees were mindful of two things. The first was that hard choices are a necessity to enacting this conference report into law. Second, we concluded that the likelihood of successfully completing conference on the housing authorization would be enhanced by resolving FHA credit limits in that forum.

Finally we have one issue in true and sincere disagreement. That would be amendment No. 87 which deals with an EPA regulation regarding foreign refinery baseline requirements for reformulated gasoline. The amendment was initiated by the Senate and is in the form of a limitation which would not change existing law. I am on the side of the angels here. I want to accommodate Senator MIKULSKI and the efforts of American refiners to preserve market share. And yet I know that the House has not had a chance to work its will yet on this controversy. So I am anxious to assess the will of this body with the hope that our conclusion will ease final approval of this report by the other body.

In closing, I strongly urge your adoption of this conference report with its endorsement of the continued and positive direction of our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, LOUIS STOKES.

□ 1650

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to associate myself with the fine remarks the gentleman made concerning our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. DEAN GALLO. He is one of the hardest working and one of the most able Members of this body. He has been a real asset to our subcommittee. The announcement that he was not going to run for reelection, of course, was something that concerned all of us. We certainly wish him all of the best in terms of his current illness and our prayers are certainly with him.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the subcommittee chairman, and I certainly join with him in those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I would like to take just a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for the excellent work he has provided in bringing this conference report to the House today. The same is true of my dear friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. The fiscal year 1995 appropriations conference report for VA, HUD, and independent agencies is one of the most diverse and challenging to be brought to the floor this year. It is challenging because the needs addressed by the bill far outstrip the resources available through the budget allocation.

The VA-HUD conference report is the department store of appropriations bills. It funds everything from VA medical care to NSF research. It funds disaster relief, homeless programs, and the EPA. It funds the Consumer Products Safety Commission, the American Battle Monuments Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Selective Service.

It represents a family of programs, whose children are pitted against one another in the annual battle for sustenance.

I wish to make it clear that the House Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies has provided great stewardship of its many charges. The chairman of the subcommittee, my dear friend, the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable LOUIS STOKES, has served the subcommittee and the Congress with great distinction. He has been forced to make enormously difficult choices, and I have nothing but the greatest respect for the work he has performed. Likewise, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, my wise and learned colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable JERRY LEWIS, has invested untold hours trying to build the best product out of a difficult budget allocation. In total \$90.6 billion is provided in the conference agreement. This is an increase of \$2.256 billion over 1994 but still comes in about \$1 million under the subcommittee 602(b) allocation.

I am pleased the full funding for NASA's space station of \$2.1 billion is provided. We have required NASA to redesign space station *Freedom* to fit within a more realistic funding profile. We did these things to retain our lead in aerospace technology; and to one day realize the benefits of a far-sighted investment in new products, systems, and technologies.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to observe that this bill contains \$16.565 billion for VA medical care, an increase of \$152 million over the President's request and \$611 million over the fiscal year 1994 level. It also provides \$7.24 billion for EPA programs including over \$3 billion for a vital clean water project fund.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee for their effort and I strongly recommend approval of the conference report.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. The amounts included for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Court of Veterans Appeals, and the American Battle Monuments Commission are very fair, and I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. STOKES, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California, Mr. LEWIS, for their good work on behalf of veterans.

This bill includes increases above the administration's request for VA medical care, and VA medical research, for construction of VA medical facilities, for grants to States to build veterans nursing homes, and for the operation of the VA's regional offices which decide claims and counsel veterans. There is a huge backlog of claims at many offices throughout the country, and the additional \$16 million provided in the bill, along with implementation of the much-delayed modernization and management-reform efforts by the VA, will help address this major problem.

The veterans health care system is beginning to make changes necessary to make it a customer-driven organization. This bill provides \$16.2 billion for medical care in 1995. This is \$111 million more than requested by the administration. It provides stable funding support for a system that will provide treatment to almost 3 million veterans next year.

In closing, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBEY, and the ranking minority member, Mr. MCDADE, and all members of the subcommittee and the full committee for the work they have done on this measure, especially as it relates to veterans.

□ 1700

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in support of the conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 4624, the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995. As ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I particularly wish to address the veterans' portion of the agreement.

I do appreciate and respect the efforts of the subcommittee chairman, Mr. STOKES, and the ranking member, Mr. LEWIS, and other members of the subcommittee for their hard work and diligence in developing this conference report.

Also, I want to acknowledge the work of Chairman OBEY and ranking minority member, Mr. MCDADE, of the full Committee on Appropriations.

In fact, the Appropriations Committee managers have probably done as well as one might expect in conference with the Senate, especially considering the inadequacies of the administration's budget recommendations with which they began.

I am particularly pleased that the conference report kept in mind VA's infrastructure needs for the delivery of patient care. The agreement significantly increases the capital improvements construction program by providing \$355 million for VA facilities. This amount is \$250 million above the House-approved level and will help VA make priority upgrades to maintain its valuable capital asset base.

In specific, I am pleased to see the needs of Arizona's veterans recognized in the appropriation of \$41 million for an ambulatory care addition at the Hayden VA Medical Center in Phoenix. This construction will help meet the special health care needs of veterans living in Arizona and alleviate the growing stress on the current hospital system.

While I support this conference report, Mr. Speaker, I have some very real concerns that resources for a number of veterans' programs are not keeping pace with what is required.

As I review the spending provided in the other titles of this agreement, I see that many areas of lesser priority are receiving inordinate increases. The HUD title stands out in this regard.

Veterans have clearly expressed a willingness to pull their fair share of the budget reduction load, but the medical care system in particular and the VA in general is already stretched thin by earlier budgets.

Very frankly, the problem facing the VA and the veterans they serve is that Federal spending for veterans' programs in inflation-adjusted dollars has not increased in more than a decade and its overall share of the Federal budget has been steadily eroding.

To continue this trend is to guarantee a perilous diminishment of our commitment to veterans.

I don't desire to fix blame for the past but I do wish to sound an alarm about the course of the future.

Let us face the facts. The VA health care system has been chronically underfunded for more than a decade. The result of this inadequate funding is a system unable to provide timely service to many veterans and barely able to maintain current services to those who received benefits in the past.

The good news is that this conference report appropriates \$111 million more than recommended by the President for medical care. The bad news is that this level of funding is far below what is needed to maintain current services and adequate care for veterans. The overall increase for medical care is nearly 40 percent below appropriation increases in any of the past 4 years.

With new claims on VA health services resulting from the Persian Gulf war and the downsizing of our military, the appropriations level in this report can only mean continued chronic underfunding.

Beyond the current delays in services, rationing of care, and veterans waiting in lines just to get an appointment to see a doctor, VA estimates that there is also a \$700 million backlog of needed new medical equipment. As

one of VA's most critical needs, the backlog is not adequately addressed in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the medical care program is the leading edge of our veterans' care system.

Those of us tasked with oversight responsibility of this system cannot continue to stand back and allow the tragic consequence of insufficient funding for VA's medical care.

And while we find it difficult to alter the priorities of current leadership, we can shout our dismay that this group of men and women who proudly wore the uniform of the United States of America are being slowly dropped to an ever lower priority.

Paralleling the needed improvements in veterans' health care are those called for in the VA adjudication system.

A backlog of initial disability claims approaching 700,000 and the Board of Veterans' Appeals 6-year turnaround time reflects a half-dozen years of neglect in funding and support reductions for this area of veteran's care.

VA employees at regional offices are overwhelmed by increasing caseloads, and the veterans they serve are frustrated and discouraged by what many perceive to be the "black hole" of VA adjudication.

I am pleased to see that this report takes a step in the right direction by earmarking \$16.5 million for additional staffing, overtime and training to reduce the backlog of veterans benefits claims.

This provision is only a small step. Without additional resources, due process in the current VA system will permanently come to mean long waits in the continually growing backlog of cases.

The Department of Veterans Affairs confirms that the time it currently takes to process an original compensation claim at a VA regional office and render a decision is 226 days.

This time has worsened from 189 days in fiscal year 1993 and 164 days in fiscal year 1992.

Clearly, it is grossly unfair and unjust that the veterans seeking help for a service connected disability or illness is forced to endure these obscene delays in receiving their fair benefits owed by the Government they have served.

So as we look at our duty to do what we can for those who served, I believe, we can do better than what is presented in this measure.

For veterans, I remain hopeful that next year's appropriations measure will go beyond the recommendation our veterans have come to expect from the current administration and respond more favorably to the Nation's commitment to help veterans and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the new year.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of this conference report on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies. This conference report includes funding for many worthwhile and necessary programs which will benefit both this Member's constituents and all citizens of the

United States. This Member would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA/HUD and Independent Agencies, Mr. STOKES, and the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. LEWIS, for their work in bringing this conference report before us today.

Foremost among the provisions this Member would like to praise is the \$3 million to capitalize the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program which this Member pushed to authorization. This \$3 million will serve to make \$22,388,000 in loan guarantees available. The foresight shown by the committee in funding this program is commendable. This program is necessitated by the fact that the trust status of tribal land has made lenders unwilling to make loans for homes on that land. This program addresses lenders' concerns by providing them with a guarantee on their loans, and keeps the trust status of the land intact by providing that the Federal Government will only liquidate foreclosed properties by selling them to a member of the tribe, the tribe itself, or the appropriate Indian housing authority. It truly will bring a new, much needed dimension to Indian housing. Helping Indian families to buy their own homes instead of necessarily relying on public housing is also a very good move for the American taxpayer.

This Member is also pleased that the Senate has included \$282 million for Indian housing new construction direct funding. This level is \$19 million over the administration request and the House-passed level. A dire shortage of safe, decent, and affordable housing still exists in Indian country and this level of direct funding is vital to meet the most basic shelter needs of our native people.

This Member also wishes to express his strong support for report language which prohibits the EPA from using funds to implement a final rule concerning radon in drinking water. Without this prohibition, communities across the Nation would be forced to spend billions of dollars to implement a regulation which would result in minimal health benefits since water contributes very little to the public exposure to radon. Because the radon issue is currently being addressed during consideration of the reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act, the proposed prohibition called for in the Senate version is appropriate and necessary.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this Member wants to express his support for the inclusion in this measure of \$6 million for rural water assistance activities, and \$70 million for public water system supervision grants. There are two very important programs for rural communities. The supervision grants directly funds State programs which implement the Safe Drinking Water Act. Without this funding, States would face another unfunded Federal mandate.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this Member thanks the distinguished chairman of the VA/HUD/Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. STOKES, and the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. LEWIS, and all the members of the subcommittee for their efforts and assistance.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the VA-HUD-independent agencies appropriations conference report and I commend the gentleman from Ohio and the conferees for their efforts.

I am extremely pleased with the substance of the bill as it pertains to programs in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and that is why I am supporting the conference report. But I do have some problems with report language that reads more like language that should accompany an authorizing bill than an appropriations bill. And I am quite disturbed that a bill that left the House relatively free of earmarks came back from the conference heavily laden with them.

Before turning to my concerns, however, I would like to commend Mr. STOKES and the conferees for funding science, space, and technology programs in a manner that is consistent with the administration's priorities and the authorizing legislation of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Let me begin with the NASA budget. This has been a difficult year for all of us in trying to achieve a level of funding sufficient to maintain a balanced space program that includes the space station, as well as important space science programs like Cassini and AXAF.

I am gratified at both the funding levels the conferees have provided and the substance of some of the actions they have proposed. In parallel with this appropriations bill, the Science Committee has been developing an authorization bill, which is now in the other body. There is a great deal of overlap between the two bills on many issues. I hope that this represents a convergence in thinking that will result in a genuine consensus within the Congress on space and aeronautics policy.

I also want to recognize that the conferees showed an outstanding level of leadership in resisting the temptation to exercise micromanagement. They have provided NASA great flexibility to formulate a plan to meet a very constrained budget. In addition, the chairman and his counterpart in the other body have consulted with me throughout the development of this bill. I hope

that this is the direction we will see in other appropriation bills in the future.

I also want to commend the conferees for their funding of the National Science Foundation at a level consistent with the administration's overall investment objectives and the Science Committee's authorization bill. In particular, the report begins to address problems of academic research facilities that were inadequately addressed in the administration's request. academic research facilities program. This appropriation will achieve the targeted funding level authorized by the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act of 1988, and will allow at last for the NSF facilities program to begin to address an estimated \$10 billion nationwide shortfall in academic facilities. Over the past 10 years the Science Committee has advocated increased Federal support to prevent the deterioration of the extensive physical research infrastructure at U.S. universities, which was built up with large public expenditures over the past 40 years and which must be upgraded to enable leading-edge research to be pursued. The conferees correctly point out that the NSF cannot alone provide the Federal portion of support required for facilities modernization. A multi-agency program is needed involving all Federal agencies which sponsor academic research. I support the conference report requirement that the administration develop a plan for such a multiagency program, which is also a requirement of the NSF Authorization Act of 1994, which passed the House in May.

In other substantive areas, I am pleased that the conferees were able to squeeze out at least a modest increase over last year's funding to support R&D operating expenses at the Environmental Protection Agency and that they funded the President's Office of Science and Technology Policy at the requested level.

As I mentioned earlier, I have some problems with the report language. I am satisfied that the bill itself is not overburdened with efforts to bypass the proper authorizing committees with inappropriate legislative language, but the statement of managers report accompanying the bill does sometimes contain language that would seem better suited to an authorization bill than to an appropriations report. Of course, a process that leaves important authorization bills languishing in the other body is the major culprit here. The House has passed authorizing legislation for all of the major scientific agencies funded by this bill—NASA, NSF, and EPA—but the Senate has acted on none of these bills. I am generally pleased with the policy direction taken in this conference report. But I hope that we in the Congress can continue to work on improving the way we do business so that the important dis-

inction between authorization and appropriations bills can be maintained.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed with the level of earmarks in this conference report. When this bill left the House at the end of June, I was able to commend the subcommittee for keeping academic earmarks near last year's relatively low level. But the bill that has come back from conference includes an amendment in disagreement that contains more academic earmarks—70 million dollars' worth—than were in VA-HUD bills in the bad old days of 1992 and 1993. Numerous other earmarks appear in report language.

We do not get to vote on or amend report language, which does not have the force of law anyway. But we can vote on amendments that are reported back in technical disagreement, and I intend to oppose amendment 28, whose sole purpose is to provide a total of \$290 million in earmarks—\$70 million for academic institutions—that were not in the original House recommendation for this appropriations bill.

Despite these concerns about earmarks, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, on balance, this is a good report. I urge all Members to support the report but to reject the amendment that is riddled with earmarks.

*Academic earmarks—VA/HUD appropriations bill, 1995*

<i>Agency—School</i>	<i>Amount</i>
HUD:	
Marshall University—construction of a new library .....	\$5,000,000
Shepherd College—capital costs for science and education activities .....	5,000,000
WV School of Osteopathic Medicine—new ambulatory care clinic .....	4,000,000
College of West Virginia—new library facility .....	5,000,000
Portland State University—urban revitalization activities .....	2,000,000
Oregon State University—science education facility .....	5,000,000
University of New Orleans—National Center for the Revitalization of Central Cities .....	1,000,000
Unknown—clinical lab space in Billings, MT ...	1,500,000
Ball State University—innovative housing research .....	500,000
Unknown—Center for Integrated Urban Care ...	1,000,000
University of Redlands—Redlands Center for Science and Environmental Studies .....	1,650,000
Loma Linda Medical Center—community based cancer patient support project .....	2,000,000
Albion College—downtown renovation and economic revitalization .....	800,000

<i>Agency—School</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Pennsylvania Educational Telecommunications Exchange Network (i.e., Lehigh, Scranton, Susquehanna, and Wilkes Universities; Albright, King's, Lebanon Valley, Lycoming, Marywood, and Moravian Colleges; Allentown College of St Francis de Sales; College Misericordia; Lehigh Carbon, Luzerne County, Northampton, and Reading Area Community Colleges) .....	2,000,000
College of Notre Dame of Maryland—renovation of the Knott Science Center .....	1,450,000
Villa Julie College—computer training center ...	1,450,000
University of Detroit Mercy—Urban Health Education Center .....	2,000,000
Fordham University—Regional Educational Technology Center .....	300,000
Iona College—Information Access Center .....	750,000
New York Medical College—medical infrastructure project .....	1,200,000
University of Maryland at College Park—Center for Political Participation .....	450,000
St. Mary's Community College—needed educational opportunities .....	1,000,000
Bryant College—international business and economic development center .....	1,000,000
Southeastern PA Consortium for Information Technology and Training (i.e., Beaver, Cabrini, Chestnut Hill, Eastern, Gwynedd-Mercy, Holy Family, Neumann, and Rosemont Colleges) .....	2,000,000
University of Scranton—National Institute for Environmental Renewal .....	2,500,000
New England Conservatory—renovation of Jordan Hall .....	1,000,000
University of San Francisco—Center for Pacific Rim studies .....	1,000,000
Columbia University—development of Audubon Research Park for biomedical research ...	1,500,000
Hazard Community Center—community service center .....	1,000,000
Pembroke State University—Regional Center for economic, community and professional development .....	2,000,000
DePaul University—direct services and partnerships with community organizations, schools and individuals in North Carolina .....	2,000,000

Agency—School	Amount	Agency—School	Amount	Agency—School	Amount
Saint Xavier University Center—Urban Redevelopment and community services .....	1,500,000	University of Oregon—Oregon Institute of Marine Biology for land margin ecosystem research .....	500,000	West Virginia University—Alternate Transportation Fuels Center .....	1,500,000
Hampton University—Leadership Institute to address profound social problems in Hampton, VA .....	500,000	University of North Dakota—National Center for Excellence on Air Toxic Metals, Energy, and Environmental Research .....	1,000,000	West Virginia University—National Environmental Training Center .....	1,000,000
Virginia Commonwealth University and City of Richmond—Richmond Education, Training and Employment Network project .....	1,300,000	Florida International University—Florida Keys Marine Sanctuary .....	250,000	Vermont Technical College—Regional training program with Vermont auto dealers (Unspecified) .....	
Norfolk State University—Center for the Prevention of Crime Violence Illiteracy, and Poverty .....	500,000	Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy (i.e., New Mexico State University; Arizona State University; San Diego State University; University of Texas, El Paso; and University of Utah) Environmental issues affecting U.S.-Mexico border region ...	2,000,000	Tuskegee University, Charles Drew University, Meharry Medical College, Florida A&M University, Morehouse School of Medicine, Xavier University of Louisiana, and Texas Southern University—Minority Health Professions (hazardous substance investigations) .....	4,000,000
University of Arkansas at Little Rock—urban community revitalization program .....	1,050,000	Penn State University and West Virginia University—National Mine Lands Reclamation Center (abandoned mines acid drainage) ...	450,000	Lamar University—Gulf Coast Hazardous Substance Waste Center ....	2,500,000
Onondaga Community College—Applied Technology Center as comprehensive economic development resource ..	500,000	University of Minnesota, St. Paul—Effects of the European Ruffe, a non-indigenous fish to Lake Superior .....	70,000	Clark Atlanta University—Clark Atlanta Hazardous Substance Research Center .....	3,500,000
University of South Carolina—expansion of the Science and Mathematics Complex .....	300,000	University of Minnesota, Duluth—Study of the uptake of environmental mercury by fish populations .....	165,000	Mine Montana College of Mineral Science & Engineering—Waste Technology Pilot Program for emerging cleanup technologies .....	5,000,000
Wilkes University—Earth Conservancy for acquisition of land .....	500,000	Colorado School of Mines—High-altitude exhaust emissions compliance testing .....	150,000	Subtotal, EPA .....	32,050,000
Buena Vista College—economic development activities related to distance learning programs .....	2,000,000	Wilkes University—Susquehanna River wetlands project .....	300,000	FEMA: University of Nevada, Reno—Earthquake Engineering Center .....	500,000
University of Alabama—small business incubator program .....	1,000,000	Colorado State University—National Center for Vehicle Emissions Control and Safety for emissions training activities .....	150,000	Subtotal, FEMA .....	500,000
Subtotal, HUD .....	68,200,000	West Virginia University—Small Flows Clearinghouse .....	1,240,000	NASA:	
EPA:		Saginaw Valley State University—Earthvision activities .....	1,200,000	Ohio State University—Regional ecosystem computer-based modeling project .....	3,000,000
University of Arkansas—Toxicological research .....	400,000	Montana State University—Small public water systems technology assistance center .....	375,000	University of Alaska—Poker Flat Rocket Range upgrade (Unspecified) .....	
University of Detroit Mercy—Center for Excellence in Polymer Research and Environmental Study .....	600,000	University of Vermont—Lake Champlain management conference ....	2,000,000	Subtotal, NASA .....	3,000,000
Colorado School of Mines—National High Altitude Heavy-Duty Engine Research & Technology Center .....	300,000	Oregon State University—Center for Analysis of Environmental Change for assessment of Pacific NW ecosystem research .....	225,000	Grand total .....	103,750,000
St. Vincent College—Environmental education, research, & demonstration project .....	300,000	University of Hawaii—investigate algal bloom crisis .....	400,000	Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].	
University of Northern Iowa—Small Business Pollution Prevention Center .....	300,000	New Jersey Institute of Technology—Integrated pollution prevention initiative .....	475,000	Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with mixed emotions. While I welcome the conferees' general commitment to VA construction projects, I am a bit perplexed by the process used to select which projects to fund. The conferees added \$150 million to the appropriation levels agreed to by the other body, more than tripling the House-passed level for the VA construction account. With this money they have recommended funding for six of the eight ambulatory care projects originally included in the President's Health Investment Fund. These projects were all determined to be critical to the VA's ability to serve veterans in need, underscoring the importance of ambulatory care to today's VA. Strangely,	
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute—Fresh Water Institute .....	500,000				
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute—Adirondacks Destruction Assessment Program .....	450,000				
McNeese State University, LA—Oilspill remediation research .....	500,000				
University of New Orleans—Municipal solid waste, and surface and ground water quality research .....	250,000				

though, not included in the report is funding for the Bay Pines Satellite Outpatient Facility, a project desperately needed to serve more than 150,000 veterans in southwest Florida. Right now, the nearest acute care facility is 150 miles away and the only service facility for these vets is a small, grossly overburdened outpatient clinic. Plans to expand the clinic and add a long-term care facility have been on the VA's schedule for years. Two consecutive Secretaries of Veterans Affairs, one from each party, have committed to the project. Nonetheless, despite being one of the cheapest and most meritorious projects on the investment fund list, this project was one of two inexplicably left out of the conference report. Until now, no distinction was made between the relative merits of the projects included in the investment fund. All were authorized together in this year's authorization bill. Can anyone explain to the 150,000 vets in southwest Florida why their need goes unmet, while 6 other projects made the grade in this bill? Clearly, it could not have been an issue of money. The conference found \$155 million for other construction projects, and this project needed only \$9.57 million. It could not have been a question of merit, since this project—according to the VA's internal priority rankings—ranks higher than four of the six projects included in the report. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid these unanswered questions are going to reinforce the image that the conference process is not always fair and does not always meet legitimate needs. That is a real shame. I look forward to finding ways to get funds for those two projects left out of this appropriation.

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

Mr. GOSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I must say the gentleman has had an extended conversation with me regarding the problem he faces in Florida. I really do very much look forward to working with him in the future, and appreciate his cooperation with the committee.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the help of the gentleman from California.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member for the courtesies extended to us for some of the needs that we had in Texas, principally on the border in areas called colonias, and even though we have had a technical legislative problem, that cooperation has been such that hopefully we might be able to resolve the problem down the line.

In all of the other areas of this bill, I appreciate the cooperation where we have interests from our area and from my district.

So I thank the distinguished chairman and the Members of the subcommittee.

□ 1710

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4624 and congratulate my colleagues on the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Subcommittee for their hard work and dedication in producing a fine product worthy of strong congressional support.

This bill includes critical funds for several vital programs to Americans, particularly veterans. As citizens, we asked for and received quality and dedicated service from our veterans. In return, we must assure and guarantee veterans the programs and assistance they are due, which include medical and education benefits. I congratulate the conferees for adding an additional \$280 million to the administration's budget request.

This bill also includes important funds for NASA such as the space station and the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite System, which provides important communications for many of NASA's important projects, including the space shuttle and the Hubble space telescope. And this bill also includes funding for essential projects under the HUD Special Purpose Grants account. One of these projects will provide \$250,000 to enable the Santa Rosa Volunteer Fire Department to purchase needed ambulance rescue equipment.

I strongly support this measure and urge my colleagues to vote "yes" when the House considers the VA, HUD appropriations conference report.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to a distinguished member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

Mr. TORRES. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4624, the conference report on fiscal year 1995 appropriations for VA, HUD, and independent agencies. As a member of the subcommittee, I want first to thank the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman STOKES and the gentleman from California, ranking member LEWIS for their excellent work in balancing the many diverse demands on this bill in a commendable fashion.

This is an important bill and it is a good bill. I will just mention briefly a few provisions that are of particular significance to me and the people I represent.

The conferees—under a mechanism negotiated with the authorizing com-

mittees of jurisdiction—agreed to release grants and loans to States and localities for drinking water treatment and projects to control water pollution. These critical current-year and next-year funds are of vital importance particularly in communities in meeting clean water quality standards. Among these communities with special needs are greater Los Angeles and the unincorporated areas along the United States-Mexico border.

I am further pleased that the conference report provides more funds than the House approved for the Environmental Protection Agency's operating budget. This increase remains consistent with tight budget realities but will also ensure that EPA has the resources it needs to maintain enforcement operations, implement administrative reforms, and undertake research and development activities.

One last thing to mention about the EPA part of this bill, is its expansion of the EPA's successful Superfund minority outreach program to serve a Hispanic serving institution.

Regarding the HUD provisions, Chairman STOKES, again, struck a fine balance. Like the House bill, the conference agreement provides \$2.9 billion in subsidies to help public housing authorities operate public housing projects, and \$500 million for assistance to severely distressed public housing projects.

The measure also provides \$290 million for drug elimination grants; \$50 million for the YouthBuild Program; and \$50 million for housing counseling assistance—each extremely important programs to all areas of the country. In addition, the conference report gives a much-needed boost in funding for the construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of housing units for the elderly.

Each year, the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill represents an enormous challenge. Its mission is daunting: to keep our commitment to the Nation's veterans; to maintain the United States' global edge in science and technology; to improve the environment; and to serve the housing needs of citizens throughout the country. It's a tall order, but I believe H.R. 4624 successfully meets these goals. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], in a colloquy.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us provides \$50 million for YouthBuild, a program that combines the education, training and leadership development of economically disadvantaged youth with the creation of affordable housing.

It is my hope that this additional funding will enable more community-based organizations to receive funding.

The author's of the YouthBuild Program recognized the importance of community based organizations to deliver successful programs.

In fact, under the public law authorizing YouthBuild, community based organizations are to be given "first priority" in receiving technical assistance. Does the chairman agree that community based organizations should be given greater consideration in the award of YouthBuild grants?

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

Mr. TORRES. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Yes, I agree with the gentleman from California and also recognize that community based organizations should be given special consideration because of their expertise in sponsoring these programs and close ties to the community.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, is it correct that a similar organization in your district—the Cleveland YouthBuild Program—was forced to close when funds were not forthcoming.

Mr. STOKES. Yes; that is correct. The competition was tremendous in the first round of funding for this program and many community based groups lacked the resources to compete effectively. During one program cycle last year, YouthBuild Cleveland enrolled 28 youth, 20, or 71 percent, of whom completed the program.

Their participation in the program included the rehabilitation of a house for a homeless family. Everyone of those 20 young people who finished the program landed jobs at an average wage of \$6.05 per hour or continued their education or training and one quarter of those kids who lacked a high school diploma received their GED—general equivalency diploma.

Nonprofit, community based groups like YouthBuild Cleveland and many others have a passionate commitment to the disadvantaged young people they serve and clearly understand the needs of their communities.

With this new funding, I am hopeful that HUD will recognize and reward community based groups with the funding they need to implement these vital new programs.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio and I too urge the Department of Housing and Urban Development to recognize and reward community based organizations. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HARRIS FAWELL.

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, after the general debate is concluded, when the House considers the items of technical disagreement on the VA/HUD bill, Congressman BROWN and I and others from the porkbusters coalition will ask every Member of the House to pay special attention to item No. 28 of the conference report.

We will urge that the House oppose a motion by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. That motion, if adopted, would add \$290 million in HUD special purpose grants to be added to the appropriation.

By defeating the Stokes motion, Mr. BROWN and I will then be able to offer an amendment to cut \$283,000 of that \$290 million in special purpose grants that are unauthorized.

□ 1720

None of these projects was in the House-passed bill, all but 5 of the 259 projects are not authorized, and none are requested by the administration.

It appears that the conferees cut assisted housing funding, including accounts such as homeless assistance and foster child care, to pay for these unauthorized projects, such as \$450,000 for the Center for Political Participation at the University of Maryland. Frankly, I think we had a little too much political participation in the conference on this bill.

They are transferring money from assisted housing projects to finance special purpose grants. The \$290 million represents really a wish list of all kinds of favored private and/or public projects, including the Center for Political Participation, which I just mentioned, and also libraries, sewer and water lines, science, and health, and educational facilities, and restorations of railroad stations and municipal plazas, and clinical labs, and economic development projects, whatever that means, business relocations and related activities, industrial development, infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to give a flavor of the types of special purpose grants that are in here: Also market developments, downtown renovations, an educational telecommunications network, and even a coliseum.

I will end right there and do not want to take too much advantage of my friends' good help to me, but, after we consider the conference report, the House will begin going through the items on technical disagreement. When item 28 comes up, I and Congressman BROWN will urge a "no" vote on the Stokes motion. A "no" vote on the Stokes motion is a vote to cut \$283 million in unauthorized special purpose grants.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the distinguished gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the members of the subcommittee, as well as the ranking minority member, for the fine job they have done in presenting to the House this conference report. We are well-served by the work they have done.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would say this to the Members of the House and to the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Ohio:

In the last 2 or 3 days we have read a lot of newspaper accounts about Congress coming for the last 3 weeks, about us polishing our image, about us doing something positive for the American people, and that is what I would like to do. But in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I think that we do need to avoid loading this bill up with special projects.

Now, for this bill, Mr. Speaker, the President asked for so much money, the House passed a bill, the Senate passed a bill, and then it goes into a conference and it is business as usual. We have added \$200 million worth of special projects again, and they run all the way from page 11 to page 25 or 28 in this bill.

Now there were a lot of praises going on, a lot of people that were thanking this person or that person for their work. I do not know who to thank for pages 11 to 28 or page 25 of this conference report.

But I can say to my colleagues that, whether we call this pork, or special projects, or whatever, they just go on and on. They start with \$2 million for the town of Fort Scott, KS, for business relocation. Why Fort Scott, KS? I mean this was in the House bill. This was not in the Senate bill. The President did not ask for this.

Then, my colleagues, go on over on the next page, and there is \$3 million for north Las Vegas for the revitalization of a Windsor Park neighborhood. Go on over, and there is \$22 million for the cities of Seattle and Spokane for public education or public science education activities, \$5 million to Shepherdstown, WV, for science and education activities, \$4 million for Lewisburg, WV, \$5 million for Beckley.

I would simply urge this House to oppose these add-ons. I think the people of America are tired of all these special projects. They are tired of us going into conference committees and coming out with \$200 million more of these taxpayer-funded programs.

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my highest respects to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS],

the ranking member, for their leadership in what I call perhaps the most important bill to recognize American heroes, and I say that because this bill provides adequate funding for our veterans under the leadership of our authorizers, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and our ranking member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], who so eloquently made the case for support for our veterans.

The appropriators have come through in strong fashion to take care of those special needs that our veterans, our American heroes, have across the country.

But I want to pay my special thanks to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for funding \$2.5 million for the Arson Prevention Act. This is the first time in recent years that we have made an effort to deal with one of the fastest growing problems in America, that of arson, whether it be the wild land fires in southern California that wreak havoc on homes and businesses, or whether it be the inner-city fires that are occurring, destroying our neighborhoods. Arson has become an epidemic in America. The International Association of Arson Investigators worked very closely with the authorizing committees and the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] to put this Arson Prevention Act through in the last session of Congress. The appropriators now are funding that. There is \$2.5 million. It is not a lot of money, but it certainly will go a long way to send a signal that we are serious about assisting the fire and emergency services community in America in dealing with the terrible problem of arson.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the leadership and of the ranking members in support of the arson prevention effort, as well as for our veterans. The 1.5 million men and women who make up the American fire service appreciate their help as well.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the gentleman that I very much appreciate his ongoing support and interest in this area. I say to the gentleman, "Your contribution to our bill is very helpful."

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, under the Clean Air Act, oil companies are required to begin selling cleaner, reformulated gasoline beginning in Janu-

ary. Many domestic refiners have made great investments since passage of the act to meet this requirement. To establish how much cleaner the gasoline must be, the EPA set 1990 as a baseline and each company must improve by increments from their levels in that year.

Originally the EPA established that for foreign nations it could not determine that accuracy of foreign companies' 1990 numbers, and for all foreign imports a baseline of the average of U.S. companies' numbers would be used. In addition to trouble with verifying foreign numbers, it is also difficult to know exactly where oil in a tanker has all come from.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, Venezuela, which produces very dirty gasoline and exports most of it to the United States has sought special treatment from the Environmental Protection Agency. If the EPA is permitted to approve the Venezuelans' request, the result will be significantly worse air quality in this country.

The Senate language will help prevent this damage to air quality. When in Maryland we are asking employers of more than 100 persons to implement onerous car pooling and commuter requirements; when we are asking industries to undertake massive environmental cleanups; when oil companies like Crown Central are moving to take older, high polluting vehicles off the streets to meet our new clean air standards and protect public health—how can we cut a special deal allowing the Venezuelans to sell dirty gasoline in our Nation that will add the equivalent of pollution from thousands of new vehicles on our streets?

The Senate amendment protects the environment and is consistent with our national goals under the Clean Air Act. At the appropriate time during the consideration of amendments in disagreement, I will urge the House to recede and concur in the Senate position on this issue.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report for H.R. 4624, legislation providing budgetary authority for the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA], the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] and 19 independent agencies.

I am pleased that this legislation, which guarantees a total of \$90.6 billion for fiscal year 1995, provides a total of \$37.6 billion for veterans programs. This amount represents an increase of \$897 million, from the level appropriated for fiscal year 1994.

By supporting this conference report, we are continuing to provide the benefits, the compensation, and the medical treatment that our veterans so deserve. Specifically, I am pleased that this measure appropriates: \$17.6 million for veterans compensation and benefits; \$1.29 million in veterans readjustment benefits; and \$78 million for the Veterans Loan Guarantee Program.

The conference report, that we are discussing today, is another substantive, veterans leg-

islative accomplishment that we can all be proud of.

From providing compensation and medical benefits to our Gulf war veterans to improving VA education programs and reemployment opportunities; the 103d Congress has ensured that our Nation's veterans are provided with the dignity and the respect that they have valiantly earned and for which they are deserving.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this conference report.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend Chairman STOKES for his leadership in bringing us a conference report which covers so well such a diverse range of programs as housing, veterans issues, environmental and consumer protection, and science and technology policy—and for doing so under severe budget constraints. These decisions are never easy, particularly when they involve such critical needs.

While this conference report covers many important programs, I'd like to mention three of specific interest to the people of Colorado. All three involve testing or monitoring of exhaust emissions at high altitude, and all have been developed in conjunction with the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to address special problems caused by vehicles operating at such altitudes.

Carbon monoxide is emitted in larger amounts and is even more of a health threat at higher altitudes than at sea level. Yet the performance of engines at high altitudes is not well understood.

The 1990 Clean Air Act amendments authorized the National High-Altitude, Heavy-Duty Research and Technology Assessment Center.

This facility contains engine and vehicle testing systems for measuring emissions associated with gasoline, diesel, and alternative fuels. Data collected by the Center indicates that emissions of carbon monoxide at higher altitudes is 50 to 70 percent greater than at low altitudes.

The development of a data base, which will be used to modify heavy-duty engines, is critical to addressing pollution peculiar to high altitudes. Cities all along the Rocky Mountains will benefit from this data and the conference report provides \$300,000 for the Center.

The National Center for Vehicle Emissions Control and Safety [NVECS] at Colorado State University was established by the EPA in 1976 to study alternative rules, vehicle inspection and maintenance, and to test emissions reduction devices. It was designated a high-altitude research, testing, and training center by the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments. NVECS has contributed substantially to the EPA's Vehicle Maintenance Initiative, which is training and retraining automotive technicians who are currently not qualified to inspect, diagnose, and repair today's vehicles. This conference report designates \$150,000 for the NVECS program.

Finally, the conference report provides \$150,000 for high-altitude exhaust emissions compliance testing conducted by the Colorado Department of Health [CDH]. As a result of tests performed by CDH, in conjunction with EPA, 778,000 vehicles have been recalled since 1989 for repairs to assure compliance

with Federal standards. CDH has the only facility officially designated by the EPA Administrator for high altitude, in-use compliance testing.

I thank the chairman and the conferees for their support of these valuable programs which will help address pollution problems particular to high altitude States like Colorado.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, here the Congress goes again, holding veterans' funding hostage to pork-barrel spending. This year's VA/HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Conference Report contains \$290 million in unauthorized special reelection projects. This makes it very difficult for any Member of this body who claims to be fiscally responsible to the American taxpayer to vote for this bill.

That is exactly why I introduced legislation last year to separate funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs from all other general appropriations bills. Our veterans should not have to compete for funding from space exploration, housing assistance, environmental protection, no matter how laudable the programs. But especially, veterans funding should not be tied to various pork-barrel projects such as \$1,500,000 for street improvements in Wichita, KS, or \$2,500,000 for the restoration of Union Station in Kansas City, MO.

My bill, House Resolution 154, would simply require that the existing VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee report out two bills—one affecting veterans and the other covering all other items under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. In an era of congressional reform, I don't believe that the House should be creating more legislative bureaucracies, especially in light of the streamlining of the subcommittees on Capitol Hill.

We already have a clean vote on Defense spending and a straight up-or-down vote on military construction projects. Certainly we can have a separate vote on veterans appropriations. It's cynical to pit 259 localized pork projects for Members' districts against veterans health care. Let's separate the two votes, and honor our commitment to our Nation's brave veterans. I urge a yes vote on the Fawell-Brown amendment to cut HUD special purpose grants from this bill and I invite all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be fiscally responsible to their constituents and co-sponsor my legislation, the Fair Deal for Veterans Act of 1993.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the VA-HUD conference report. This is a tough bill working under a tight budget allocation. Balancing the diverse priorities contained in this funding bill from Veterans and Housing needs to EPA and NASA to name a few, is a very difficult and challenging task.

I'd like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and our ranking member, the gentleman from California, for the impressive manner in which they have guided this bill through the appropriations process. They have been fair and accommodating and I have enjoyed working with both of them.

As many know, I am an ardent supporter of the international space station which is fully funded in this bill. And I am very pleased with the display of overwhelming support on the vote for this critical project in the House this June.

The space station is about our future; it's an endeavor that holds the promise of new discoveries in medicine, materials, and technology, movement toward the ability of Americans to live and work in space and much more. It's about teamwork with our international partners and a new cooperative working relationship with Russia. I have no doubt that this is an investment that will pay off in great dividends for our country.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to point out report language included in this conference report which I consider to be of significant importance. In essence, the language directs the EPA to look into the environmental self-evaluation privilege enacted into law in Colorado, Kentucky, Indiana, and Oregon.

In the past, if companies have done an environmental self-evaluation, and have disclosed the results, EPA or States with delegated environmental programs have sometimes fined those companies. In Colorado, a company performed a voluntary study not required by law, and kept the regulatory agency informed about the study that identified gross underestimates of air emissions in EPA guidance documents.

The company was rewarded with a \$1,000,000 penalty. It is this experience that led to passage in Colorado of a law that creates immunity from certain penalties for voluntarily disclosing instances of noncompliance. The primary purpose of the legislation is to maximize environmental compliance.

In my mind, providing incentives to the private sector to do self-evaluations is the most progressive and efficient way to bring about more complete compliance with environmental requirements.

EPA, however, has consistently opposed this commonsense approach. EPA's Assistant Administrator for the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance has stated that EPA wants to use enforcement to "promote complete compliance with the Nation's environmental laws" by imposing penalties often and in a very adversarial process.

The language included in the conference report gives EPA the obviously needed direction from Congress to consider the implementation of innovative compliance methods for companies and regulated entities that want to comply with environmental laws.

Self-evaluated privileges provide an opportunity to maximize compliance with environmental laws and as a result achieves the primary goal of benefiting the environment. Contrary to EPA's belief, penalties are not the most effective method.

I'd like to thank my chairman and the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee for working with me to include this language in the conference report. I look forward to pursuing this issue with the EPA and in the next Congress when my colleague from Colorado, Congressman HEFLEY, will introduce legislation extending the environmental self-evaluation privilege at the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report and I urge my colleagues to approve it.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the conference report for VA, HUD, and independent agencies, including my support for the NASA space station.

Mr. Speaker I have consistently opposed funding for the space station in the past because I believe the station's tremendous costs were not sufficiently justified by the promise of its mission. NASA's budget was literally out of control, and management of the space station lacked effective oversight.

In the last year, however, NASA has substantially improved the station program. NASA has redesigned the station and trimmed its work force by over 1,000 employees. It has reduced its bureaucracy, streamlined its contracting process, and eliminated unnecessary duplication. All of these changes will hold down the station's costs. I want to commend Administrator Goldin and the NASA team for the work they have done to correct these problems.

One of my major concerns in the past has been that the station budget was jeopardizing other valuable NASA programs, particularly smaller science. Recently, NASA has demonstrated a genuine commitment to preserving non-station science, even while strengthening the potential for scientific yield from the station. Despite an overall reduction in NASA's budget from fiscal year 1994 to 1995, science spending has increased from \$3.3 to \$3.35 billion.

The success NASA has had in bringing new international partners into the station project including Russia, has made the station a unique and truly global project. The contributions of our international partners increases the efficiency of the station and bolsters our foreign policy goals. I am especially pleased that our partnership with Russia will accelerate the launch schedule and allow for an expansion of size of the mission crew.

A carefully conceived and fiscally responsible station can certainly improve America's technology base and provide significant medical research opportunities. Technological innovation propels economic growth. The National Academy of Public Administration estimates that every \$1 invested in NASA research and development generates over \$7 in our economy. The station could also be vital to NASA's own efforts to continue generating advanced technology.

After much thought and consideration, I have concluded that on balance, the station is a worthwhile project which deserves my support.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to be vigilant in our efforts to trim our deficit. At the same time, we cannot turn a blind eye to the future. We must continue to invest in it, even when we are confronted with budgetary and other problems. We must look at the opportunity the future offers. The NASA space station holds considerable promise and I now believe it is worth that investment.

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to insist on the House position regarding amendment in disagreement No. 87 to H.R. 4624, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act. The Senate's amendment would prohibit the use of funds to implement the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed regulations for imported reformulated gasoline. Mr. Speaker, this amendment has no place in this bill and I implore my colleagues to reject it.

Nothing about the Senate's amendment makes sense. Proponents of the Senate's position rely on incorrect and distorted information to push for an outcome which could be extremely harmful to consumers and to the U.S. economy and could adversely affect our relations with one of America's most valuable allies and trading partners.

In return, the American people would get nothing of benefit from the Senate amendment—no environmental benefit, no trade benefit, no anything. If we uphold the Senate's position we risk causing gasoline shortages and dramatically higher consumer prices for no reason at all. Do my colleagues really want to explain to their constituents that they voted for higher gasoline prices and potential supply problems without knowing the facts about gasoline imports from Venezuela? I certainly hope not. So let's talk about the facts—and put to rest the many misleading statements which proponents of the Senate amendment have put forward.

Proponents of the Senate amendment claim that Venezuela wants a special deal on reformulated gasoline, a deal which some claim would exempt Venezuelan gasoline from the Clean Air Act and undermine the entire reformulated program. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, Venezuela merely wants the same treatment that United States refiners will receive under EPA's December rule—the right to use its own baseline for computing emissions reductions. EPA acted in May to correct its previously discriminatory treatment of Venezuela, since Venezuela can document its compliance with United States requirements. And in a highly unusual step, Venezuela is also willing to allow United States inspections of its refinery and export operations in order to satisfy the EPA that it is not violating those United States requirements. Thus, EPA's second corrective regulation, issued in May, makes sense and should not be arbitrarily overruled by an appropriations rider.

Unfortunately, the United States Independent Refiners Coalition wants you to believe that equal treatment for Venezuela would result in higher United States air pollution emissions. Here, too, their argument is simply wrong. In order to make their case, they have used misleading figures on olefin content and ignored inconvenient information about Venezuelan gasoline's superior performance on air toxic standards for benzene and aromatics.

In fact, Venezuela's olefin content for regular grade gasoline, the only grade they export to the United States, is 22 percent. This level is virtually identical to the U.S. average for regular grade gasoline of 20.5 percent, according to the domestic refining industry's own figures.

It is important for Members to realize that since the United States olefin figure is an average, some domestically refined gasoline also exceeds this level and has a higher olefin content than Venezuelan gasoline. Indeed, company-by-company data on 1990 baseline-year United States gasoline composition, collected by the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association, show that several United States oil companies sold regular grade gasoline with higher olefin content than that contained in Venezuelan gasoline for the same period—the

year that will be used for baseline purposes under the rule. For example, this survey shows that Mobil Oil's regular grade unleaded gasoline contained 26 percent olefins in New York City and 23.1 percent in Boston, figures which were considerably higher than the Venezuelan gasoline that Mobil would like to see banned from the same markets. So if you ask many of those refiners about the olefin content of the regular gasoline which they sell—their answer might surprise you. While you're at it, ask them to explain why so-called dirty Venezuelan gasoline is so much lower than the United States average for air toxic emissions.

Mr. Speaker, this is not to argue for imported gasoline over domestic; the fact is, both are important. Rather, it is merely an attempt to set the record straight in light of the very misleading environmental statements which some have made about this matter.

Some assert that Venezuela is seeking a special deal under the rule. In fact, the opposite is true: Venezuela wants the same deal, and the same standards, as United States refiners. EPA's initial unequal treatment of foreign gasoline gave rise to Venezuela's possible GATT challenge against the December rule. The effect of EPA's December rule, if it had gone unchanged, was to treat foreign companies differently—and more stringently—than U.S. refiners, thereby creating an improper non-tariff trade barrier under GATT. According to EPA, once they had the data and assurances they needed to ensure that Venezuela could and would comply, there was no longer any reason to treat them more harshly than United States refiners. Thus, EPA issued its subsequent regulations in May 1994, which the Senate amendment now seeks to prohibit from being implemented.

In addition, Congress makes a big mistake in ignoring Venezuela's potential GATT challenge on this matter. If Venezuela is successful in making its case, the result could be retaliation against United States products, such as wheat, which the Venezuelans currently import in significant quantities. The result would be a further blow to the U.S. economy.

Finally, adopting the Senate language will create serious supply disruptions for consumers by excluding as much as 100,000 barrels per day of environmentally sound reformulated gasoline from the U.S. market. This disruption in gasoline imports—which accounts for 3 to 5 percent of nationwide domestic gasoline consumption every day—may sound unimportant, but a supply shortage of less than 2 percent in 1973 caused the price of gasoline to more than double. The shortage will be far worse in areas such as the Northeast which are particularly dependent on imported gasoline—as much as 30 percent under certain conditions—although other areas of the country will also suffer ill effects as shortages cause price increases to ripple throughout the Nation.

The two oil price shocks of the 1970's resulted in years of inflation and economic downturn for the United States. One reason for our current relative prosperity is low gasoline prices. Before we take steps that could damage our economic prosperity, we must ask ourselves what we are buying in return. The Senate's amendment on this issue is just the kind of bad deal the economy cannot afford.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to look at the facts here—not the myths—and reject the Senate amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to Senate amendment 87.

The Senate language to block EPA funds from implementing its reformulated gas regulations is bad policy.

Accepting the Senate provision will have a devastating impact on our Nation. The pending rule is simply meant to subject foreign refiners to the same environmental standards as domestic refiners. This issue boils down to efforts by the U.S. domestic refiners to gain the competitive edge in market share over the domestic independents, who rely on imported oil for their product.

Allowing the EPA to proceed with its reformulated gas rules will have no environmental impact. The domestic refining industry stipulates that Venezuelan and other foreign oil is dirtier than United States gasoline. This simply is not the case.

Taken olefin content for example. The fact is that on olefin, just one of many polluting compounds in gasoline, Venezuelan gasoline is comparable to gas being marketed by many of our own domestic refiners.

Just yesterday, the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association released its National Fuel Survey, indicating that Venezuelan oil fared better on olefin content—22 percent in 1990—than many domestic refiners, like Mobil Oil in New York City—26 percent—and Getty—nearly 25 percent—and Texaco—nearly 24—in Philadelphia. A little known fact is that Venezuelan gasoline is actually superior on air standards for benzene and aromatics.

The Senate language will create serious problems for consumers, especially citizens in Northeastern States that count on imported gasoline for as much as 30 percent of their energy needs. Nationwide, we rely on gasoline imports for 3 to 5 percent of domestic consumption each day. The dislocation of imported fuel could potentially raise the price of gasoline 15 to 22 cents per gallon. This will have a dismantling effect on the New England economy, increase inflationary pressures, and will inflict supply shortages throughout the Northeast and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of fairness and energy security for our citizens—merely treating domestic importers with the same environmental standards for reformulated gasoline under the Clean Air Act as domestic refiners.

I strongly urge my colleagues to insist on the House position—to ensure that both domestic and imported environmentally sound gasoline can serve our citizens.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on the fiscal year 1995 VA—HUD appropriations bill. I commend Chairman STOKES and ranking member LEWIS for their successful work in crafting this balanced bill designed to meet the many competing needs of the subcommittee's diverse programs and thank them for their attention to programs of particular importance to the people of San Francisco, who I am honored to represent.

I am particularly pleased that the conference report contains \$40 million for San Francisco's Richmond transport control wastewater facility for a comprehensive combined sewer overflow

system, which will allow the city to complete construction on an important project to limit sewage discharge into San Francisco's coastal waters, as well as \$1.5 million for a housing facility for homeless and mentally disabled people of San Francisco and \$1 million for the Center for Pacific Rim Studies, a community and economic development initiative designed to enhance the competitiveness of the bay area throughout the Pacific rim. I thank the chairman for report language encouraging prostate research at the San Francisco VA Medical Center. This research will help to increase our knowledge of the prevention and treatment of this tragic disease.

I am also pleased that this fiscal year 1995 bill contains funding for a number of nationwide housing programs with significance for San Francisco. I will note here only two, the AIDS Housing Program [HOPWA], to be funded at \$186 million, an increase of \$30 million over fiscal year 1994, and HUD's Housing Preservation Program, to be funded at \$175 million. Both of these programs have a real impact in providing affordable housing in my community.

Again, I commend Chairman STOKES and the members of the subcommittee for their success with this conference report and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 4624, VA/HUD and independent agencies appropriations fiscal year 1995. I would like to commend Chairman STOKES and the conferees for putting together an excellent bill that wisely invests in every American's need for safe, clean housing, addresses the needs of our veterans, and addresses the management of our environment. I strongly support this conference report which addresses the critical needs of New Mexicans and other Americans.

H.R. 4624 expands funding for assisted housing, low-income housing, and homeownership programs. These expanded programs will benefit moderate and low-income people of northern New Mexico who are faced with escalating home prices. The \$1.5 million for affordable housing in Santa Fe, NM will allow hundreds of hardworking families to realize the American dream of owning their own home.

I commend the conferees for recognizing the importance of keeping the promises that we have made to the millions of men and women who have risked their lives to defend this country. I would like to thank Chairman STOKES and the conferees for their commitment to primary care services for veterans in rural areas. We cannot provide medical care 300 miles from a veterans home and claim that the veteran has accessible health care. In fiscal year 1994 the committee provided for a clinic in Clovis, NM. The Veterans Health Administration subsequently found over 11,000 veterans in the area who were not being served. I want to thank the committee for providing another \$550,000 to expand the Clovis Veterans Clinic to serve rural veterans of eastern New Mexico and west Texas who for decades have been denied the basic health care they earned fighting for this country. The committee has also provided \$178,000 for a rural health care in Clayton, NM. These services

will provide much needed care to our veterans in the tristate area of New Mexico, Texas and Oklahoma who are now forced to travel for 150 to 400 miles to receive veterans care.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4624 will serve our Nation's longterm interest by investing in essential housing, veterans, and environment needs. I am ready to support the conference agreement on HUD/VA and independent agencies fiscal year 1995 appropriations and urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1730

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as Doc Syers, who worked with me on our side on this bill, and I yield back the balance of our time, we want to express our deep appreciation to not only my chairman, but also his very fine staff, for creating an environment that is totally nonpartisan, whereby this bill has been able to go forward as effectively as it has.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. STOKES. 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 313, nays 61, answered, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

YEAS—313

Abercrombie	Brooks	Deal
Andrews (ME)	Browder	DeLauro
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (CA)	DeLay
Andrews (TX)	Brown (FL)	DeLums
Applegate	Brown (OH)	Deutsch
Bacchus (FL)	Byrne	Diaz-Balart
Baessler	Callahan	Dicks
Baker (CA)	Calvert	Dingell
Barlow	Canady	Dixon
Barrett (NE)	Cantwell	Dooley
Bartlett	Cardin	Dunn
Bateman	Carr	Durbin
Beilenson	Chapman	Edwards (CA)
Bentley	Clay	Edwards (TX)
Bereuter	Clayton	Emerson
Berman	Clement	English
Bevill	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bilbray	Coleman	Evans
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Everett
Bishop	Collins (IL)	Ewing
Bliley	Collins (MI)	Farr
Blute	Costello	Fazio
Boehrlert	Coyne	Fields (LA)
Bonilla	Cramer	Fields (TX)
Bonior	Cunningham	Fliner
Borski	Danner	Fingerhut
Boucher	Darden	Fish
Brewster	de la Garza	Flake

Foglietta	Lewis (CA)	Richardson
Ford (TN)	Lewis (GA)	Rogers
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Rose
Frank (MA)	Lightfoot	Rowland
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Frost	Livingston	Rush
Furse	Lloyd	Sabo
Gallely	Long	Sanders
Gejdenson	Lowey	Sangmeister
Gephardt	Lucas	Sarpalitus
Geren	Maloney	Sawyer
Gibbons	Mann	Schenk
Gilchrest	Manton	Schiff
Gillmor	Margolies-	Schroeder
Gilman	Mezvinsky	Schumer
Gonzalez	Markey	Scott
Goodlatte	Martinez	Sharp
Goodling	Matsui	Shaw
Gordon	Mazzoli	Shays
Grandy	McCandless	Shepherd
Green	McCloskey	Shuster
Greenwood	McCollum	Sisisky
Gunderson	McCrery	Skaggs
Gutierrez	McDade	Skeen
Hall (OH)	McDermott	Skelton
Hamburg	McHale	Slaughter
Hamilton	McHugh	Smith (IA)
Hansen	McInnis	Smith (NJ)
Harman	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Hastert	McKinney	Snowe
Hayes	McMillan	Solomon
Hilliard	McNulty	Spence
Hinchey	Meehan	Spratt
Hoagland	Meek	Stark
Hobson	Menendez	Stearns
Hochbrueckner	Meyers	Stokes
Hoke	Mfume	Strickland
Holden	Mica	Studds
Horn	Michel	Stump
Houghton	Mineta	Stupak
Hoyer	Moakley	Swift
Hughes	Mollinari	Talent
Hunter	Mollohan	Tanner
Hutchinson	Montgomery	Tauzin
Hutto	Moran	Taylor (MS)
Hyde	Morella	Taylor (NC)
Insole	Murtha	Tejeda
Jacobs	Neal (MA)	Thomas (CA)
Jefferson	Neal (NC)	Thompson
Johnson (CT)	Nussle	Thornton
Johnson (GA)	Oberstar	Thurman
Johnson (SD)	Obey	Torkildsen
Johnson, E.B.	Olver	Torres
Johnston	Ortiz	Trafficant
Kanjorski	Orton	Tucker
Kasich	Oxley	Unsoeld
Kennedy	Packard	Valentine
Kennelly	Pallone	Vento
Kildee	Parker	Viscosky
Kim	Pastor	Volkmmer
King	Payne (NJ)	Vucanovich
Kingston	Payne (VA)	Walsh
Klecicka	Pelosi	Walters
Klein	Peterson (FL)	Watt
Klink	Peterson (MN)	Weidon
Kolbe	Pickle	Wheat
Kreidler	Pomeroy	Whitten
LaFalce	Porter	Williams
Lambert	Poshard	Wilson
Lancaster	Price (NC)	Wise
Lantos	Pryce (OH)	Wolf
LaRocco	Quillen	Woolsey
Lazio	Quinn	Wyden
Leach	Rahall	Wynn
Lehman	Ravenel	Young (AK)
Levin	Reed	Young (FL)
Levy	Regula	

NAYS—61

Allard	Crane	Istook
Archer	Crapo	Johnson, Sam
Armey	Doollittle	Klug
Bachus (AL)	Duncan	Knollenberg
Ballenger	Ehlers	Kyl
Barca	Fawell	Linder
Barrett (WI)	Franks (NJ)	Manzulio
Barton	Gekas	Miller (FL)
Boehner	Gingrich	Minge
Bunning	Goss	Moorhead
Burton	Hall (TX)	Myers
Buyer	Hancock	Paxon
Castle	Hefley	Penny
Coble	Herger	Petri
Combest	Hoekstra	Pombo
Cox	Inglis	Ramstad

Roberts	Saxton	Walker
Roemer	Schaefer	Zeliff
Rohrabacher	Sensenbrenner	Zimmer
Roukema	Smith (MI)	
Royce	Upton	

## NOT VOTING—60

Ackerman	Glickman	Reynolds
Baker (LA)	Grams	Ridge
Barcia	Hastings	Ros-Lehtinen
Becerra	Hefner	Rostenkowski
Blackwell	Huffington	Roth
Bryant	Inhofe	Santorum
Camp	Kaptur	Serrano
Clinger	Kopetski	Slattery
Condit	Laughlin	Smith (OR)
Conyers	Lewis (FL)	Stenholm
Cooper	Machtley	Sundquist
Coppersmith	McCurdy	Sweet
DeFazio	Miller (CA)	Synar
Derrick	Mink	Thomas (WY)
Dickey	Murphy	Torricelli
Dornan	Nadler	Towns
Dreier	Owens	Velazquez
Engel	Pickett	Washington
Ford (MI)	Portman	Waxman
Gallo	Rangel	Yates

□ 1753

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Dornan against.  
Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Grams against.

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

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to the rule, the amendments in disagreement are considered as read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 1, 11, 17, 32, 33, 38, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 65, 66, 77, 80, 82, 86, 97, 103, 104, and 105 be considered en bloc and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendments enumerated in the foregoing unanimous consent request are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 8, line 8, after "1996" insert: "Provided further, That of the \$15,622,452,000 made available under this heading for fiscal year 1994 in Public Law 103-124, the \$9,863,265,000 restricted by section 509 of Public Law 103-124 for personnel compensation and benefits expenditures is reduced to \$9,813,265,000".

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 17, after line 24, insert:

NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP TRUST  
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

For the National Homeownership Trust Demonstration program, as authorized by title III of the National Affordable Housing Act, as amended by section 182 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 18, line 19, strike out ".54 per centum" and insert: "\$15,000,000".

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 24, strike out lines 13 to 17 and insert:

For contracts with payments to public housing agencies and nonprofit corporations for congregate services programs, \$25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995, of which up to \$6,267,000 shall be for entities operating such programs in accordance with the provisions of the Congregate Services Act of 1978, as amended, and the balance shall be for programs under section 802 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625).

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 25, strike out lines 2 to 9 and insert:

For the HOPE VI/urban revitalization demonstration program under the third paragraph under the head "Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere grants (HOPE grants)" in the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, Public Law 102-389, 106 Stat. 1571, 1579, \$500,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the first proviso of such third paragraph, the Secretary shall have discretion to approve funding for more than fifteen applicants: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the third proviso of such third paragraph, the Secretary may provide funds for more than 500 units for each participating city: *Provided further*, That in selecting HOPE VI implementation grants recipients in fiscal year 1995, the Secretary must first award such grants to those cities or jurisdictions which have received HOPE VI planning grants in fiscal year 1993 or fiscal year 1994: *Provided further*, That the requirement of the immediately preceding proviso shall not limit the Secretary's discretion to limit funding to amounts he deems appropriate, nor shall it prevent the Secretary from guaranteeing that all implementation grant recipients conform with the requirements of the HOPE VI/urban revitalization demonstration program: *Provided further*, That of the foregoing \$500,000,000, the Secretary may use up to \$2,500,000 for technical assistance under such urban revitalization demonstration, to be made available directly, or indirectly, under contracts or grants, as appropriate: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the Secretary from conforming the program standards and criteria set forth herein, with subsequent authorization legislation that may be enacted into law.

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 29, line 22, after "\$20,885,072,000" insert: "Provided further, That of the foregoing amount provided to subsidize program costs, not more than \$47,098,750 may be obligated by January 1, 1995, not more than \$94,197,500 may be obligated by April 1, 1995, not more than \$160,135,750 may be obligated by July 1, 1995".

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 38, after line 2 insert:

Subparagraph (A) of the first sentence of section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(b)(2)) is amended by striking clause (i) and all that follows through "May 12, 1992;" and inserting the following:

"(i) 75 percent of the dollar amount limitation determined under section 305(a)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act for a residence of the applicable size;

except that the applicable dollar amount limitation in effect for any area under this subparagraph may not be less than the

greater of the dollar amount limitation in effect under this section for the area on the date of enactment of the Housing Choice and Community Investment Act of 1994 or 38 percent of the dollar amount limitation determined under section 305(a)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act for a residence of the applicable size."

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 38, after line 10, insert:

"Beginning fiscal year 1995, the Government National Mortgage Association shall permit Ginnie Mae II mortgage-backed securities to be eligible as collateral for multiclass securities that such Association guarantees, in accordance with the Notice published at 59 Fed. Reg. 27290 (May 26, 1994) and successor Notices."

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 38, after line 10, insert:

Section 8(c)(2)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting at the end the following: "However, where the maximum monthly rent, for a unit in a new construction, substantial rehabilitation, or moderate rehabilitation project, to be adjusted using an annual adjustment factor exceeds the fair market rental for an existing dwelling unit in the market area, the Secretary shall adjust the rent only to the extent that the owner demonstrates that the adjusted rent would not exceed the rent for an unassisted unit of similar quality, type, and age in the same market area, as determined by the Secretary. The immediately foregoing sentence shall be effective only during fiscal year 1995."

The immediately foregoing amendment shall apply to all contracts for new construction, substantial rehabilitation, and moderate rehabilitation projects under which rents are adjusted under section 8(c)(2)(A) of such Act by applying an annual adjustment factor.

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 38, after line 10, insert:

Section 8(c)(2)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended by the immediately foregoing amendment to such section, is further amended by inserting at the end the following: "For any unit occupied by the same family at the time of the last annual rental adjustment, where the assistance contract provides for the adjustment of the maximum monthly rent by applying an annual adjustment factor and where the rent for a unit is otherwise eligible for an adjustment based on the full amount of the factor, 0.01 shall be subtracted from the amount of the factor, except that the factor shall not be reduced to less than 1.0. The immediately foregoing sentence shall be effective only during fiscal year 1995."

The immediately foregoing shall hereafter apply to all contracts that are subject to section 8(c)(2)(A) of such Act and that provide for rent adjustments using an annual adjustment factor.

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 38, after line 10, insert:

Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

## "(aa) REFINANCING INCENTIVE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may pay all or a part of the up front costs of refinancing for each project that—

"(A) is constructed, substantially rehabilitated, or moderately rehabilitated under this section;

"(B) is subject to an assistance contract under this section; and

"(C) was subject to a mortgage that has been refinanced under section 223(a)(7) or

section 233(f) of the National Housing Act to lower the periodic debt service payments of the owner.

"(2) SHARE FROM REDUCED ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may pay the up front cost of refinancing only—

"(A) to the extent that funds accrue to the Secretary from the reduced assistance payments that results from the refinancing; and

"(B) after the application of amounts in accordance with section 1012 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988."

Section 223(a)(7) of the National Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 1751n(a)(7)) is amended in subparagraph (B), by striking "and" at the end; and by inserting, before "": *Provided further* in said paragraph, the following: "": and (D) any multifamily mortgage that is refinanced under this paragraph shall be documented through amendments to the existing insurance contract and shall not be structured through the provisions of a new insurance contract."

The amendments of the two immediately preceding paragraphs shall be effective only during fiscal year 1995.

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 38, after line 10, insert:

Section 601 of title VI of S. 2281 (103d Cong., 2d Sess), as reported to the Senate on July 13 (legislative day, July 11), 1994 (S. Rep. 103-307), is hereby incorporated into this Act, and such section 601 is deemed enacted into law upon enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That the provisions of such section 601 shall be effective only during fiscal year 1995.

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 38, after line 10, insert:

Title VIII of S. 2281 (103d Cong., 2d Sess), as reported to the Senate on July 13 (legislative day, July 11), 1994 (S. Rep. 103-307), is hereby incorporated into this Act, and such title VIII is deemed enacted into law upon enactment of this Act.

Senate amendment No. 55: Page 38, after line 10, insert:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the New York City Housing Authority is authorized to use not more than \$12,420,000, from development reservation number NY36P005324 for 100 public housing units previously awarded from funds appropriated under Public Law 101-507 (Nov. 5, 1990), for the purpose of completing a homeownership program involving not more than 463 dwelling units located in Bronx County, in the City of New York, in accordance with a certain submission dated November 16, 1993 made in response to a Notice of Funding Availability issued at 58 Fed. Reg. 41127. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall thereafter add a similar number of existing non-Federal public housing units, designated by the Authority, to the agency's inventory of federally-assisted public housing developments and said units shall, for all purposes other than the repayment of any debt associated with their development or rehabilitation, be considered as if initially developed under title I of the Housing Act of 1937.

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 41, line 12, after "Act" insert: "": *Provided further*, That \$6,500,000 shall be made available for the Points of Light Foundation for purposes authorized under title III of the Act."

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 41, line 12, after "Act" insert: "": *Provided further*, That no funds from any other appropriation, or from funds otherwise made available to the Corporation, shall be used to pay for personnel compensation and benefits, travel, or any other administrative expense for the Board of Directors, the Office of the Chief Execu-

tive Officer, the Office of the Managing Director, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, the Office of National and Community Service Programs, the National Civilian Community Corps, or any portion of any of the Corporation's field offices or staff working on National and Community Service or National Civilian Community Corps programs."

Senate amendment No. 77: Page 44, after line 14 insert:

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$43,870,000, to remain available until expended.

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 45, line 9, after "CERCLA" insert: "": *Provided further*, That \$15,384,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the Office of Inspector General appropriation to remain available until September 30, 1995."

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 46, line 12, after "expenses" insert: "": *Provided further*, That \$669,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the Office of Inspector General appropriation to remain available until September 30, 1995."

Senate amendment No. 86: Page 48, line 15 insert:

None of the funds provided in this Act may be used within the Environmental Protection Agency for any final action by the Administrator or her delegate for signing and publishing for promulgation of a rule concerning any new standard for radon in drinking water.

Senate amendment No. 97: Page 56, after line 19 insert:

Of the amounts provided under the heading, "CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES", for the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network in Public Law 102-389, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

Senate amendment No. 103: Page 59, after line 2 insert:

Notwithstanding the limitation or the availability of funds appropriated for "Mission support", amounts made available by this Act for personnel and related costs and travel expenses of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall remain available until September 30, 1995 and may be used to enter into contracts for training, investigations, cost associated with personnel relocation, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

Senate amendment No. 104: Page 60, after line 2 insert:

The fourth proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Science, space, and technology education trust fund" in the Department of Housing and Urban Development—Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 101-404, 102 Stat. 1014, 1028) is amended by striking out "for a ten-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof "hereafter".

Senate amendment No. 105: Page 60, after line 2 insert:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall convey, without reimbursement, to the City of Slidell, Louisiana, all rights, title, and interest of the United States in the property, including all improvements thereon, known as the Slidell Computer Complex, and consisting of approximately 14 acres in the City of Slidell, St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana: *Provided*, That appropriated funds may be used to effect this conveyance: *Provided further*, That

in consideration of this conveyance, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may require such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 11, 17, 32, 33, 38, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 65, 66, 77, 80, 82, 86, 97, 103, 104, and 105, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 11, line 22, strike out "\$101,965,000" and insert: "\$208,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$355,612,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1800

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 18, line 6, after "That" insert: "to be added to and merged with the foregoing amounts there shall be up to \$200,000,000 of amounts of budget authority and (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 1995; and up to \$100,000,000 of transfers of unobligated balances from the Urban Development Action program: *Provided further*, That".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "to be added to and merged with the foregoing amounts there shall be up to \$400,000,000 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 1995 or are unobligated as of September 30, 1994; and up to \$1,000,000 of transfers of unobligated balances from the Urban Development Action Grants program: *Provided further, That*".

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 19, line 4, strike out "\$2,643,000,000" and insert: "\$2,144,582,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$2,785,582,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 19, line 7, after "1437(o)" insert "*Provided further, That of the amount provided for rental assistance, up to \$350,000,000 shall be available for the Pension Fund Partnership program, as authorized by section 6 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-120); \$20,000,000 shall be the Community Viability Fund; \$50,000,000 shall be for the Colonias program; and \$500,000,000 shall be for the Neighborhood Leveraged Investment Program (LIFT)*".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided further, That of the total amount provided for rental assistance, a total of up to \$400,000,000 may be made available for new*

programs subject to enactment into law of applicable authorizing legislation".

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 21, line 12, after "opportunity" insert: "*Provided further, That notwithstanding the language preceding the first proviso of this paragraph, \$135,000,000 shall be used for special purpose grants in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in Senate Report 103-311*".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided further, That notwithstanding the language preceding the first proviso of this paragraph, \$289,500,000 shall be used for special purpose grants in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the committee of conference report and statement of the managers (H. Rept. 103-715) accompanying H.R. 4624, except for the grant of \$500,000 for the Earth Conservatory for the acquisition of land near Wilkes-Barre, PA*".

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to ascertain if either the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from California is opposed to this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California opposed to the motion?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] may claim one-third of the time.

On this motion, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] will be recognized

for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may utilize.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my motion on amendment No. 28.

The gentleman states that he is opposed to the earmarking of funds for special purpose grants. We have debated this issue before and those opposed to HUD special purpose grants have always lost.

The subcommittee received a large number of requests for increased funding for different purposes. Some Members requested additional funding for VA programs, including major construction projects. Some Members requested funding for individual EPA water infrastructure projects for communities with special needs. A number of Members have requested funds for HUD's special purpose grants to address special needs in their districts. We attempted to help Members who requested assistance—whether it was for a project in VA, EPA, HUD or some of the other agencies funded in the bill.

Earmarking funds for special projects has been a congressional prerogative for a long time. All knowledge about the various program needs of the communities across the country does not reside solely in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, these are good projects. They are projects that each of the Members had to satisfy our subcommittee were good projects. The subcommittee has meticulously and scrupulously looked into each of these projects. We deem them to be good projects. We urge all the Members to vote "yes" on the conference agreement on amendment No. 28.

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

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Stokes motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 28 with an amendment. This motion will add \$290 million in projects to the bill that were not in the House-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees' action in adding these projects, some \$290 million in special purpose grants, is a kind of Robin Hood in reverse, cutting from assisted housing funds for low-income people to pay for these unauthorized projects.

What kind of projects are we talking about? Here is almost half a million dollars for the reconstruction of a Center for Political Participation at the University of Maryland. Here is \$5 million for a West Virginia construction of a new library. Another \$5 million for a science education facility in Newport, OR.

An applied technology center in a community college in central New York takes \$500,000.

If we are successful in defeating the Stokes motion, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and I will offer in a motion to strike \$283 million from the funding.

Mr. Speaker, \$283 million represents funding for 254 projects which are unauthorized. These 254 projects are unauthorized by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and are unrequested by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. When the VA-HUD appropriations bill left the House, it was completely clean. The special purpose grants were not included. These grants have long been criticized by Presidents and Members of this Congress as bastions of special interest. But the Senate-passed bill has \$135 million in such grants. We have all kinds of grants which are included.

In addition to projects already mentioned, we have funding of sewer and water lines, of science, health and educational facilities, of restorations of railroad stations, municipal plazas. We have funding of clinical labs, economic development—without an explanation of what economic development means, we have funding of all kinds of industrial developments, infrastructure improvements, social service activities, loan funds, market development funds, downtown renovations, telecommunications networks, and the building of a municipal coliseum.

□ 1810

We are funding all this by using \$290 million which otherwise would be used for public-assisted housing. I think we all know we shouldn't be doing that. But, I presume as long as these kinds of actions are unnoticed by the public, they seem to go on. At least, last year, for the first time in many years, this kind of a raid on low-income housing funds did not take place. But I guess the temptation this year was too great on the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker we are in the 2-minute drill here. All year our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations have been working diligently to produce the appropriation bills necessary to fund the Government. They have passed the House and Senate. They have gone into conference and now they are coming out of conference.

When this bill left the House it had no earmarks in it. It now has \$290 million of which \$70 million are academic earmarks in which my Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has a jurisdictional interest. There are of course in addition to that considerably more earmarks.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said that he had re-

ceived large numbers of requests for increased funding, apparently between the time the bill left the House and it emerged from conference. I might point out, and I will include tables and charts with my remarks, that 60 percent of these magical requests came from members of the conference committee. The other 40 percent came from close friends of the conferees.

My objection is not to the project. My objection is to the process here. None of these was authorized, none were requested. Apparently they could not meet the criteria for Community Development Block Grants, but they magically appear. There were none in the House bill. The Senate bill had \$135 million, and in conference the compromise was to extend it to \$290 million. That is the kind of mathematics that puzzles the people of this country, how we would compromise zero and 135 and come up with 290.

The point I have been making now for several years, and I will continue to make it until this situation is corrected, is that we have an orderly process for considering expenditures in this House. Generally speaking they originate with a request. They go to the authorizing committee where they are considered. They are authorized and then, as an authorized program, they go to the appropriators to determine the level of funding.

All of that is thrown out the window here, and we have the members of the Appropriations Committee, all dear friends of mine who exercise tremendous power as illustrated in this conference report, doing what they will, and what they will to do is to use the taxpayers' money to fund in this particular case nearly \$300 million of programs, most of which benefit the conferees themselves.

This process will destroy the comity of this House. This will destroy the sense of the members of the authorizing committee that they are coequal members of this particular branch of Government. They are ruining our relationship with the Senate, because as I pointed out, most of this originates in the Senate, and our dear friends on the House Appropriations Committee are almost forced into playing the same game with them, because they could not afford to be out of line with the Senate colleagues.

The grants are also properly balanced between the Republicans and the Democrats. This is the greatest sense of equity that I see in this body. Roughly the same percentage of these grants go to Republicans as there is membership in the House, and that, of course, is intended to build bipartisan support.

This system is pernicious. It must be stopped, and this is the place to stop it with this amendment to this bill.

I urge a "no" vote on the Stokes amendment and a "yes" vote on the Brown-Fawell amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the committee's recommendation of \$290 million in appropriations for the HUD special purpose grants account, and I will tell Members why.

Many of these projects fund critical programs and needs in our communities and States that will otherwise go unfunded if this amendment is not approved. It is the only access we have in this system for conditions of dire need.

For example, one of the appropriations in this account would allow the Santa Rosa Volunteer Fire Department to purchase needed ambulance rescue equipment.

I don't know about your rural areas, but let me tell you a little about Santa Rosa and Guadalupe County, NM. Santa Rosa is located 120 miles east of Albuquerque and 150 miles west of Amarillo, TX. Guadalupe County is a rural county with only two ambulance services to cover approximately 3,000 square miles. Within this area, the local fire department responds to any incident that may occur within 214 miles of State and Federal highways, including over 70 miles of Interstate 40. The county does not have an emergency response rescue unit.

At any given time, there are more people traveling through Guadalupe County on I-40 than there are people living in the entire area. And the demands placed upon local officials to fund emergency calls are increasing. Over 55 percent of the fire department's emergency calls are due to accidents on the Federal highway, I-40. This appropriation will provide \$250,000 to allow the local fire department to procure emergency response vehicles and equipment that will be used to respond to emergency incidents. The dedicated volunteers of the Santa Rosa Volunteer Fire Department will provide the necessary manpower to enable Guadalupe County to respond in a timely manner and a responsible manner to road accidents and emergencies.

Guadalupe County does not have the tax base to afford good ambulance and rescue services. There is no help from the State government. The Federal Government owns most of the land in the county and the citizens are located in the second lowest per capita income region of the State.

The example serves as an important example of the need that will be addressed by this body's approval of the HUD special purpose grants account. This account lets Congress address and fund important projects and priorities in our communities that will otherwise go unfunded and unattended to.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. When the House passed this bill on June 29, we passed out a clean bill. Now we come back with a conference report, and not only do we go here again because we have put in all kinds of pork projects, but interestingly enough, we left here with the crime bill and now we start off with another crime bill. If we take a look at four pages of pork projects, a million dollars for innovative community policing activities, a million dollars for anticrime youth initiatives in Washington, DC, \$54,000 for housing authority, \$500,000 for the development of a center for the prevention of crime, violence, and illiteracy for the Norfolk State University in Norfolk, VA.

□ 1820

Are these projects necessary? Perhaps. But let us take a look at the process that we have gone through.

These have not gone through the committee process. These have not been authorized by the House.

They were put in through a process of a conference committee, individual Members putting in pork. The Senate put in over 102 unauthorized grants for \$135 million. The House conferees responded by adding in \$155 million of their own.

These projects have less to do with housing than they do with election-year politics. Imagine how many press releases are going to go out tomorrow if we pass this bill by Members saying, "I delivered for you. I brought home the pork. Remember me in November."

I think the most appropriate thing to do is to vote "no" on this. Support our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the fine gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, we have an ever-tightening budget on discretionary items, and as a consequence of this tighter spending cap, we thought we were beginning to make headway in getting rid of pork-barrel spending at the national level.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] and I formed the Porkbusters' Coalition several years ago, and for several years in a row fought against pork-barrel items in this specific appropriation bill. In 1992 and 1993, we raised the issue of these unauthorized projects being added on by the appropriators or by the conferees, and in 1994 we thought we had won the battle, because finally we had a clean bill.

This year, the House stayed in that vein by producing another bill that was clean of pork-barrel spending. But we have gone to conference committee and found that old habits die hard. Because of the Senate's sins in putting some pork-barrel items in, our conferees could not resist the temptation to lard this bill up with some projects for themselves.

There is a new math at play here. The House sent to conference committee a bill with zero projects and zero funding for special projects. The Senate comes along with 102 special-interest projects totaling \$135 million.

Now, under the normal process, you might think the compromise would be halfway between those two numbers, but that is not the way things work when pork-barrel spending is involved. The new math puts in a conference report that has not 102 projects but now 259 projects, not a total of \$135 million but now a total of \$290 million.

These projects were not authorized by the appropriate policy committee. Why? Because that committee did not deem them to be meritorious. These projects were not requested by the administration, because the departments and agencies involved did not consider them meritorious.

Measured against the normal grant programs that are authorized under law, these projects would be considered ineligible. This is an outrage. These projects in this bill represent an insult to the Members of the House of Representatives who voted for a clean bill, and it is an insult to the American taxpayers who want a clean bill and an end to pork-barrel spending.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Constitution makes it very clear that the responsibility for setting policy rests in the Congress and not in the executive branch.

What we are really arguing about today is whether the President makes the priorities or Congress makes the priorities. What has happened here is that this committee has rearranged the priorities.

It is not a case of new money, and, as a matter of fact, this budget is less than the President proposed. It is less than passed the House originally. But it is a question of what we spend it for.

The committee has decided that there are different priorities in the Congress than in the executive branch.

It is easy to throw around the term "pork barrel." I happen to be familiar with a couple of things in here where one is an assisted-living for a public hospital to help seniors make the transition from the hospital to the private nursing homes. I do not believe that is pork. Another is a small amount of money to develop preventive-medicine techniques for workers in industry to deal with heart problems, to deal with lung problems, to deal with the things that confront us today.

We all say one of the ways to deal with health care is to put more emphasis on preventive medicine, help people stay well. That is exactly what is done by one of these projects.

To use the term "pork" carelessly is a tremendous disservice and a mis-

nomer. It is a case of whether the priority on the expenditures should be made by this body, which has the constitutional responsibility to do so, or whether it should be made by the President and the administration which, under the Constitution, executes the policy we make.

I think the committee has done a responsible job. There may be a couple of projects that you can attack if you do not have all the facts, but I think if you look at many of these projects they are extremely worthwhile, and in the committee's judgment and the judgment of this body should be—this makes good responsible policy as opposed to what happened in the case of the administration.

There is no new money. It is a question of who decides, the Congress or the President, how we expend existing funds.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, one step forward, two steps back. That is the dance Congress performs in its effort to fight the deficit.

We pass tough spending restrictions to combat the deficit, then we waive them every time we think they might succeed.

Last year, we defeated the pork-riddled economic stimulus package. This year, many of the same projects are funded under the guise of crime prevention.

One step forward, two steps back.

The bill before us fits the pattern. When it initially passed the House, it was free of HUD special purpose grants, localized projects award without regard to merit or need. That was one step forward.

Today, however, the bill returns with over 250 special purpose grants. These grants were not awarded competitively, most are unauthorized and unrequested, and they will cost over \$280 million. Definitely two steps back.

These projects are pork by anyone's definition: unauthorized, unrequested, unexamined. Neither the House nor the Senate voted on a majority of them. They just danced their way into the conference report.

Well, I say this dance has gone on long enough. A vote against the Stokes motion is a vote against irresponsibility. It is a vote against midnight deals and closed-door sessions.

Most importantly, it is a vote for the taxpayer. Oppose the Stokes motion and you will support fiscal responsibility. With a \$200 billion deficit, we can not afford to dance any longer.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I support the Fawell-Brown motion to strike unauthorized pork projects in the VA-HUD appropriation bill.

Once again 254 special interest pork projects totaling \$290 million were slipped into an appropriation bill. All but four of the projects are unauthorized by the committee of jurisdiction and were not requested by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

These special interest pork projects are a perfect example of why we have an annual budget deficit and a skyrocketing national debt. Again, it is business as usual, with Congress spending and spending and spending, with little or no regard for the taxpayer who must foot the bill.

To stop the funding for these projects, join with me in voting to defeat the Stokes motion, allowing Representatives FAWELL and BROWN to offer a motion to strike the Senate level to \$7 million—the total funding level for the four authorized projects including in the bill.

Finally, I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois. He has tirelessly fought to protect taxpayers dollars from being irresponsibly squandered, and I thank him for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD a letter dated September 12, 1994, from the National Taxpayers Union, as follows:

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,  
Washington, DC, September 12, 1994.

Hon. HARRIS FAWELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FAWELL: The 250,000-member National Taxpayers Union supports your effort to strike 254 projects totaling \$283 million in funding during consideration of the FY 1995 VA/HUD Appropriations Conference Report.

In the Senate's version of this bill, appropriators provided \$135 million for 102 "special-purpose grants" out of low-income housing funds. The House provided no such funding in its VA/HUD legislation. Yet, conferees decided to "compromise" by adding \$155 million to the Senate's provision, for a total of \$290 million for 259 special purpose grants. This twisted fiscal arithmetic simply will not compute with overburdened taxpayers.

Unless Congress acts to terminate them, most of these grants will be made for wasteful, unnecessary, or low-priority projects designed primarily to benefit very small constituencies in certain states. The current VA/HUD Conference Report contains \$5 million for a new library in Beckley, West Virginia, \$450,000 for construction of the Center for Political Participation at the University of Maryland, and \$500,000 to an "Applied Technology Center" at Onondaga Community College in New York, to name a few.

All but five of these grants were never authorized by the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, and were never requested by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Furthermore, many of these projects have little or no direct connection to veterans affairs or housing issues, for which the bill was ostensibly drafted. Regardless of whatever merit these grants may have, their existence in the Conference Report is a circumvention of the congressional budget process and a contradiction of accountable budget principles. Such additions only reinforce taxpayer skepticism over Congress' ability to maintain fiscal discipline.

Congress must not repeat the debacle of last month's Crime Bill by accepting yet another flawed proposal like the VA/HUD Conference Report. NTU supports your effort to strike \$283 million in funding for "special purpose grants" from the VA/HUD Conference Report. A vote to kill \$283 million in funding for special purpose grants in the VA/HUD Conference Report will be considered for inclusion as a pro-taxpayer vote in NTU's 1994 Rating of Congress.

Sincerely,

DAVID KEATING,  
Executive Vice President.

□ 1830

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

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

Mr. Speaker, to the Members of the House, I wonder if you ever stop to think what the words "special purpose" really mean, because I think here today I have heard you trying to embellish the real meaning of "special purpose."

The real meaning of these grants is to meet special needs. I want you to know there is no one here in Washington, bureaucrat or President, who can tell me what I need in my district. And they cannot tell you what you need in your district. I want to say to you that you were sent here to represent your district, to identify these needs which many people cannot identify in block grants or whatever. It is up to you to decide whether or not they were unrequested or not. Are you going to allow an unelected person to make those decisions for you?

That is why many of you have trouble getting back here, because you do not know what is going on in your own district. You do not know whether you need something for the people back there who are in rural areas, who will never be considered in any program here in Washington because they do not have the clout to get it in. But that is why they elected you, so you can come up here and every once in a while give them a little something to take back to them.

Now, they are not asking for all of these things we are talking about that are so pernicious. We have already done those. The billion dollars, trillion-dollar kinds of things. These kinds of things these people cannot ask for. So they are asking you "to get me a million," or "get me \$500,000. This is a special need."

I think each of us should vote to support Mr. STOKES' amendment today. Vote down the reason to not have this pass today.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the conferees on conference committees and

the leadership of this institution on both sides of the aisle have a trust relationship, both with the American people and with the other Members of this institution. The conferees are to faithfully represent both Chambers to iron out differences and not use the conference process as an opportunity to advance the special interests that they feel are represented or needed by their own States or congressional districts.

The citizens of this great Nation are more than cynical about the work of this institution; they are disgusted. Why?

They are disgusted because Members of this institution are abusing the public trust by favoring their districts, their States, their provincial interests.

Mr. Speaker, this is our opportunity to restore confidence. Let us eliminate this special pork-barrel funding.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I know that the appropriators who put these projects into these bills are trying to use this money in a well-intentioned way for the people in this country. But the fact of the matter is we all know what the House rules say. No money shall be expended and appropriated unless already authorized.

The fact is we are violating the rules of the House. We would not even be having this debate on the floor if in fact the Committee on Rules had not waived the rules of the House.

So I ask my colleagues once again how many times are we going to come here to the floor of the House and insist that you obey the House rules?

How many times are we going to ask and come down here and say—and remind everyone what the rules say? Every time this happens, "we are going to do this, next time, we are going to do it next year." It reminds me of my trying to deal with my two teenage daughters, trying to get them to clean up their room. "We will do it tomorrow."

At some point we will have to say enough is enough. I will say to my colleagues today is the day. Today is the day we send the signals to our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, and we send a message to the Members of the other body that we are not going to do this any more.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to address one or two points brought up by Members during the debate. I was particularly concerned by the statement made by an earlier speaker that the reason for

these grants is that the expertise to make these kinds of decisions does not reside solely in the executive branch but resides in the Congress. I would agree with the statement.

Let me point out, however, that the Congress has not acted on this. Congress has been circumvented on this. The fact of the matter is, and I will have this in a table attached to my remarks, one-half of this \$300 million went to 8 States represented by 12 members of the conference committee—8 States represented by 12 members of the conference account for \$140 million here.

Now I understand that the people who exercise power in the Committee on Appropriations like to use it to the best advantage that they can. I particularly like the way Senator BYRD has occasionally described the appropriation process as one in which most of the Members of Congress are ignorant, they do not understand how it works. He knows how you use power, and he uses it to the benefit of West Virginia.

I am going to steal a march from the distinguished Senator. He likes to quote the classics and so I will quote to you from Thucydides in his "History of the Peloponnesian War," in which the Athenians, at war with Sparta, were negotiating with the neutral Melosians, asking the Melosians to yield allegiance to Athens. And here is how Thucydides describes the negotiations: "In a meeting between Athenian and Melosian envoys during the Peloponnesian War, in which the Athenians demand control of Melos, their envoys said, 'The powerful exact what they can, and the weak grant what they must.' When the Melosians say that they would sooner be slaves, that they will appeal to the gods, the Athenians reply, 'Of the gods we believe and of men we know that, by a law of their nature, wherever they can rule they will. This law was not made by us and we are not the first to have acted on it; we did but inherit it.'"

Mr. Speaker, the appropriators today have inherited that law and they are practicing it. That is wrong and it will destroy the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my friend the gentlemen from Illinois, HARRIS FAWELL, an esteemed member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. As Members in this Chamber are aware, I have for some time vigorously opposed earmarks to academic institutions. Of the \$290 million earmarked in these special purpose grants, almost 25 percent or more than \$68 million appears to go to academic institutions.

I have never tried to assess the quality or merit of every earmarked project. Many of them no doubt—including many in this bill—are probably of high quality. What I do oppose is the irregular process which typifies earmarking. Funds are disbursed for projects that often have nothing to do with an agency's mandate, and without any type of formal re-

view or input from the majority of the Members of Congress. The majority of these earmarks occur in report language where they are protected from congressional scrutiny and debate, not to mention Presidential signature. Nonetheless, agencies treat appropriations reports and associated earmarks with the same weight as law.

This group of special purpose grants provides a classic example of the earmarking process. The House-passed bill had no special purpose grants. The other body passed a bill with \$135 million in special purpose grants. Now we are faced with a conference report that contains 259 earmarked projects valued at \$290 million. This is an arcane branch of mathematics whereby the compromise between zero and 135 million actually works out to be 290 million.

Where did these projects come from? Only a select handful of our Members, those in the conference, know the answer to that question. Seven States share almost 45 percent of these funds and 60 percent of the earmarked funds go to States which were represented at the conference. A quick review of these projects shows that Congress can work in a bipartisan fashion, at least when it comes to earmarking, because many Members from both sides of the aisle succeeded in lassoing funds for their districts and States. The ratio of Republican to Democratic pork seems to be about the same as the ratio of Republicans to Democratic Members—a triumph of equity in this often partisan body. Some of the very Members in the other body who were most vocal in denouncing the recently passed crime bill as pork-laden were simultaneously engaged in earmarking pork in this bill for their own States.

I hope the same Members in this body who were upset by what they considered to be pork in the crime bill will stand and be counted today. I realize that the decision facing us is a painful one. As I stated earlier, I am sure that many of these projects are useful and will greatly benefit their communities. However I oppose these earmarks, and I hope other Members will also, for two fundamental reasons: the irregular order in which they were brought before the House and the unfair process which allows a small minority of the House and the other body to dole out largess to their parochial projects at the Nation's expense.

I urge my colleagues to support Mr. FAWELL's amendment.

The tabular material referred to is as follows:

HUD SPECIAL PURPOSE GRANTS—STATES RECEIVING MORE THAN \$10 MILLION  
(In millions of dollars)

State	Amount	Conference committee member
New York	\$25.4	D'Amato.
West Virginia	23.0	Byrd, Mollohan.
California	21.9	Feinstein, Torres, Lewis.
Ohio	17.75	Stokes, Kaplur.
Pennsylvania	17.35	McDade.
New Jersey	13.49	Lautenberg, Gallo.
Michigan	10.45	
Maryland	10.15	Mikulski.
Total	139.49	

<sup>1</sup> 48.1% of total funding.

VA, HUD AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES CONFERENCE REPORT—HUD SPECIAL PURPOSE GRANTS

ACADEMIC EARMARKS

Total—\$68,200,000

\$1,500,000 to Billings, MT for clinical lab space.

\$500,000 for innovative housing research in inner city neighborhoods in the cities of Gary, Indianapolis, Terre Haute, Bloomington, and Columbus, IN, to be conducted through the Housing Futures Institute in Muncie, IN. (Ball State University)

\$5,000,000 to the city of Huntington, WV for the construction of a new library. (Marshall University)

\$5,000,000 to Shepherdstown, WV for continued capital costs for science and education activities. (Shepherd College)

\$4,000,000 to Lewisburg, WV for construction of a new ambulatory care clinic. (WV School of Osteopathic Medicine)

\$5,000,000 to Beckley, WV for construction of a new library facility. (College of West Virginia)

\$5,000,000 for science education facility in Newport, OR. (Oregon State University)

\$2,000,000 for planning and design of urban revitalization activities in Portland, OR. (Portland State University)

\$1,000,000 to New Orleans, LA for continued operations of the National Center for Revitalization of Central Cities. (University of New Orleans)

\$800,000 for a grant to Albion College in Albion, MI for downtown renovation and economic revitalization.

\$2,000,000 to the State of Pennsylvania for educational telecommunications network. (Lehigh, Scranton, Susquehanna, and Wilkes Universities; Albright, King's Lebanon Valley, Lycoming, Marywood, and Moravian Colleges; Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales; College Misericordia, Lehigh Carbon, Lezerne County, Northampton, and Reading Area Community Colleges)

\$1,450,000 to the College of Notre Dame of Maryland in Baltimore, MD for capital costs, including equipping and outfitting activities, connected to the renovation of the Knott Science Center.

\$1,450,000 to Villa Julie College in Stevenson, MD for a state-of-the-art computer training program, including construction, other capital activities, equipment, and outfitting for a technology training center.

\$2,000,000 for the development of an Urban Health Education Center at the University of Detroit Mercy in Detroit, MI.

\$1,000,000 for the Henry Ford Health System in initiate the Center for Integrated Urban Care, as part of a regional and national demonstration or urban health care delivery in Mississippi.

\$300,000 to Fordham University to construct a new facility to house the Regional Educational Technology Center in Bronx, NY.

\$750,000 for the renovation, expansion, and conversion of a section of Iona College's New Rochelle campus' Ryan Library to house an Information Access Center for women and minority owned businesses in the New York area.

\$1,200,000 for the New York Medical College to develop a community based medical infrastructure project in New York.

\$450,000 for the construction of the Center for Political Participation at the University of Maryland at College Park.

\$1,000,000 for the expansion of St. Mary's Community College in St. Mary's County, MD, for needed educational opportunities.

\$1,650,000 to the Redlands Center for Science and Environmental Studies for capital costs associated with a science education facility in Redlands, CA. (University of Redlands)

\$2,000,000 for a community based cancer patient support project in Loma Linda, CA, including capital costs for an extended outpatient care residential facility combining multidisciplinary cancer approaches. (Loma Linda Medical Center)

\$1,000,000 for international business and economic development center in Smithfield, RI. (Bryant College)

\$2,000,000 for an information technology and training network and for related economic development activities in Norristown and Aston, PA in concert with the Southeastern Pennsylvania Consortium for Information Technology and Training. (Beaver, Cabrini, Chestnut Hill, Eastern, Gwynedd-Mercy, Holy Family, Neumann, and Rosemont Colleges)

\$2,500,000 for the National Institute for Environmental Renewal in Lackawanna County, PA for economic development and job expansions. (University of Scranton)

\$1,000,000 for the renovation of Jordan hall at the New England Conservatory in Boston, MA.

\$1,000,000 for funds to develop the Center for Pacific Rim Studies in San Francisco, CA. (University of San Francisco)

\$1,500,000 for Columbia University for the development of Audubon Research Park for biomedical research in New York.

\$1,000,000 for the Hazard Community College for construction of a community service center in Kentucky.

\$2,000,000 for Pembroke State University to construct a Regional Center for economic, community and professional development in southeastern North Carolina.

\$2,000,000 for DePaul University's library to provide direct services and partnerships with community organizations, schools and individuals in NC.

\$1,500,000 for the construction of St. Xavier University Center for Urban Redevelopment and community services in Chicago, IL.

\$500,000 for program support for the Leadership Institute at Hampton University for Activities which address profound social problems in Hampton, VA.

\$1,300,000 for the City of Richmond and the Virginia Commonwealth for the development of the Richmond Education, Training and Employment Network project.

\$500,000 for the development of a Center for the Prevention of Crime Violence Illiteracy, and Poverty at Norfolk State University in Norfolk, VA.

\$1,050,000 to the University of Arkansas at Little Rock for a coordinated urban community revitalization program operation in Arkansas.

\$500,000 to Applied Technology Center at Onondaga Community College to serve as a comprehensive economic development resource in central New York.

\$300,000 for the expansion of the Science and Mathematics Complex at the University of South Carolina.

\$500,000 for the Earth Conservancy for the acquisition of land near Wilkes-Barre, PA for economic and community development purposes.

\$2,000,000 for economic development activities related to distance learning programs in Storm Lake, Iowa. (Buena Vista College)

\$1,000,000 to the City of Birmingham, AL to assist in the expanding a small business incubator program at the University of Alabama.

#### PEER REVIEW IS BEST TEST FOR RESEARCH FUNDING

(By Anthony Flint)

The White House unveiled its new national science policy last week, pledging to lead the world in basic science, mathematics and engineering. The policy promises to wean the American research community from the Cold War era, when funds flowed more freely to universities and laboratories.

The government's promise now is to fund researchers who can help fight new wars: economic competitiveness, the environment, health and education. The Clinton administration wants to change the current 60-40 military-civilian split of the \$70 billion federal research and development budget to 50-50 by 1998.

If it comes to pass, the US government and industry support for science will be boosted by 15 percent, putting it on a par with science funding in Japan and Germany when figured as a percentage of the national economy.

In large measure, the new emphasis will be on ideas that can be readily turned into products with commercial application. Critics say that will lead to a dangerous industrial policy, where government picks winners and losers incubating in the laboratory, rather than letting a hundred flowers bloom.

Unfortunately, this garden is already overrun with weeds.

New reports suggest that now more than ever, the academic research funding system has been nominally corrupted by pork-barrel appropriations, those multimillion-dollar so-called "earmarked" grants from powerful members of Congress to specific colleges and universities, often tucked into totally unrelated appropriations bills. The practice is so common it has become a kind of industrial policy of its own.

In the early 1980s, only the boldest big universities with the best Washington connections tried to get earmarked funds. These days, just about every self-respecting institution is doing it, assisted by politically savvy government liaison officers and lobbyists. Earmarked projects totaled \$11 million in 1982; this year the total is \$651 million, according to an annual review by the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Given the composition of institutions here, Massachusetts naturally has received a healthy share of typical earmarks: \$2 million from the Department of Defense for burn treatment research for Harvard and Massachusetts General Hospital; \$2.4 million from the Agriculture Department for Tufts; \$3 million for the University of Massachusetts for a telescope. The state ranks second among the 50 states in total earmarked funds received from 1980 to 1994, according to analysis of data compiled by the Chronicle and the Library of Congress.

The basic objection to earmarking is that the money does an end-run around the traditional system of peer review, which is supposed to channel government money for research and academic projects to the best possible institute or laboratory in a systematic and orderly fashion.

Those who defend earmarking say that while the funds don't go through established channels, the projects are still inherently worthwhile, whether in health research or other areas. And, they say, earmarking is competitive, a kind of peer review of its own, except that universities pitch proposals to their federal legislators.

Some projects seem implausible to the point of absurdity, however: a planetarium for a Michigan community college that has

no astronomers, for example, or money for Chesapeake Bay studies for a new Pennsylvania environmental center 180 miles from the nearest soft-shell crab. Earmarked money also regularly goes for facilities renovation or construction that benefits no one more than the university itself: a new dock, a laboratory, a library.

For those in Congress, there's something infectious about bringing home the pork to academic institutions in their districts, and crowing about it in press releases. New labs and libraries and research projects seem so wholesome.

In political terms, the practice feeds upon itself, as members strike horse-trading deals: You support my earmark, I'll support yours. It seems to create a knee-jerk mentality, where members elbow to get their own piece of every pie. Witness Senate minority leader Bob Dole holding up a bill to repair buildings on historically black college campuses because he wanted to tack on \$3.6 million for Sterling College in Kansas, whose enrollment is only 3 percent black. (His reasoning: Congress should provide restoration funds for colleges that try to be more diverse.)

Those who protest earmarking are swiftly punished. It's an open secret on Capitol Hill that Rep. John Murtha (D-Penn.), one of the biggest players in the academic pork-barrel game, initiated a giant slash in regular Defense Department research funding in partial retribution against California Rep. George Brown, who has criticized the practice. Murtha also has let it be known that he'd like the universities to step up more and defend the practice.

Reform-minded House Appropriations Committee chairman David Obey (D-Wis.) has slashed the discretionary spending accounts of subcommittee chairmen, and is on the lookout for academic earmarks in all 1995 appropriations bills.

But Obey is feeling the heat from both House and Senate leaders to back off a bit.

Is earmarking just the way things work? Maybe. But it certainly favors institutions who can afford lobbyists such as Cassidy & Associates, who helped Tufts, BU and Boston College win more than \$130 million in earmarked grants since 1977, according to a recent report by Knight-Ridder/Tribune News Service.

Peer review seems to be the fairest process for awarding research funding. Some kind of equally objective, need based system for awarding funds for facilities also would be desirable. Academia, after all, is supposed to be the ultimate meritocracy.

At a time when research hangs in the post-Cold War balance too much scientific inquiry, is simply going to the highest bidder.

#### TOP RECIPIENTS OF ACADEMIC EARMARK GRANTS

WASHINGTON.—Here are the top recipients of academic earmark grants in Congressional appropriations bills from 1980 through 1994. The rankings and the amounts come from analysis of data compiled by The Chronicle of Higher Education and the Library of Congress. In instances where a single grant was made to more than one university, the money was assumed to be divided evenly. Amounts listed are in millions.

1. University of Pittsburgh, \$140.2.
2. Iowa State University, \$103.6.
3. University of Alaska, \$101.2.
4. University of Hawaii, \$100.5.
5. Oregon Health Science Center, \$100.5.
6. Louisiana State University, \$90.7.
7. University of West Virginia, \$80.8.
8. University of Rochester, \$68.3.
9. University of Alabama, \$67.1.

10. Florida State University, \$67.1.
11. Michigan State University, \$62.8.
12. Boston University, \$56.5.
13. University of North Dakota, \$53.5.
14. Tufts University, \$51.8.
15. University of Maryland, \$51.3.
16. Indiana University, \$48.6.
17. Washington State University, \$47.0.
18. Loma Linda University, \$41.5.
19. University of Illinois, \$41.0.
20. Oregon State University, \$40.4.
21. North Dakota State University, \$39.5.
22. Boston College, \$37.6.
23. University of Oregon, \$36.2.
24. University of Florida, \$35.3.
25. Wheeling Jesuit College, \$33.5.

STATE RANKINGS OF ACADEMIC EARMARK GRANTS

WASHINGTON.—Here is the ranking among states and the District of Columbia of recipients of academic earmark grants in congressional appropriations bills from 1980 through 1994.

The rankings and the amounts come from analysis of data compiled by The Chronicle of Higher Education and the Library of Congress.

In instances where a single grant was made to more than one university, the money was assumed to be divided evenly. Amounts listed are in millions.

1. Pennsylvania—\$377.2.
2. Massachusetts—\$206.2.
3. Oregon—\$186.9.
4. Louisiana—\$174.4.
5. Florida—\$173.4.
6. New York—\$165.9.
7. Michigan—\$163.0.
8. California—\$146.9.
9. Iowa—\$138.5.
10. West Virginia—\$126.7.
11. Illinois—\$104.2.
12. Hawaii—\$101.5.
13. Alaska—\$101.2.
14. Mississippi—\$98.8.
15. North Dakota—\$94.8.
16. Alabama—\$87.1.
17. Texas—\$80.9.
18. Maryland—\$80.2.
19. South Carolina—\$78.6.
20. Washington—\$76.1.
21. Indiana—\$69.0.
22. Wisconsin—\$66.9.
23. New Jersey—\$65.0.
24. Washington, D.C.—\$58.5.
25. Utah—\$56.7.
26. New Hampshire—\$53.2.
27. Oklahoma—\$50.7.
28. Ohio—\$48.6.
29. Kansas—\$47.5.
30. Arizona—\$42.0.
31. Georgia—\$41.3.
32. Arkansas—\$41.3.
33. Minnesota—\$40.8.
34. North Carolina—\$39.1.
35. Nevada—\$38.7.
36. Nebraska—\$31.9.
37. New Mexico—\$28.3.
38. Kentucky—\$27.1.
39. Connecticut—\$26.7.
40. Missouri—\$25.1.
41. Maine—\$23.5.
42. Idaho—\$18.6.
43. Tennessee—\$16.6.
44. Colorado—\$16.4.
45. Virginia—\$15.1.
46. Rhode Island—\$14.1.
47. Montana—\$9.6.
48. Wyoming—\$7.7.
49. South Dakota—\$7.6.
50. Vermont—\$3.8.
51. Delaware—\$0.5.

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

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I rise at this moment only to express no small amount of concern about the description that has been outlined here of the process we have been through.

I raise my voice only because I am concerned that some of those descriptions have cast a shadow upon the work of my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [LOUIS STOKES]. There is not a chairman in the House who has put in more effort and gone out of his way to communicate with these people who have interests in various aspects of this bill.

The gentleman has indeed reached out, where it was appropriate, to a variety of members, including the appropriate committee chairman as we tried to work our way through this bill. You cannot touch base on every issue, but on significant issues he has certainly made a concerted effort. Indeed, in terms of individual projects where there were concerns about this building for that project, to help solve these problems my chairman said early on to me that we want to be very, very careful about this process because people love to rise on the floor and talk about a thing called pork.

□ 1840

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, generally speaking we all know that pork is defined by Members as a project that is a 100 miles away from their own district. Beauty lies in the eyes of the genuflector as one reviews that part of the process. What does not seem to be appreciated here is that the chairman, in an attempt to measure and evaluate these requests with great care, delayed through the process all the way to the conference, as a matter of fact, because he wanted to make sure that he knew exactly what was involved in the requests by the Members of the House. As a practical fact of life, after the work of the committee, and then going to conference, the chairman has brought this bill back with \$164 million less spending than when the bill came out of the House, and in turn, indeed, he has responded to some of those individual requests of Members after the careful evaluation that I have described.

What needs to be understood by the Members is that, if the chairman's motion to recede to the Senate is not passed, it will not reduce the spending in this bill one iota; indeed the money will remain. But the administration will decide how it is going to be spent instead of responding to the criteria established by my chairman and his efforts to satisfy needs of a number of Members of the House.

It is very, very clear in this case that that classic that says that the administration proposes and the Congress disposes applies in a very professional way. My chairman has worked with his colleagues in the other body attempt-

ing to make certain that we are very careful about the way dollars were being spent, and at the same time attempt to be as responsive as possible as Members of the House.

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

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I do want to make it clear, by the way, that the amendment which we would offer in the event the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is defeated, as I hope it would be, will actually cut \$283 million.

Now I think it is important for us to understand that nobody is necessarily against the idea of communities being helped from time to time by grants of Federal funds and that indeed is why we have the Community Development Block Grant [CDBG] program. But, under CDBG, Federal funds are distributed to local governments back home by an established formula related to need. Local governments in turn then make grants to worthy private or public entities of their choice within general guidelines of HUD. But those kinds of Federal grants would not be acceptable here because certain Members want federally funded projects which will enable them to be touted as the one who personally brought home a Federal project in his or her district. No hearings were held on these projects. No merit review made. What happened in this HUD conference report? They simply added \$110 million to the total Assisted Public Housing appropriations to be spend in fiscal year 1995, and then proceeded to raid and earmark \$290 million which was supposed to be spent on low income public housing money and required that the money instead be spent for these 257 special purpose grants. And as has been indicated, most of these grants were simply hard-nosed wish-lists for private or public projects back home, such as: building a municipal coliseum, or a library, or restoring a railroad station, or a municipal plaza, or for various science, education or sundry projects, extensions of sewer and/or water lines et cetera, et cetera, none of which probably would have passed muster if they were to be put through the required review by the authorizing committees.

The Stokes amendment should be defeated.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, but, before I yield back my time, let me mention to my colleague from Illinois, that we have provided very substantial funding in all of those categories. The Chairman has been extremely sensitive through the hearing

process, trying to make sure that we were as generous as possible with housing projects, and CDBG programs.

All the money in the world is not available to satisfy every need. To suggest that in some way this chairman would be taking away from veterans, or housing programs, or Community Development Block Grants in order to hand out special projects to say the least, is a distortion of the process. My chairman has been extraordinarily fair to me and the Members of my side of the aisle in his committee process. He has reached out consistently to all the authorizing chairmen involved in the process.

I think this is a very well-balanced and extremely fair bill, and I urge the Members not just to support the bill, but to support the work of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] as well.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARLOW].

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the motion to concur with Senate amendment No. 87 to the VA-HUD Appropriations bill. It is not often that agreement can be reached among environmental groups, labor groups, regulators and industry. But with an issue facing us today, they do agree. They're against the proposal to allow special exemptions on the quality of gasoline foreign refiners export to the United States.

In testimony before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, the Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife, and the Center for International Environmental Law joined the Independent Refiners Coalition in stating that the Venezuelan deal is "flawed trade policy, unsound environmental policy, and nonsensical economic policy." Labor organizations, such as the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union and the AFL-CIO, have opposed strongly the foreign baseline. The coalitions of State air quality regulators from 17 mid-Atlantic and Northeastern States oppose this proposal as well.

Let us hold foreign refiners to the same environmental standards we've set for our own domestic industry. Vote for the motion to concur with Senate amendment No. 87.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I shall not take a long period of time to try and close debate this evening. I think it is important for me to try to say a couple of things.

As chairman of the VA-HUD Subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to bring a balance to our bill that is reflective of the House. I have tried to approach the needs of the people of this country, the agencies that we serve, and also the Members of this House, in

a way that would reflect credibly upon the House.

For a number of months, when we conducted our hearings on this bill, we had a number of Members who came before our subcommittee and asked us for special grants that would address needs in their specific congressional districts. These are needs that did not always fit within the criteria set by certain agencies, but nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, they were needs related to their congressional districts. They were needs related to housing, to health, and to infrastructure in the cities. Often, mayors and commissioners and other public officials also came to urge the Congress to consider these special purpose grants. We, in fact, had more than 300 requests for special purpose grants alone. When we take into account the requests we had from Members for EPA, HUD, and VA projects, we had more than 1,000 requests.

Mr. Speaker, seldom could I walk on the floor of this House without Members asking me to sit down so they could tell me about a special project in their congressional district. Seldom could I sit in my office without Members coming and bringing people from their congressional districts to tell me of their special needs.

We tried to be responsive to the Members of this house. We have tried to be responsive on a bipartisan basis. We tried to treat the Republican Members and the Democrat Members alike. We recognize that they have special needs to serve their constituents, and we tried to serve those needs. We did it saving money because we brought the bill back before the House \$164 million below the figure that the House passed. So we, in fact, saved money while we were trying to address the needs of all the Members' constituents.

□ 1850

We spent a great deal of time, and I appreciate the remarks of my ranking Republican Member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS]. The gentleman and I often spent hours going over these requests, trying to ascertain that each of the requested projects had the merit for us to include them in the bill.

So I would urge those Members who came to us and asked us to consider the special needs in their congressional districts to vote for the Stokes motion, so that we can try to support all the Members of this House with the special needs of their constituents. I would urge Members to vote "yes" on the Stokes motion.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. FAWELL. 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 189, nays 180, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

YEAS—189

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Pastor
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Applegate	Hall (TX)	Pelosi
Bacchus (FL)	Hamburg	Peterson (FL)
Barlow	Hansen	Pickle
Bateman	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Bentley	Hinchee	Price (NC)
Berman	Hobson	Quillen
Bevill	Hochbrueckner	Quinn
Bilbray	Hoke	Rahall
Bishop	Holden	Reed
Blute	Houghton	Regula
Boehkert	Hoyer	Richardson
Bonior	Hughes	Rogers
Borski	Jacobs	Rose
Boucher	Jefferson	Rowland
Brooks	Johnson, E.B.	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Sabo
Byrne	Kennedy	Sawyer
Calvert	Kennelly	Schenk
Cardin	Kildee	Schiff
Carr	Klink	Schumer
Chapman	Kreidler	Scott
Clay	LaFalce	Sharp
Clayton	Lewis (CA)	Shepherd
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Coleman	Livingston	Skaggs
Collins (GA)	Lowey	Skeen
Collins (IL)	Manton	Skelton
Collins (MI)	Margolies-	Slaughter
Conyers	Mezvinsky	Smith (IA)
Coyne	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Martinez	Snowe
Darden	Matsui	Spence
de la Garza	Mazzoli	Stokes
DeLauro	McCandless	Strickland
Dellums	McCloskey	Studds
Diaz-Balart	McDade	Stupak
Dicks	McDermott	Swift
Dingell	McHale	Taylor (NC)
Dixon	McKinney	Tejeda
Durbin	McNulty	Thompson
Eshoo	Meehan	Thornton
Evans	Meek	Thurman
Ewing	Menendez	Torkildsen
Farr	Mfume	Torres
Fazio	Mineta	Trafilant
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Tucker
Filner	Mollinari	Unsoeld
Flake	Mollohan	Visclosky
Foglietta	Montgomery	Vucanovich
Ford (TN)	Moran	Walsh
Fowler	Morella	Waters
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Watt
Frost	Myers	Wheat
Furse	Neal (MA)	Whitten
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Williams
Gephardt	Obey	Wise
Gibbons	Olver	Woolsey
Gilman	Ortiz	Wyden
Gonzalez	Orton	Young (AK)
Gordon	Packard	
Green	Pallone	

NAYS—180

Allard	Andrews (TX)	Bachus (AL)
Andrews (ME)	Archer	Baesler
Andrews (NJ)	Armey	Baker (CA)

Ballenger	Goodling	McInnis
Barca	Goss	McKeon
Barrett (NE)	Grandy	Meyers
Barrett (WI)	Greenwood	Mica
Bartlett	Gunderson	Michel
Barton	Hamilton	Miller (FL)
Beilenson	Hancock	Minge
Bereuter	Harman	Moorhead
Billrakis	Hastert	Nussle
Billey	Hayes	Oxley
Boehner	Hefley	Parker
Bonilla	Herger	Paxon
Brewster	Hoagland	Payne (VA)
Browder	Hoekstra	Penny
Brown (CA)	Horn	Peterson (MN)
Bunning	Hunter	Petri
Burton	Hutchinson	Pombo
Buyer	Hutto	Porter
Callahan	Hyde	Poshard
Canady	Inglis	Pryce (OH)
Cantwell	Inslee	Ramstad
Castle	Istook	Ravenel
Clement	Johnson (CT)	Roberts
Coble	Johnson (GA)	Roemer
Combest	Johnson (SD)	Rohrabacher
Costello	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Cox	Kasich	Royce
Crane	Kim	Sanders
Crapo	King	Sangmeister
Cunningham	Kingston	Sarpalius
Danner	Kiecicka	Saxton
Deal	Klein	Schaefer
DeLay	Klug	Schroeder
Deutsch	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Dooley	Kolbe	Shaw
Doollittle	Kyl	Shays
Duncan	Lambert	Shuster
Dunn	Lancaster	Smith (MI)
Edwards (TX)	LaRocco	Smith (TX)
Ehlers	Lazio	Spratt
Emerson	Leach	Stearns
English	Lehman	Stump
Everett	Levin	Talent
Fawell	Levy	Tanner
Fields (TX)	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Fingerhut	Lightfoot	Taylor (MS)
Fish	Linder	Thomas (CA)
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Upton
Franks (NJ)	Lloyd	Valentine
Gallely	Long	Vento
Gekas	Lucas	Volkmer
Geren	Maloney	Walker
Gilchrist	Mann	Weldon
Gillmor	Manzullo	Wolf
Gingrich	McCollum	Young (FL)
Glickman	McCrery	Zeliff
Goodlatte	McHugh	Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—65

Baker (LA)	Huffington	Rostenkowski
Barcia	Inhofe	Roth
Becerra	Kaptur	Santorum
Blackwell	Kopetski	Serrano
Bryant	Lantos	Slattery
Camp	Laughlin	Smith (OR)
Clinger	Lewis (FL)	Solomon
Condit	Machtley	Stark
Cooper	McCurdy	Stenholm
Coppersmith	McMillan	Sundquist
DeFazio	Miller (CA)	Swett
Derrick	Mink	Synar
Dickey	Murphy	Thomas (WY)
Dornan	Nadler	Torricelli
Dreier	Neal (NC)	Towns
Edwards (CA)	Owens	Velazquez
Engel	Pickett	Washington
Ford (MI)	Portman	Waxman
Gallo	Rangel	Wilson
Grams	Reynolds	Wynn
Hastings	Ridge	Yates
Hefner	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1912

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nadler for, with Mr. Dornan against.  
 Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Grams against.  
 Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Lewis of Florida against.  
 Mr. Towns for, with Mr. Smith of Oregon against.

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

Ms. SCHENK and Messrs. SWIFT, PETERSON of Florida, BATEMAN, and MARTINEZ changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 30: Page 22, line 17, strike out "\$3,750,000,000" and insert "\$2,992,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert the following: "\$2,536,000,000."

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 51: Page 38, after line 10, insert:

"The United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended in each of sections 6(c)(4)(A)(ii) and 8(d)(1)(A)(ii); by striking "and (V)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(V) assisting families that include one or more adult members who are employed; and (VI)"; in sections 6(c)(4)(A)(ii) and 8(d)(1)(A)(ii), by inserting after the final semicolon in each the following: "subclause (V) shall be effective only during fiscal year 1995"; and in the penultimate sentence of section 16(c), by striking "under the system" and all that follows up to the period.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

The United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended in each of sections 6(c)(4)(A)(ii) and 8(d)(1)(A)(ii), by striking "and (V)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(V) assisting families that include one or more adult members who are employed; and (VI)"; and in sections 6(c)(4)(A)(ii) and 8(d)(1)(A)(ii), by inserting after the final semicolon in each the following: "subclause (V) shall be effective only during fiscal year 1995";.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 40, strike out lines 3 to 5.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-124, \$1,730,000 are rescinded immediately upon enactment of this Act.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 58: Page 40, after line 5 insert:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For grants, loans, and technical assistance to qualifying community development lenders, and administrative expenses of the Fund, \$125,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996, of which \$100,000,000 shall become available on September 23, 1995: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, up to \$10,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to \$1,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided further*, That the costs of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be defined as 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 \$75,815,000: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for programs and activities of the Bank Enterprise Act.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUNDS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For grants, loans, and technical assistance to qualifying community development lenders, and administrative expenses of the Fund, \$125,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, up to \$10,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to \$1,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided further*, That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be defined as 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 \$75,815,000: *Provided further*, That not more than \$39,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading may be used for programs and activities authorized in section 114 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 60: Page 40, strike out all after line 24 over to and including "hereafter" in line 1 on page 41 and insert: \$610,000,000, of which \$411,212,000 is available for obligation for the period September 1, 1995 through August 31, 1996.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$575,000,000, of which \$386,212,000 is available for obligation for the period September 1, 1995 through August 31, 1996."

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 64: Page 41, line 12, after "Act" insert: "*Provided further*, That not more than \$9,450,000 of the \$155,590,000 for the National Service Trust shall be for educational awards authorized under section 129(b) of the subtitle C of title I of the Act."

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That not more than \$14,175,000 of the \$145,900,000 for the National Service Trust shall be for educational awards authorized under section 129(b) of the subtitle C of title I of the Act."

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 71: Page 43, after line 13 insert:

## "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; \$350,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That not more than \$50,567,000 of these funds shall be available for procurement of laboratory equipment, supplies, and other operating expenses in support of research and development."

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

## "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; \$350,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That not more than \$55,000,000 of these funds shall be available for procurement of laboratory equipment, supplies, and other

operating expenses in support of research and development."

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 72: Page 43, after line 13 insert:

## 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; \$1,417,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That not more than \$296,772,500 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.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

## 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; \$1,417,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That not more than \$304,722,500 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 from funds appropriated under this heading, the Administrator may make grants to federally recognized Indian governments for the development of multimedia environmental programs.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 47, after line 25 insert:

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE/STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

For necessary expenses for capitalization grants for State revolving funds to support water infrastructure financing, and to carry out the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Water Quality Act of 1987, \$3,400,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$22,500,000 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; \$52,500,000 shall be for section 510 of the Water Quality Act of 1987; \$47,500,000 shall be made available in consultation with the appropriate border commission for architectural engineering, and design, and related activities in connection with wastewater facilities in the vicinity of Nogales, Arizona, and Mexicali, Mexico, and planning and design of other high priority wastewater facilities in the area of the Mexican border, the purpose of which facilities is to control municipal wastewater from Mexico; \$50,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Texas, which shall be matched by an equal amount of State funds from State sources, for the purpose of improving wastewater treatment in colonias in that 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 that State; \$70,000,000 shall be for making grants under section 1443(a) of the Public Health Service Act; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$369,700,000 shall be for making grants with a 55 percent Federal share for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in Senate Report 103-311: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$500,000,000 made available under this heading in Public Law 103-124, and ear-

marked to not become available until May 31, 1994, which date was extended to September 30, 1994, in Public Law 103-211, shall be available immediately and without further authorization for making grants with a 55 percent Federal share for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in Senate Report 103-311: *Provided further*, That the grant awarded from funds appropriated under the paragraph with the heading "Construction grants" in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1990 (103 Stat. 858) for construction of a connector sewer line, consisting of a main trunk line and 4 pump stations for the town of Honea Path, South Carolina, to the wastewater treatment facility in the town of Ware Shoals, South Carolina, shall include demolition of Chiquola Mill Lagoon, Clatworthy Lagoon, Corner Creek Lagoon, and Still Branch Lagoon: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for State revolving funds shall be allocated based on the 1992 Needs Survey Report to Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE/STATE REVOLVING FUND

For necessary expenses for capitalization grants for State revolving funds to support water infrastructure financing, and to carry out the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Water Quality Act of 1987, \$2,962,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$22,500,000 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, and shall be available only upon enactment of clean water authorizing legislation, but if no such legislation is enacted by November 1, 1994, these funds shall immediately be available; \$52,500,000 shall be for section 510 of the Water Quality Act of 1987; \$70,000,000 shall be for making grants under section 1443(a) of the Public Health Service Act; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$781,800,000 shall be available upon enactment of clean water authorizing legislation, but if no such legislation is enacted by November 1, 1994, the funds shall then be available for making grants for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in House Report 103-715: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$500,000,000 made available under this heading in Public Law 103-124, and earmarked to not become available until May 31, 1994, which date was extended to September 30, 1994, in Public Law 103-211, shall be available upon enactment of clean water authorizing legislation, but if no such legislation is enacted by September 30, 1994, these funds shall then be available for making grants for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in House Report 103-715: *Pro-*

*vided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$1,235,200,000 shall be available upon enactment of clean water state revolving fund authorizing legislation, but if no such legislation is enacted by November 1, 1994, these funds shall immediately be available for making capitalization grants under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the grant awarded from funds appropriated under the paragraph with the heading "Construction grants" in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1990 (103 Stat. 858), for construction of wastewater treatment facilities for the towns of Ware Shoals and Honea Path, South Carolina, and would include, but would not be limited to, the construction of a connector sewer line, consisting of a main trunk line and four pump stations for the town of Honea Path, South Carolina, to the wastewater treatment facility in the town of Ware Shoals, South Carolina, the upgrade and expansion of the Ware Shoals wastewater treatment plant, and the demolition of the Chiquola Mill Lagoon, the Clatworthy Lagoon, the Corner Creek Lagoon, and the Still Branch Lagoon.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 87: Page 48, after line 15 insert:

None of the funds provided in this Act may be used during fiscal year 1995 to sign, promulgate, implement or enforce the requirement proposed as "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Individual Foreign Refinery Baseline Requirements for Reformulated Gasoline" at volume 59 of the Federal Register at pages 22800 through 22814.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOEHNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate Amendment #87 to the bill, H.R. 4624, and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The debate is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER]. 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].

□ 1920

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my motion to insist on the House position on amendment numbered 87.

I wish to discuss this amendment, which prohibits the promulgation, implementation, and enforcement of a proposed rule by the environmental protection agency concerning the regulation of fuels and their baseline requirements. At issue in this proposed rule is whether, under certain circumstances, imported reformulated gasoline should be calculated using a baseline similar to that used for domestic reformulated gasoline.

Unfortunately, there has been much confusion as well as misinformation about this particular rulemaking and the process used in revising the original EPA decision. I, too, have reservations about the proposed rule and the process used by EPA in proposing this rule—in fact, I signed a letter to the President in June expressing my concern about it and the rulemaking process used. However, I am not here to discuss the contents of the rule or its merits at this time. I am now asking that the House position be retained: that no language concerning the reformulated gasoline rule be included in the bill.

There was no language in our bill when the bill left the House and I am asking that we keep that position.

Basically, the Senate Amendment reopens the Clean Air Act. While this provision can be considered a limitation, which technically is in the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, it does prohibit EPA from acting in any manner on this issue and prevents EPA from making rules under the guidelines of the Clean Air Act—which in this case is the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. This Appropriations Subcommittee is being asked to include a provision with no hearings or debate by this subcommittee on this particular issue.

It is my understanding that the appropriate legislative committees have, in fact, held hearings on this issue and can more effectively address any deficiencies in the proposed rule. As recently as June 22, 1994, the Committee on Energy and Commerce held oversight hearings regarding the process followed by the EPA, the State Department, and the U.S. Trade Representative in the development of this proposal. This conference report is not the appropriate venue for such a debate.

There is no question that there are many controversial and complex issues surrounding this proposed rule. How-

ever, this rule is not yet completed. I would urge those interested in this proposed rule to work through the appropriate channels and process by making comments to EPA rather than circumventing this established process by prohibiting EPA from acting upon this rule. Because this rule is still pending, efforts to upset it legislatively through a rider on an appropriations bill would be quite disruptive to the process.

I would urge my colleagues in the House to insist upon the House position on this matter which is to reject the Senate amendment.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do so, rising with no small amount of trepidation, for I have expressed to the House on a number of occasions today that my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, LOU STOKES and I have worked very, very closely on this bill and we disagree on absolutely nothing. We do have a little difference in understanding of what this amendment is all about. I must say when this issue arose, I could not help but react to it in a couple of ways. First of all, the issue flows around the admission of Venezuelan oil into this country, oil that is refined in a fashion that provides less in terms of air quality standards than refining that is done in this country. I have reacted in two ways: The first involves my work for many, many years as the chairman of the select subcommittee dealing with air quality in the California State Legislature. During those years, we took major steps moving the direction of putting pressure on American industry, putting pressure on American automobile drivers to do all that we possible could to make sure that emissions from stationary sources or emissions from automobiles were operating at the highest possible level in terms of improving our air quality. This amendment, which was put in the bill by Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland, is designed to make sure that our manufacturers and their market share is protected by making certain that Venezuelan oil and other imported oil meets the same standards.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, it is very strange in an issue like this to find this combination of people supporting the Mikulski position, thereby supporting the Boehner proposal. The Sierra Club is supporting the Boehner position. Listen to that. The Sierra Club is supporting the Boehner position. The Defenders of Wildlife are supporting the Boehner position. Friends of the Earth are supporting Mr. BOEHNER and my position.

Having said that, there are oil companies, chemical workers, the Atomic Workers Union, Public Citizen, Independent Refiners Coalition, et cetera,

et cetera, all have come together miraculously to support the Boehner position. I would like to say that was simply because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] and I were supporting that position, but it is Ms. MILUKSKI's impact on this issue that is really making the difference. The gentleman from Maryland in our conference expressed very clearly the reality that it would be a serious mistake for us to allow and establish a precedent whereby oil coming from a foreign country, in this case Venezuela, does not have to meet the same standards that oil does that is produced and used by manufacturers here at home. The correct position on this in terms of American refiners' market share is to support the Boehner position. The correct position on this if Members are concerned about improving our air and making sure that we set clear standards regarding manufactured products that will be used in this country is to support the Boehner, Lewis, and Mikulski position and I urge my colleagues to join us in that position.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Stokes motion on H.R. 4624, insisting on the adoption of the House position on foreign refinery reformulated gas imports. In addition to the concerns already raised, I would like to point out that the enactment of the Senate amendment will create a non-tariff trade barrier in violation of the national treatment clause of the GATT. In fact, Venezuela has already filed a GATT challenge.

The principle of non-discriminatory, national treatment that is embodied in GATT for imported products vis-a-vis domestic production is critical to the effective working of the global trading system. Some have contended that GATT provides an exception for measures that are necessary to protect health and the environment, and it is therefore acceptable to discriminate against foreign gasoline. This argument does not hold water. GATT does provide an exception for these measures, but only if they are not applied in an arbitrary or discriminatory manner, are not a disguised restriction on trade, and are necessary under established GATT doctrine. Moreover, a health-related measure is only considered "necessary" if there is not an alternative less inconsistent with GATT that could be expected to achieve the same policy goals.

In the instance under debate, there is a less trade-restrictive means of accomplishing the goals of the Clean Air

Act Amendments of 1990 than enacting the Senate amendment. Namely, foreign refiners should be allowed to comply with the Clean Air Act standards in the same manner as domestic refiners, just as the Environmental Protection Agency has recommended in its proposed modifications to its reformulated gasoline regulations.

The United States has made great strides in recent years toward opening our markets and removing barriers to free trade. It makes no sense to arbitrarily erect a barrier which will wreak havoc in the gasoline market and deny foreign gasoline access to our markets. Currently, the United States imports between 3 and 7 percent of the gasoline it uses each day. A worst case scenario of the effect of the Senate amendment is that all imports would be cut off due to a regulation that has two sets of rules—one for domestic refiners and one for foreign refiners. As we all know, international trade is a two-way street. If we suddenly deny \$5 billion in imports, our exports will suffer—make no mistake about it.

We often debate fair trade versus free trade. In this particular instance, they are the same. It is entirely fitting for us to allow foreign refiners to meet the standards of the Clean Air Act in the same manner that is used by domestic industry. It would be entirely inappropriate for us to create two separate standards. Moreover, enactment of the Senate amendment would seriously impact fuel supplies in the U.S. market and I include in the RECORD a letter that I received from a company in my district, State Oil Co., which explains how the Senate provision would severely restrict imports of reformulated gasoline. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the House position on the proposed EPA rule for equal treatment of reformulated gasoline by voting "yes" on the Stokes motion.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter referred to in my remarks, as follows:

STATE OIL CO.,

Grayslake, IL, September 1, 1994.

Re VA-HUD appropriations—foreign refiner baseline.

HON. PHILLIP CRANE,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CRANE: As a distributor of motor fuels in Illinois and Kentucky, we are writing to you to express our concern regarding the Conference Report on H.R. 4624. This bill contains a provision inserted by Senator Barbara Mikulski, which House conferees refused to agree to, that would forbid EPA from implementing the foreign refiner baseline rule during FY 95.

This provision is of extreme concern to our Company. If this provision is enacted and EPA is prevented from according equal treatment to foreign refiners, there will be significant negative consequences for motor fuel suppliers. The Mikulski provision is an attempt to restrict imports and eliminate competitions from the free market.

As you know, independent motor fuel marketers neither explore for crude oil nor

produce petroleum products. Our very existence in the U.S. market is wholly dependent upon the existence of numerous sources of supply, both foreign and domestic. Supplies are already expected to decrease even without provisions like the one pushed by Senator Mikulski. Some foreign refiners have already informed their customers that they will not produce RFG for export to the U.S. If other foreign refiners, who do plan to export RFG to the U.S. are precluded from doing so, our sources of supply will be dramatically reduced. Enactment of this provision would prevent the importation of environmentally-sound RFG. If there is a shortage of supply of RFG, no area of the country will be immune and prices will rapidly escalate.

We are urging you to strenuously object to the approval of this Senate amendment. Not only would its adoption severely limit the available sources of supply for independent marketers, it would set a dangerous precedent, lead to shortage and mean higher prices for consumers. Further, we do not feel Appropriations legislation is the appropriate vehicle for Clean Air Act legislative amendments.

The House will debate the foreign baseline issue soon after you return from the Labor Day Recess. We hope we can count on your vote to reject the Senate amendment. Thank you for your attention to this very urgent matter.

Sincerely,

PETER ANEST,  
President.

□ 1930

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my motion would have the House recede to the Senate and require the EPA to abide by the rule it promulgated last December and not arbitrarily make changes to fulfill a secret deal between the State Department and the Venezuelan Government.

The Senate version of the conference report would prevent foreign refiners from importing a low-quality gasoline that undermines the benefits of the Clean Air Act.

I believe Congress should not allow foreign refiners to be given special exemptions which allow the importation of poorer quality gasoline into the United States while the domestic industry must invest millions of dollars to produce environmentally acceptable gasoline.

The Venezuelans have claimed that they can not meet the stricter standards. In fact, the state-owned company is the third largest oil company in the world. It's American subsidiary—Citgo—has its brand on over 12,500 service stations. Poverty? I do not think so. I think there is another reason.

Domestic oil companies will have to invest \$37 billion over the next 10 years to comply with the Clean Air Act, while the industry's total capitalization is valued at only \$31 billion. It should not be the policy of this Government to use exemptions from our environmental laws to give foreign com-

petitors an advantage over our domestic companies.

If we allow the importation of gasoline that does not comply with our laws, other sectors may be forced to make greater reductions to ensure overall reductions to meet the Clean Air Act. Congress would be forcing small businesses in the Northeast to bear a greater share of the burden so that foreign gasoline would not have to meet the stricter standard. I for one will not support pushing any more mandates on the backs of our small businesses. We should be doing things to spur economic growth, not further hinder it.

Foreign refiners should not get special treatment. If it is good enough for Venezuela, it ought to be good enough for the domestic producers in our country. I urge my colleagues to support my motion to concur with the Senate.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to support the position of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) on this issue. This is no trivial matter and it puts at risk, at great risk, the consumers of gasoline in the 10 largest cities in this country as well as putting at risk a policy we are trying to put in place on the environmental side of the equation.

What is to occur next January is that in these 10 communities there must be a new gasoline that is cleaner. The rule that EPA has put forth now that was under debate here does in fact treat the foreign, namely Venezuelan oil, the same as it treats American oil. The fact is some American companies would like an advantage. I do not blame them. But what is going to happen is about 3 to 4 percent of the supply of gasoline for the Americans next January will not be available unless American refineries can outperform themselves and produce it.

We have a problem already, and that is whether or not we can make this marketplace work next January, because we have a new Government policy that we endorsed during the Bush administration and we endorsed it here in the Congress. We should not now at this late date add another major hurdle to be gotten over because, ladies and gentlemen, if we are wrong in our votes today, and I think it is wrong if we support the Mikulski position, if we are wrong in that, what we will see is a shortage next January with a concomitant price increase that would be anywhere from 10 cents to 50 cents additional cost per gallon to a consumer in these cities. Nobody knows for sure.

If Members do not believe what I am saying and others are saying, look at what happened last January when we phased in the first part of the clean diesel for a much smaller market in this country, for trucking. Some of my

colleagues got letters and angry calls from truckers as they saw the price spike for 2 weeks, 3 weeks, and 4 weeks at a time at very high rates. Fortunately it did even out then, so we saw the tempers reduce themselves.

But we are putting at risk the consumers in this country, and I think creating a political backlash to environmental policy that we want to see work. It is very late in the game. The oil industry has rightfully been complaining that we did not have the rules straight and square so they could plan because they are making major investments to meet this policy.

But some in that industry are now wanting us to switch those rules so they will apply differently to Venezuela. Ladies and gentleman, it does not matter whether Members are for or against Venezuela, it matters whether they are for or against making this environmental policy work, it matters whether they are for or against helping the American consumer next January, and this is one in which we will be able to identify who caused the problem, and it will be right here in the House of Representatives, or in the U.S. Senate if this thing goes awry next January.

The prudent thing to do is to support the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JOE BARTON.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Boehner amendment. I think we need to cut right to the chase. This is purely and simply a case of where a foreign refiner is asking for an exemption that is not going to be given to any of our domestic refiners or any other foreign refiners in the world.

Under the Clean Air Act amendments it was decided that in 1995 certain non-attainment areas in this country were going to have to comply with the Clean Air Act by using reformulated gasoline. Under that eventually about one-third of the gasoline in this country is going to be reformulated. In other words, it is going to have a higher oxygen content, and supposedly this is going to reduce nitrous oxides and other VOC's, volatile organic compounds.

The EPA, in trying to comply with the act, set up proposed standards using a complex computer model that was going to require the use of reformulated gasoline according to each refiner's 1990 baseline. It turns out that some of the foreign refiners did not have any data on what their baseline was, so the EPA initially ruled that foreign refiners would have to use kind of an average baseline based on the domestic refiners in this country.

The bottom line is that the EPA said that anybody selling gasoline in the U.S. market had to have a certain oxygen content. Everybody accepted that

except Venezuela, and they said, "We can't do that. It is unfair. We do not have the data." So under pressure from the State Department and the U.S. Trade Representative, the EPA set an exemption only for Venezuela. I think that is patently unfair. If we are going to enforce the Clean Air Act, we ought to enforce it uniformly. Let Venezuela challenge under GATT. GATT specifically says each nation can set standards for safety, health, and environment. That is what the EPA is doing. It should be uniform. We should support the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] and support the Senate position. This is one of those rare occasions where we will be on the side of the energy industry in this Nation, on the side of the environmental community in this Nation, and on the side of the buy American community in this Nation.

Vote for Boehner. Vote yes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Chairman LOUIS STOKES.

I am equally sympathetic to the limitation adopted by the Senate because it is consistent with the information provided to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which I chair, at its hearing of June 22, 1994. The problem is that the Senate limitation is defective because it is anticipated that the Environmental Protection Agency will finalize its rule in fiscal year 1994, not fiscal year 1995. This fact was communicated to Chairman STOKES in my letter of August 9, 1994, along with my concern about efforts to amend the Clean Air Act directly or indirectly.

I am greatly concerned that the administration, particularly the State Department, entered into agreements with the Venezuelan Government to promulgate such a rule in order to provide Venezuelan refiners with an alternative baseline which could be less environmentally sound and give an advantage to the Venezuelans over United States domestic refiners. As I said at our hearing, the results of our investigation "has caused me to question whether the State Department is functioning here as part of the executive branch of the U.S. Government or a lobbying arm of foreign countries or foreign refiners and suppliers."

Venezuelan gasoline is high in gasoline and olefins. It creates oxides of nitrogen which can exacerbate ozone. Despite this, the EPA apparently contends that the proposed rule is sound because of a volume cap urged by the State Department. I am not convinced.

Since our hearing, the subcommittee has raised additional questions about

this special interest rule and the EPA has yet to respond. Possibly, the EPA's failure to act on this rule, is evidence that the EPA has decided that it is not in the public's interest to promulgate this rule. I hope this is the case.

Before closing, I want to stress that I continue to be very concerned that the EPA and the Department of Energy are not adequately on top of the question of whether there will be adequate gasoline supplies in all regions of the country beginning next December. This is a matter of high concern to the Congress and to our subcommittee. I have asked the Energy Information Administration to examine this matter and to provide a report in a few weeks. I assure you that we will hold additional hearings on these matters if we have any inkling of inadequate supplies or price spikes.

□ 1940

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY].

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my chair for the handling of this bill, but from time to time we will disagree on several points; some of them are points that folks consider minor, others consider them major, but we will disagree on this one point.

The issue of importing dirtier oil from foreign countries has haunted me for more than a year now. I rise in support of amendment 87 because foreign refiners should not be able to establish their own RFG baseline. I believe this not only because of the negative environmental impacts of smog-forming contents such as olefins, but also because of the unfair economic disadvantage that is dealt to our domestic refiners when these independent baselines are allowed to exist.

Amendment 87 takes the step we need to put this nightmare to rest. The EPA promulgated its final rule last December, and although it seems sad that we must force the agency to comply with its own rule, it is clearly the only way we can be assured that our environment remains protected and that our domestic refiners are competing on a level playing ground.

Passage of this will mean that the air we breathe from New York City to Norristown—and across this country—will be better, safer, and cleaner.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

This is without question a part of the protectionist past that comes to haunt the consumers of today, not only as an

environmental issue but also as a price issue. If any of you happen to have domestic oil companies headquartered in your district, make sure you vote with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER]. That is the correct vote. I do not want to mislead you.

However, if, on the other hand, all you happen to have is consumers in your district and you want to make sure that you have access to the low price and environmentally acceptable Venezuelan oil, then you better vote no, because at the end of the day that is all it boils down to. This is nothing more than a disguised oil import fee that will allow the domestic oil companies to wall out imported oil.

If you are a consumer driving your automobile in Massachusetts or in Maryland or in Michigan or any other part of this country, all that is going to happen here is that if your particular part of the country is dependent upon imported oil, your prices are going up with no environmental benefit for the country. The only benefit will flow to the domestic oil companies. That is what this is all about. It is oil import fee in a different guise.

How you vote on oil import fee on this floor at other times is how you should vote tonight. It is as simple as that, the domestic oil companies trying to ratchet up the price by keeping out imported oil at the expense of the American consumer, and in many instances, and in this particular case, the American environment as well.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the author of this privileged motion, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I find it rather ironic that three of the major high-ranking Members including the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce have come to the well of the House asking us to vote against my motion and basically asking the House to grant the country of Venezuela a break from the Clean Air Act that they wrote.

If I recall correctly, the three gentleman from the committee who were here in the well of the House all voted for the Clean Air Act. This is their bill, and if it is good enough for the refiners in this country, if it is good enough for the consumers in this country, then why is it not good enough for the people of Venezuela who want to export oil to our country?

For them to be down in the well of the House claiming that if we do not allow this cheap, dirty gas in, American consumers are going to pay the bill, I find it just somewhat ironic.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SHARP. First of all, we dispute this notion that this oil is dirtier.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE], a great fighter for the environment, a Member who has fought all the time she has been here for jobs in America.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that agreement can be reached among environmental groups, labor groups, regulators and industry. But on this issue they do agree. They are against the proposal to allow special exemptions on the quality of gasoline foreign refiners export to the United States.

In testimony before the Senate Environment Committee, The Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife, and the Center for International Environmental Law have joined the Independent Refiners Coalition in stating that the Venezuelan deal is "flawed trade policy, unsound environmental policy, and nonsensical economic policy." Labor organizations, such as the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union and the AFL-CIO, have opposed strongly the foreign baseline. The coalitions of State air quality regulators from 17 mid-Atlantic and Northeastern States oppose this proposal as well. Why give foreign refiners an advantage over our domestic companies while at the same time undermining the clean air provisions?

Let us hold foreign refiners to the same environmental standards we have set for our own domestic industry. Vote for the BOEHNER motion to concur with Senate Amendment No. 87.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important we address this question whether this oil is dirtier or cleaner or what is the circumstance on this issue.

I really hold no particular brief for Venezuela. The point is the American consumers are being told somehow they are going to get a dirtier deal, and that is fundamentally untrue.

There are several surveys that exist which compare gasoline which has multiple kinds of chemicals in it with each other.

□ 1950

The fact is nothing different is being done for Venezuela that is not being done for the American refiners. They are being treated the same. For a certain portion of the gasoline, they are allowed to use their 1990 figures, and when you look at their 1909 figures, what you discover is certain prominent American companies that I could name, and I will not name them—they are on the charts—are actually polluting at a greater level for the olefins that people are talking about, even though the national average is less. And those companies will get to go ahead for the next few years and pol-

lute at those levels. If you look at one of the most dangerous chemicals in gasoline they are tightening down on, it is benzene. Many American companies will put out more gasoline with more benzene in it than Venezuela will over the next 3 years. This issue is a red-herring. It is not a question of which is cleaner; it is simply not true. The original rule that was struck down or changed back in December, that rule did treat foreign and domestic differently.

Now, why is Venezuela the issue here? Because they are only ones we are aware of so far that have been willing to make the investment in those refineries in order to meet our new standards. American companies have, naturally, done it. Venezuela is doing it. They are trying to meet this standard.

Now we have a game going here where we can exclude them. That may be all right in another time. I am not worried about that. It might even be reasonable, as argued last year. But you are arguing that 3 or 4 months before this deadline takes effect.

Ladies and gentlemen, you had better be darned right, or we are going to have a shortage next January with very high prices and some angry people are going to ask questions: "Who did this to us?"

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SHERROD BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion to concur with Senate amendment No. 87. Under the EPA rule, foreign companies will not be held to the same standards as our domestic producers because they are claiming hardship. The Venezuelans claim they cannot make gasolines that comply with the United States standard because of their own protectionist domestic content laws that get in the way. They claim American companies can buy the essential technology off the shelf and be in compliance quickly and inexpensively. They are complaining about our laws and seeking a waiver because our standards are too high and our technology is too cheap.

Let us not punish American businesses who have followed the law to give advantage to foreign competition. This is a jobs issue, this is an environmental issue, this is a fair trade issue. I ask the House to support the motion to concur with Senate amendment No. 87.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the author of this privileged motion, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of charges thrown around here on the floor tonight. One of them involves the issue of supply

and the issue of price. There is no evidence that any of the reformulated gas shortfalls really do exist as Venezuelans and others on this floor have claimed. I think you also need to consider the fact that new capacity is being brought on line quickly with the addition of significant facilities in the Virgin Islands and in Canada that can meet the specifications of the reformulated gas program as originally adopted.

In the Canadian case, their largest refiner, Irving Oil, brought new capacity on line just to meet the onerous American standards, only to find that the United States stands ready to allow Venezuelan gasoline to push them out of the market.

It is also important to note that in the area in which the Venezuelan gas is marketed, Canadians constitute twice the share of the Venezuelan gasoline. To date, in 1994, the United States has received imported gasoline from more than 17 countries. Only refiners from 2 of the 17 has commented to the EPA on their proposed rule. One of the two, Canadian refiner Irving Oil, opposed granting an exemption to Venezuela.

Opponents claim that if Venezuela is not given the exemption, we will be shorting the market by some 100,000 gallons. In 1993 Venezuela only exported 40,000 barrels a day, and in the first 5 months of this year they have only exported 30,000. Where does the 100,000 number come from?

Venezuela itself has said that under the United States standard they will still be able to produce 52,000 barrels a day. Venezuela supplies only four-tenths of 1 percent of United States gasoline supplies, four-tenths of 1 percent. EPA and the administration also have the power to waive the reformulated gas rules in emergency situations. If such a shortfall were to occur, the rules certainly could be waived.

Why give them the special waiver? Just so we do not have to spend the same capital as U.S. refiners to meet the market standards? Talk about unfairness. Today Members of Congress are getting phone calls from independent dealers all across the country who want a shot at getting this cheaper gasoline to have a competitive advantage in their markets.

I think it is a crime. I think we should not do it.

Let me make just one other point. Venezuela has dedicated \$20 billion of capital investment to bring their facilities in line to make this gasoline. But because of low crude prices, they were forced to reduce the amount of investment to \$4 billion. Can you imagine what the EPA would say to a U.S. refiner if they were to say, "We can't comply because we have low crude prices, we can't comply with these regulations"? The EPA would laugh. Yet we are going to give Venezuela a special deal. I do not think it is right. Please support my motion.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time. So, as I kind of leave this unusual circumstance, a very unusual circumstance where my chairman and I might have a minor disagreement on a technical point, I would close my comments by reminding the Members it is unusual in another way. You have Senator MIKULSKI in the other body supporting our position; Mr. BOEHNER and I are in agreement on this matter. Another unusual combination: This involves the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers Union, Independent Refiners Coalition, American Petroleum Institute, and the Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife, Friends of the Earth, and the American Corn Growers Association.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this additional time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one point. It is an absolute myth that Venezuela is being treated differently. It is an absolute myth that there is an exemption here for Venezuela or for anybody else. Every American refinery, every foreign refinery is to be treated the same in terms of the 1990 baseline for the next 3 years. That is what this is all about. It is equal treatment that it happens to work out if we do it that way, very well for the American consumer.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very interesting debate here this evening, not only has it been interesting but it has been informative and educational. But I must tell you it has nothing to do with the VA/HUD bill. If you will recall, when this bill came to the House, there was no discussion about Venezuelan oil, whether it was clean or dirty. There was no discussion, because this is not a matter that comes before the VA/HUD committee. We are not the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House. You heard from the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, who said to us that this amendment was included by the other body and it has no business on this bill. I think it is important for the House to realize that. This is why we brought the matter back to the House in true disagreement.

In conference, I made it very clear with my Senate counterpart that the House has not held hearings on this matter, on the VA/HUD bill, and it has no business on our bill. We have no authority to recede and concur to what was never discussed during the House procedures.

So that we understand now where we are—I moved that we insist upon the House position which would require you to vote "yes" on the Stokes motion.

Mr. BOEHNER has a preferential motion that takes precedence over my motion, and his motion is to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. Which means if we accept Mr. BOEHNER's motion to recede and concur that we then accept the amendment that was put on in the other body.

In order to defeat the Boehner motion you will have to vote "no," because his motion comes up first and we would have to vote it down in order to be able then to vote on the Stokes motion to insist on the House position on which we would ask you to vote "yes."

So at this time we are asking that the House vote "no" on the Boehner motion.

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

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the preferential motion.

There was no objection.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

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

Mr. BOEHNER. 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 222, nays 148, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

YEAS—222

Allard	Cardin	Franks (NJ)
Andrews (NJ)	Castle	Frost
Andrews (TX)	Chapman	Gallegly
Archer	Coble	Gekas
Armye	Coleman	Geren
Bachus (AL)	Collins (GA)	Gilchrest
Baessler	Combust	Gillmor
Baker (CA)	Costello	Gilman
Ballenger	Cox	Gingrich
Barca	Cunningham	Glickman
Barlow	Danner	Goodling
Barrett (NE)	de la Garza	Goss
Barrett (WI)	Deal	Green
Bartlett	DeLay	Greenwood
Barton	Deutsch	Gunderson
Bentley	Diaz-Balart	Hall (TX)
Bereuter	Dooley	Hancock
Bilbray	Dunn	Hansen
Bilirakis	Edwards (TX)	Harman
Boehner	Ehlers	Hastert
Bonilla	Emerson	Hayes
Borski	Evans	Hefley
Brooks	Everett	Hinchee
Brown (FL)	Ewing	Hoagland
Brown (OH)	Fawell	Hobson
Bunning	Fazio	Hochbrueckner
Burton	Fields (LA)	Hoekstra
Buyer	Fields (TX)	Hoke
Byrne	Fliner	Holden
Callahan	Fingerhut	Horn
Calvert	Fish	Hoyer
Canady	Fowler	Hunter
Cantwell	Franks (CT)	Hutto

Inglis  
Insee  
Istook  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kiecicka  
Klein  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kreidler  
LaFalce  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lehman  
Levy  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lucas  
Maloney  
Mann  
Manzullo  
Margolies-  
Mezvinisky  
Martinez  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCollum

## NAYS—148

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews (ME)  
Applegate  
Bacchus (FL)  
Barcia  
Bateman  
Beilenson  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Bonior  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Carr  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Darden  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doollittle  
Duncan  
Durbin  
English  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (TN)  
Frank (MA)  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt

McCrary  
McHale  
McInnis  
McKeon  
Menendez  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Mica  
Michel  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Molinar  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Kiecicka  
Klein  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kreidler  
LaFalce  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lehman  
Levy  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lucas  
Maloney  
Mann  
Manzullo  
Margolies-  
Mezvinisky  
Martinez  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCollum

Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Penny  
Peterson (FL)  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Ramstad  
Reed  
Roemer  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sawyer  
Schenk  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Sharp  
Shays  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Smith (IA)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Spratt  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stump  
Swift  
Tanner  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Tucker  
Unsoeld  
Valentine  
Viscosky  
Volkmer  
Walsh  
Waters  
Watt  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Woolsey  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—64

Baker (LA)  
Beccerra  
Blackwell  
Bryant  
Camp  
Clinger  
Condit  
Cooper  
Coppersmith  
DeFazio  
Derrick  
Dickey  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Edwards (CA)  
Engel  
Ford (MI)  
Gallo  
Grams  
Grandy  
Hall (OH)  
Hastings

Hefner  
Huffington  
Inhofe  
Kopetski  
Lantos  
Laughlin  
Lewis (FL)  
Machtley  
McCurdy  
McMillan  
Miller (CA)  
Mink  
Murphy  
Nadler  
Owens  
Pickett  
Portman  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Reynolds  
Ridge  
Ros-Lehtinen

Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Santorum  
Serrano  
Slattery  
Smith (OR)  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Sundquist  
Swett  
Synar  
Thomas (WY)  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Velazquez  
Washington  
Waxman  
Wilson  
Wynn  
Yates

□ 2022

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of Oregon for, with Mr. Rangel against.

Messrs. PAYNE of New Jersey, CLYBURN, HILLIARD, ACKERMAN, SCHUMER, and WALSH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARLOW, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KLEIN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the preferential motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 98:

Page 56, after line 19 insert:

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICAL FACILITIES

For construction of new national wind tunnel facilities, including final design, modification of existing facilities, necessary equipment, and for acquisition or condemnation of real property as authorized by law, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$400,000,000, to remain available until March 31, 1997.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICAL FACILITIES

## (INCLUDING RECISSION)

For construction of new national wind tunnel facilities, including final design, modification of existing facilities, necessary equipment, and for acquisition or condemnation of real property as authorized by law, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$400,000,000, to remain available until March 31, 1997: *Provided*, That the

funds made available under this heading shall be rescinded on July 15, 1995, unless the President requests at least \$400,000,000 in the fiscal year 1996 budget request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for continuation of this wind tunnel initiative.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:  
Senate amendment No. 100:  
Page 57, line 14, after "\$2,549,587,000" insert  
", to remain available until September 30, 1996".

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: , to remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under the heading "Research and program management" in Public Law 103-211, \$18,000,000 are rescinded immediately upon enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That an additional \$18,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995, shall be immediately available for research and program management activities, contingent upon the enactment of the rescission in the preceding proviso before October 1, 1994.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 111: Page 62, line 10, after "1995" insert": *Provided*, That \$190,000,000 of the funds under this heading are available for obligation for the period September 1, 1995 through August 31, 1996."

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 111, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *Provided*, That \$131,867,000 of the funds under this heading are available for obligation for the period September 1, 1995 through August 31, 1996: *Provided further*, That the funds made available in the preceding proviso shall be rescinded on July 15, 1995, unless the President requests at least \$250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1996 budget request for the National Science Foundation for academic research infrastructure activities.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 117: Page 75, after line 13 insert:

SEC. 517. None of the funds in this Act may be used to reimburse grantees for indirect costs at an amount that differs from procedures in use by Federal agencies on June 1, 1994, or from OMB Circular A-21, as published in the Federal Register on July 26, 1993, on pages 39996 through 39999.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 518. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to implement any cap on reimbursements to grantees for indirect costs, except as published in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 123: Page 75, after line 13 insert:

TITLE VI EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Community development grants", as authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, for emergency expenses resulting from the January 1994 earthquake in Southern California, \$225,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996, of which \$50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds provided under the head "Department of Education, Impact aid" in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-211): *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount, \$200,000,000 and \$25,000,000 shall be for the cities of Los Angeles and Santa Monica, California, respectively: *Provided further*, That in administering these funds, the Secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or any use by the recipient of these funds, except for statutory requirements relating to fair housing and non-discrimination, the environment, and labor standards, upon finding that such waiver is required to facilitate the obligation and use of such funds, and would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of the statute or regulation: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

For an additional amount for "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 program as authorized by title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, to be used to assist States, local communities, and businesses in recovering from the flooding and damage caused by Tropical Storm Alberto and other disasters, \$180,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent of an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive any provision of law (except for provisions relating to fair housing, the environment, or labor standards) if the Secretary determines such waiver is necessary to facilitate the obligation of the entire amount: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may transfer up to \$50,000,000 to the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, to be used for purposes related to flooding and damage caused by Tropical Storm Alberto and other disasters.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

For an additional amount for "Disaster assistance direct loan program account" for the cost of direct loans, \$12,500,000, as au-

thorized by section 417 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to be used to assist local governments in recovering from flooding and damage caused by Tropical Storm Alberto and other disasters: *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 \$50,000,000 under section 417 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act: *Provided further*, That any unused portion of the direct loan limitation and subsidy shall be available until expended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent of an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted to the Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The matter under the heading in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-211) is amended by deleting "\$950,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$775,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

TITLE VI EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Community development grants", as authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, for emergency expenses resulting from the January 1994 earthquake in Southern California, \$225,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1996, of which \$50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds provided under the head "Department of Education, Impact aid" in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-211): *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount, \$200,000,000 and \$25,000,000 shall be for the cities of Los Angeles and Santa Monica, California, respectively: *Provided further*, That in administering these funds, the Secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or any use by the recipient of these funds, except for statutory requirements relating to fair housing and nondiscrimination, the environment, and labor standards, upon finding that

such waiver is required to facilitate the obligation and use of such funds, and would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of the statute or regulation: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

For an additional amount for "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 program as authorized by title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, to be used to assist States, local communities, and businesses in recovering from the flooding and damage caused by Tropical Storm Alberto and other disasters, \$180,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive any provision of law (except for provisions relating to fair housing, the environment, or labor standards) if the Secretary determines such waiver is necessary to facilitate the obligation of the entire amount: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may transfer up to \$50,000,000 to the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, to be used for purposes related to flooding and damage caused by Tropical Storm Alberto and other disasters: *Provided further*, That the entire amount, including transfers, is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the entire amount, including transfers, shall be available only to the extent of an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted to the Congress.

#### INDEPENDENT AGENCY

##### FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for "Disaster assistance direct loan program account" for the cost of direct loans, \$12,500,000, as authorized by section 417 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to be used to assist local governments in recovering from flooding and damage caused by Tropical Storm Alberto and other disasters: *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 \$50,000,000 under section 417 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act: *Provided further*, That any unused portion of the direct loan limitation and subsidy shall be available until expended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent of an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire

amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted to the Congress.

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The matter under the heading in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-211) is amended by deleting "\$950,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$775,000,000".

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of a schedule conflict, I was unable to arrive in Washington. As a result, I missed three votes. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "no" on each of rollcall votes No. 417 and No. 418 and "yes" on rollcall vote No. 419.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, due to my unavoidable absence on Monday, September 12, I was unable to record my vote during even rollcalls, Nos. 417 through 419, inclusive. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 417, and I would have voted "no" on rollcall Nos. 418 and 419.

#### 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 on the conference report on H.R. 4624, as well as the Senate amendments reported in disagreement, and that I may include tables, charts and other extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

#### POSTPONEMENT OF VOTE ON H.R. 4308, NORTH AMERICAN WET- LANDS CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule I, the Chair redesignates Tuesday, September 13, 1994, as the time for resumption of pro-

ceedings on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4308.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PELOSI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994 and June 10, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I very seldom ever take or participate in Special Orders. I realize they are expensive to the taxpayer, and I sometimes question the effectiveness. But the topic this evening is so important and so time sensitive, we have very little time left to try to prevent the President from doing what would be the most incredible thing and the worst thing any commander in chief could do, and that would be to send young men and young women into Haiti to lose their lives.

I pleaded in three letters to the President not to make this mistake of sending troops into Haiti. The response I have received is that the administration is committed to restoring democracy. My response to that letter has been, how can you restore something that has never been in the first place? There has never been a democracy in Haiti.

From 1843 to 1915, there were 22 different despots in Haiti.

□ 2030

Only one, only one, ever served their entire time. From the middle of 1880 to 1910, we had eight United States interventions, troops going into Haiti on eight different occasions, from 1880 to 1910.

Did we do anything good for Haiti by doing that? The answer is no. Did democracy take roots while we were there? The answer is no. We went back in again in 1915. This time we stayed for 19 years, 19 years, and again, no roots for democracy took place. Nothing happened good as far as Haiti is concerned.

How long do we stay this time, Madam Speaker? Who knows. We stayed 19 years the last time, and nothing good happened, but this time we could have troops being picked off constantly while we are there trying to keep peace or developing a democracy.

There is no bilateral or unilateral group that can move into Haiti and develop a democracy. It has not happened before; it will not happen now. No security interests for the United States are

there, unlike those that were either perceived or were real in the Cuban Soviet concern in the sixties, or the Soviet Grenada concerns in the 1980's, no security interests for the United States.

There are no Americans at risk in Haiti. All those Americans in Haiti at the present time said the only risk they will ever have is if we move into Haiti. Then their lives will be at risk. They are not at risk now. They want us to stay out. That is what we should do.

Madam Speaker, we rightfully helped prevent starvation and death due to illness in Rwanda, and we do that rightfully. At the same time, we have a policy to cause starvation and death due to sickness in Haiti.

Tonight is the night, I would say to the Members, when all of the Members who feel as strongly as I do about this issue have to make it clear to the administration how we feel. Tonight is the night for all of those constituents in everybody's district who feel strongly about the fact that we have no business sending young men and women into Haiti, get the phones ringing at the White House. You may be too late by tomorrow or the end of the week. Do it tonight. No troops, no American young men and women, die in Haiti.

#### A STRONG DEFENSE FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Speaker, despite the doubling of President Bush's reductions in defense spending since entering office, President Clinton has always promised the American people that he would provide our soldiers, allies, and the American people with defense against missile attacks from the likes of North Korea, Saddam Hussein, Mu'ammar Qadhafi, various Iranians, and other lost souls throughout this world who have access to high and capable technology that might threaten the United States.

No longer do we face a threat from the Soviet Union, thankfully, since the collapse of the evil empire of communism. No longer do we expect the onslaught of some 10,000 or 15,000 missiles, or 35,000 warheads.

However, it is quite possible that we would, at some point in the coming years, face the possibility of one or two incoming ballistic missiles or nuclear-tipped air breathing missiles or the like, and the fact is that we understand that confidential arms control talks are currently going on in Geneva, and have been for the last year, and that President Clinton's State Department and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency are unilaterally giving away our country's ability to test and deploy effective missile defenses.

Mr. Speaker, under the guise of clarifying the 1972 ABM Treaty—which I

would submit does not exist, because that was a treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union does not exist, so there is no ABM treaty—but under the guise of clarifying that treaty, Clinton administration officials have agreed to proposals from the Russian republic, and have offered some of their own, that would prevent us from testing or deploying sea-based, air-based, space-based, and many ground-based theater missile defenses. At the very least, they would restrict those defenses.

Mr. Speaker, these programs include such programs as the Navy's sea-based theater missile defense program, including the upper tier program; the Air Force boost phased intercept program, the space-based programs, and more advanced Army theater high altitude area defense systems. These are the systems that we are developing that will keep incoming missiles from hitting American people.

President Clinton has not told the American people, but the fact is that today, mid-September, 1994, we do not have the capacity to intercept an incoming ballistic missile in any reasonable fashion in this Nation, which means that if an incoming nuclear-tipped warhead were to come by way of outer space into the continental United States, millions of Americans could die. It is that simple.

The Navy theater missile defense, including the upper tier program, has been called one of the most promising and effective near-term missile defense programs we could deploy by Ambassador Hank Cooper, President Bush's missile defense director.

There are various other systems that are ongoing which have proven, likewise, very, very capable. Within the matter of a very short period of time, perhaps two or three years at most, we could actually develop systems which could intercept those missiles and save millions of Americans from being wiped out in a nuclear holocaust.

Madam Speaker, I would like to incorporate in my remarks a column by Mr. Frank Gaffney from the Center for Security Policy, which elaborates on the concern that I have that right now the Clinton administration is negotiating away the speed, the range, the number, the capacity of our current systems, or the systems that we are developing, so we will not necessarily be able to intercept those incoming nuclear or chemically or biologically equipped warheads.

That worries me, Madam Speaker, worries me greatly, worries me that we have already in those negotiations conceded interim limits on sea-based theater missile defense missiles. We have already conceded the prohibition of space-based theater missile defense interceptors and missiles. We have already prohibited bomber deployment of air-based theater missile defense mis-

siles. We have already prohibited nuclear-tipped theater missile defense missiles. We have already limited air-based theater missile defense missile volume.

Those are technical terms, but basically they mean we have conceded already that we will unilaterally not develop that which is technology capable for us to develop, and we will bind our hands, and we will not intercept missiles with certain capacities or capability, even though we have that capability to develop those defenses. That is tying our hands behind our backs and allowing somebody to hit us right in the nose.

Madam Speaker, on the table and not yet agreed to, but possibly which might be agreed to before Boris Yeltsin comes to meet with President Clinton in a summit within a matter of a few weeks, are the possibility of limiting velocity of air-based theater missile defenses, a possibility of limiting land-based theater missile defense systems to a very low velocity, the possibility of limiting all theater missile defense interceptor missile systems in velocity, and the possibility of limiting interceptor ranges of air-based theater missile defense systems.

□ 2040

This does not make sense, nor does it make sense to possibly prohibit testing of theater missile defenses during certain phases of incoming or target missile flight. Yet we are negotiating the prohibition of such testing. Nor does it make sense to limit the theater missile defense which has recently been proposed by Russia and more details are being compiled on that.

Madam Speaker, I would urge the President and the administration and the State Department and everyone answerable to President Clinton not to negotiate away the capacity of the American people to defend ourselves against incoming missiles.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the decision brief from the Center for Security Policy and Treaty Proposals to Restrict Theater Missile Defense, as follows:

#### MORE STEPS ON THE SLIPPERY SLOPE TOWARD TERMINATING U.S. THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE OPTIONS

Washington, D.C.—In recent months, the Clinton Administration has made steady progress in negotiating away what little latitude remains to the United States in developing effective defenses against missile attack. Since the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty essentially precludes useful strategic defense (i.e., those against intercontinental-range missiles), as long as the United States continues to be bound by this treaty, the best hope for acquiring militarily useful and efficient anti-missile capabilities has been through theater missile defense (TMD) which are not constrained by the Treaty. Thanks to Clinton diplomatic initiatives with the Kremlin, however, this option is also about to be permanently foreclosed.

THE LATEST "BREAKTHROUGH"—MORE EROSION  
IN THE U.S. POSITION

The vehicle for accomplishing such an undesirable goal has been negotiations nominally aimed at developing amendments to the ABM Treaty that would define the differences between limited strategic missile defenses and "unconstrained" TMD systems. In practice, the result of these negotiations has been to develop what amounts to a new Anti-Theater Ballistic Missile Treaty—a document that not only defines but bans the most promising means of defending against shorter-range missile attacks.

The latest developments in these negotiations occurred as a result of meetings held during the week of 11 July when the Clinton Administration dispatched a high level team to Moscow, Kiev, and Minsk to present a new U.S. position on defining TMD demarcation. The American delegation, led by the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, John Holum, informed its interlocutors that the U.S. was prepared to accept Moscow's standing demand for stringent limitations on the velocities permitted theater anti-missile interceptors. (This concession would round out an earlier, disastrous decision undertaken unilaterally by the Clinton team permanently to ban space-based theater missile defenses.)

Specifically, the United States would agree to 3 kilometer/second as an upper limit for deployed ground- and sea-based systems. The Holum team announced, however, that it wanted to preserve the option to test higher velocity systems for "ascent-phase" defense. (This going-in position would have protected the right to test the Navy's promising "Upper Tier" program, but not to deploy it.) At the same time, the U.S. indicated it was amenable to operational restrictions regarding range, payload, and size of an interceptor that would so limit the defensive capabilities of higher velocity ascent-phase interceptors as to render them essentially useless.

THE RUSSIAN RESPONSE: PAR FOR THE COURSE

The Russians are clearly determined to settle for nothing less than restrictions that will preclude promising American defensive technologies. As the Center noted in its 30 June analysis of these negotiations, Moscow appears motivated by two considerations:

"(First,) they already have deployed reasonably effective defenses against shorter-range missile attack—and even some longer-range missiles—while the U.S. has not. Such a strategic situation has traditionally been viewed by Moscow as a desirable one and the Russians have gone to great lengths in their propaganda and diplomatic machinations to perpetuate it.

"(Second,) the Russians also have another, more practical motivation for demanding the negotiation of limits that would principally have the effect of precluding advanced American theater defense programs. By constraining or precluding particularly those U.S. systems that can be easily retrofitted into existing weapons platforms, Moscow will eliminate competition for the potentially lucrative international market in such defenses. Russian officials have described this market as a "gold mine"; Moscow clearly would like to ensure that its SA-10, SA-12, S-300 and other air-defense/ATBM systems remain best positioned to exploit it."

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the Kremlin reacted to the Administration's proposal by allowing that it represented progress, but did not go far enough in limiting TMD systems under the ABM Treaty. For its part, the Administration was aston-

ished that Moscow would want still more constraints. Therefore, Washington pushed to hold further discussions in the form of an "experts meeting" held in Geneva during the last week of July.

MORE EROSION

On 25 July, the U.S. acting representative to the Standing Consultative Commission, Stanley Riveles, took up the mission of explaining the "logic" behind the U.S. position initially laid out by the Holum's delegation earlier that month.<sup>3</sup> After two weeks of exploring the Clinton Administration's latest capitulation to its demands, Moscow insisted on even more.

On 8 August, the Russian team presented a proposal creatively worded to look like an acceptance of the U.S. position. In fact, it amounted to a repackaging of the Kremlin's original demand for 3 kilometer/second velocity limits across the board (i.e., for land-, sea-, and air-based theater missile defense systems). The Russian position boils down to an insistence on an interceptor velocity limit of 3 kilometer/second in testing and/or deploying any TMD systems with the exception of a limited number of higher-velocity tests for "ascent phase" defense concepts. In effect, this low limit would kill U.S. plans for Navy's "Upper Tier" missile defense, and every other advanced TMD program the U.S. currently has under development. The Russians also proposed additional, ill-defined restrictions on deployed systems—such as range and operating mode—that would affect all U.S. TMD systems and further hamper effective missile defenses.

Riveles either did not recognize that the Russian proposal was even more restrictive than the U.S. position on the table—or, like many others in the Clinton Administration, supports measures to preclude missile defenses of virtually any kind. That same night he transmitted Moscow's proposal to Washington and asked for permission to accept it! The Russian proposal circulated through the interagency process on 9 August.

Perhaps concerned that such a swift and abject capitulation would reinforce criticism of how it is conducting these negotiations, the Clinton team declined to approve Riveles' request for instructions, directing him instead to return to Washington on 12 August for consultations. An interagency meeting on the subject is scheduled for 29 August.

If past experience is any guide, it is a safe bet that the upshot will be further erosion in the U.S. position—if not outright acceptance of the latest Russian demands. The Administration's hope apparently continues to be that some deal on theater missile defenses could be signed at the late September summit meeting in Washington between President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

MEANWHILE, ON CAPITOL HILL

In light of a requirement added to the FY1995 Defense authorization bill that requires any "substantive change" to the ABM Treaty to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, the Clinton Administration has been quietly lobbying Senators to minimize any opposition its give-away on missile defenses might encounter. Robert Bell, a member of the National Security Council staff and former Senate staffer, has spent a considerable amount of time meeting with certain Republican Senators trying to convince them that the Clinton Administration truly is committed to effective theater missile defense, notwithstanding its track record in negotiating with the Russians.

This argument largely rests on the contention that the Army's Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system has been fully protected by the emerging agreement and its development and deployment will be facilitated by the success of these negotiations. Actually, as noted in the Center's 30 June *Decision Brief*:

"Even the Army's THAAD system . . . will very likely wind up being constrained by the 3 kilometers/second interceptor velocity limitation. The Demonstration and Evaluation (DEVAL) version of the THAAD system now under development has an interceptor velocity of 2.4 kilometers/second—reduced from 2.6 km/sec a few months ago. Even if the so-called "Objective System" intended ultimately to be deployed can be constrained to velocities less than the limit, future growth options to give the THAAD interceptor more capability will be foreclosed."

Under such circumstances it is not clear that THAAD will have sufficient capability and cost-effectiveness to secure the necessary sustained support required for its procurement and deployment. Indeed, some of the strongest supporters of missile defenses have concluded that any THAAD likely to emerge from these negotiations will not be worth having.

Even though all 44 Republican Senators signed a letter on 22 March 1994 indicating that if the negotiations were to "add constraints on TMD interceptors and sensor characteristics . . . precluding a class of TMD . . . it is unlikely that we would be able to support any such agreement," Bell has reported having "some success" with the targets of his lobbying. He has, for example, told his superiors in the White House that Senator John Warner is "in my pocket" and will accept the Administration's capitulation on effective missile defenses.

Fortunately, other influential legislators have begun to register their strong opposition to the Clinton effort to garrotte what remains of U.S. options to defend against missile attack. In two similar letters to President Clinton, over 50 senior members of the House of Representatives—including most of that chamber's Republican leadership—have forcefully objected to any action that would negotiate away America's right to effective theater missile defenses. For example, a letter signed by Reps. Newt Gingrich, Dick Army, Henry Hyde, Floyd Spence and thirty-five other Members of Congress observed:

"We know of no compelling argument for limiting our freedom to pursue theater defense options with the very best technology we are capable of developing . . . No one can now anticipate the technical accomplishments we may be able to achieve in the future. Nor can we know what missile threats to our theater forces will emerge over the next 10, 20 or 30 years. That is why it would be short-sighted in the extreme to accept limits now, after the end of the Cold War, in the context of an ABM Treaty of declining relevance and whose provisions were never intended to limit theater defenses."

THE BOTTOM LINE

Before the Clinton Administration takes any further steps down the proverbial "slippery slope" represented by negotiating new limits on missile defenses with the Russians, the Congress and the American people need to be heard from. The majority appear adamantly opposed to perpetuating the Nation's present, absolute vulnerability to shorter-range missile attack—a stance incidentally shared, at least rhetorically, by President Clinton himself. Their interests should not

be disserved, and their intelligence insulted, by new agreements that will deny the United States the most effective (and perhaps any) theater missile defense options.

TREATY PROPOSALS TO RESTRICT THEATRE  
MISSILE DEFENSE

INITIAL U.S. PROPOSAL IN 1993.

1—Limit to 5km per second the velocity of target (or incoming) missiles.

PROPOSALS CURRENTLY ON THE TABLE

1—"Interim" limit of 3km/per second on sea-based TMD missiles. (Navy Upper Tier velocity is currently 4 & 1/2 km/s)

2—Limit velocity of air based TMD defense. (i.e. Boost Phase Intercept (BPI))

3—Limit land based TMD systems to 3km/s velocity. (THAAD system currently 2.6km/s)

4—Limit all TMD (or interceptor) missile systems to 3km/s velocity. Would leave only limited land systems as viable options)

5—Limit interception range of air based TMD missiles.

6—Prohibit space based TMD interceptors/missiles.

7—Prohibit heavy bomber deployment of air based TMD missiles.

8—Prohibit nuclear tipped TMD missiles.

9—Limit re-entry angle of incoming missiles.

10—Limit air based TMD missile volume.

11—Prohibit testing of TMD systems during certain phases of incoming (or target) missile flight.

12—Limits on TMD (unspecified) to be proposed by Russia.

DO NOT INVADE HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PELOSI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor tonight with great concern about the beating drums that we are hearing in this country now on the issue of Haiti. Casper Weinberger made a speech here in Washington a number of years ago and I do not have the speech in front of me, but I hope to dig it out and bring it to the floor here in the next couple of days, talking about how the United States makes decisions on when to intervene militarily. He enumerated a number of points that needed to be examined that would essentially serve as a guidepost as to where the United States would commit forces. And in a world that has become much more confused, much more difficult to determine what actions we take, I think this outline of former Secretary Weinberger should be reviewed. I argued this case when we found ourselves involved with an ever-changing mission and role in Somalia and I think that before we would take any precipitous action, we would one more time take a look at the outline of what Mr. Weinberger suggested when we decide or when we try to figure whether we want to commit U.S. forces.

The first question as I recall from that speech is, is it in the United States interest to intervene militarily? I would make the case that there has

been no clear definition of how the activities that are currently going on in Haiti directly affect the United States interests. So when it comes to United States interests, clearly the President has not made a compelling case as to how the American people should find themselves in a position of agreeing to go to Haiti because somehow this directly affects what is going on in the United States and directly affects our interest.

Second, Mr. Weinberger said, do we have a plan for getting involved? What exactly are the plans that we have? Frankly, I do not know what the plan is for going to Haiti. I do not know what the plan is for when we get to Haiti. What are we going to do? Are we going to have Mr. Aristide run the government? Is he supported by the people? There is so much confusion across this country about exactly what the plan of the President's is. Until the President can articulate that plan, clearly he does not make the second requirement that Mr. Weinberger outlined in his speech.

Thirdly, is there an exit policy? Once you get in, how do you get out? The last time we went to Haiti, we were there for 19 years. I do not anticipate that the American people would support the idea of the United States having another extended involvement in Haiti. There is no exit plan. There is only hope and a prayer and a wish that we would get in and get out quickly. But frankly without a specific plan, without a specific program, how can we begin to determine what the exit strategy will be?

Then a fourth point that Mr. Weinberger outlined was, do the American people support this military action? He considered that to be critical. You might remember during the gulf war, President Bush traveled across this country outlining the U.S. interest that was involved in terms of invading Iraq, in trying to rescue Kuwait from the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. He argued what the U.S. interests were. You might remember that former Secretary of Defense Aspin argued what the defenses were. Nukes and oil and aggression had to be stopped. You might remember that President Bush went around the country telling us how we were going to go in and essentially what the plan was, to expel Iraq from Kuwait. And in addition to that, how we were going to exit that particular situation, all of which was designed to garner public support for the military action against Saddam Hussein.

President Clinton has failed clearly to enlist United States support for a variety of reasons. One is because the President has not been able to show us the compelling reason for invading Haiti. He has not been able to show what is in the U.S. interests. He does not have a plan to go in. He does not have a plan when we get there. He does

not know how we are going to get out, and he does not therefore have the support of the American people. These are the compelling reasons as to why the House of Representatives, this body, must vote on whether the United States is going to intervene militarily in Haiti.

In this House, we have had many debates about military operations and we have had many debates about whether we would get involved in, for instance, Nicaragua and El Salvador.

DO NOT INVADE HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kasich].

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The problem we have here is that for years whenever the United States decided to be involved in any part of the world, it was always demanded that we have a vote. I do not know how many times we voted on Nicaragua and El Salvador, the whole issue of Central America. We demanded a vote when it came to Iraq and I myself told Secretary Baker that there was no way that we could conduct a war against Saddam Hussein without having a vote. The situation in Grenada where it took emergency action, the activity in Panama designed to capture Noriega, which then-Congressman Les Aspin said we were dragging our feet on for too long, were exceptions to this rule. But when we were going to go to war against Saddam, we had the vote and we clearly should have the vote on Haiti, because what the vote would require is for the President to outline the compelling interests as to why we should go.

If the President fails to do it, ladies and gentlemen, we will be on very thin ice, because in this very dangerous and sometimes confused world, we must have a set of principles to guide ourselves when we begin to commit U.S. forces to military action and threaten their safety.

You better have a plan, you better tell people what the plan is, you better tell them what the chances of success are. You better have a way to get out once you have achieved your plan, your goals, and you had best rally the support of the American people. If you do not do those things, you are not going to have a success in foreign policy.

Mr. WALKER. I want to congratulate the gentleman for his statement. I think that it is important to reflect on exactly what the gentleman has said here this evening. I do not think that any of us doubt that the President as commander in chief has the authority to commit our troops worldwide in

emergency kinds of circumstances. That is something that a number of us have come to the floor over the years and suggested is the case. However, in the situation of Haiti, it is very clear that we are committing not only for a short duration but possibly for a long duration in that an occupation may be required. In those kinds of instances, it just does not make any sense, first of all, to not even brief the Congress. There has not even been a comprehensive briefing of Congress on the issues involved in Haiti by the President and by his administration.

Second, it is important for there to be a vote indicating that Congress will support the actions as this situation moves forward. Without that vote, there is no assurance that Congress will continue to provide the money that will be necessary to sustain the operation. That will be a terrible thing for our troops, to commit them there, with no understanding of whether or not there is a willingness on the part of Congress to continue that occupation or not.

I think the administration makes a tremendous mistake if they do not move forward with a vote here in the Congress.

Mr. KASICH. If the gentleman will yield, I believe the reason the administration does not want to have a vote is that they do not believe they can win a vote. But also I believe they do not believe they can make a compelling case for why we ought to be involved in this.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, that is the point the gentleman makes that I think is so important. That is, that the administration in order to win votes in the Congress at the present time would have to make a compelling case. I think that any administration that is going to commit young men and young women's lives to an operation has the duty to make that kind of compelling case. If they were to come to Congress not having made their case, there is no doubt they would lose such a vote on the floor.

□ 2050

If they can make that case to Congress and can get the concurrence of Congress, then it seems to me they have at that point assured that there is a policy worth risking of American lives. But until that is done, I think you are going to have a hard time convincing Congress and a hard time convincing America that it is worth the lives of our troops for the mission that may be undertaken there.

Mr. KASICH. I would suggest to the gentleman that when we looked at Bosnia and we saw the terrible things that were going on in Bosnia, when we began to take a look at, is there a compelling United States interest, is there a goal that we can achieve, is there an exit strategy, do the American people

support this action, the conclusion was no, and that is precisely why we did not engage there.

These rules serve a useful purpose. They allow us to make rational judgments about where the United States should involve itself, and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, where we are going to risk the lives of the U.S. military to achieve a goal.

I would ask that this administration come to this House for purposes of having a vote.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

#### POSSIBLE UNITED STATES INVASION OF HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PELOSI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COX. Madam Speaker, I would like to permit my colleagues to extend if they wish to do so and continue this debate and discussion on the subject of what we now understand from news reports to be the imminent invasion by United States troops of the island nation of Haiti.

As my colleague pointed out, there has been no discussion or debate in proper fashion of this on the House floor, neither on the Senate floor because the administration has not sought congressional approval. I find it ironic that the same administration sought approval from the United Nations, sought approval from the OAS, sought approval from nations like Tobago, but not from the United States Congress.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman saying that they specifically went to the United Nations and got the vote in the United Nations whereas they have not done the same thing here in the U.S. Congress?

Mr. COX. As the gentleman knows, that is precisely the case. And while the United Nations provides a useful forum for the debate of international matters such as this, its votes are purely advisory for the most part. And while it has authorized the use of all necessary means to reinforce and to restore democracy to Haiti, the United States will be the only nation, only member of the United Nations that will be a taker.

We have been remarkably unsuccessful, the Clinton administration has been remarkably unsuccessful in persuading any other governments in this hemisphere or in Europe to join with us as combatants. As a matter of fact, the best we have been able to do is convince four Caribbean islands in total to commit 266,000 troops, not combatant troops, but for subsequent peacekeeping roles. Canada has turned us down flat. No European nation is willing to participate with us, no nation in this

hemisphere will participate with the United States in invading Haiti. There is no support outside of the United States by one member state of the United Nations that has voted for this nevertheless. What they voted to do was to let Uncle Sam carry this burden, and if that is the case, if this is purely an American burden, should we not be debating it here in the U.S. Congress?

My colleague from Ohio pointed out I think absolutely correctly that there are some circumstances in which the Constitution permits unilaterally the Commander in Chief to commit United States troops to combat or to situations that look like war if there is imminent harm to United States citizens or property as was in the case in Grenada or if there is an overriding military need for secrecy as was the case in the Bay of Pigs, if there is a necessary element of surprise as was the case in Libya and in Panama. None of those things exists here. This is the most preannounced invasion in history.

We remember how long it took for those ships to steam down to the Falklands. There was that strange sense that this war will start some day. We all knew it was going to happen, but there certainly was not any secrecy about it. This war is even more obvious than that. General Cedras has been on our American talk shows, he being the victim of an invasion, saying when will the invasion come and so forth.

Mr. KASICH. Let me just suggest to the gentleman, if he will yield, the reason I came to the floor tonight to talk about this is that if we intervene without meeting some of the requirements or some of the standards that Secretary Weinberger laid out about compelling U.S. interests and a plan and an exit strategy and support of the American public, we could really damage our ability in the future to be able to conduct necessary military operations. This would be such a damaging thing for the way in which we conduct foreign policy. That is why I come to the floor and almost plead for the fact that we need to have a vote because it would force this administration to do the things that we need to do before we undertake military action.

If we go without doing it, we create a precedent for reckless behavior on the part of the Executive that the American people will not tolerate.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, the thing that disturbs me about this is I remember very well the time after we lost the 18 lives in Somalia the administration at that point coming up here to brief the Congress on the Somalia mission and their inability at that time to articulate what it was that those young people had died for in Somalia. It met with disgust on Capitol Hill that you had administration officials unable to explain the rationale behind their policy that was costing American lives.

Far better that we have that debate and that rationale is laid out to the Congress before we engage in military action rather than afterwards, and we find out that the mission is not well defined and may in fact be ill-conceived.

So I am hopeful, as the gentleman from Ohio has said, that we will be permitted to have that kind of debate so we do not end up with that kind of a tragic situation.

#### JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENT TO SEEK PUBLIC ACCESS TO COURT RULINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue of grave concern to one of the largest employers in my district.

I refer to this press release issued by the Department of Justice on September 2, 1994, with the headline, "Justice Dept. Seeks Public Access to Court Rulings."

In effect, the Justice Department is getting ready to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to put America's private sector legal information industry out of business—and put thousands of American taxpayers who work in that industry out of jobs.

According to this press release, the Department is concocting plans, right now, for a new, \$100 million-plus, taxpayer-funded Government program to meet needs already being satisfied by the private sector.

First, the Department intends to create and impose an additional new, so-called public citations system for court cases—despite the fact that a docket-case number-based public citation system already exists and serves the legal profession perfectly well.

Second, the Department intends to duplicate, at public expense, legal databases already easily available from the private sector—databases containing millions of court cases.

This announcement particularly shocks and disturbs me because West Publishing Co.—the company specifically singled out by this announcement and targeted for this new government competition—employs, serves and does business with tens of thousands of people I represent.

Madam Speaker, West Publishing is an American success story. It is a homegrown, independent, employee-owned, 102-year-old Minnesota company that has become—in an extremely competitive market—America's preeminent publisher of legal materials.

West makes some 4,000 legal databases available to the general public and to agencies of Government, including the Department of Justice. It

does this efficiently and at reasonable cost.

Moreover, some 32,600 public libraries, including around 3,600 law libraries, make legal information available free of charge to anyone who wishes to do the research.

The point is that while the American people are telling us to get to work on deficit reduction, crime control and prevention, better education, better health care, a cleaner environment, more jobs and a host of other things, neither I, Madam Speaker, nor I suspect anyone else in this body, has been approached with complaints about the unavailability of online legal information—or the inadequacy of our citation system.

Beyond the threat to tens of thousands of well-paying private sector American jobs—and beyond the unimaginably high cost to a Federal Government already trillions of dollars in debt—this ridiculous venture into Government information policy by the Department of Justice raises several critical concerns:

It clearly violates the intent and letter of OMB circular A-130, which prohibits Federal agencies from undertaking initiatives already performed by the private sector.

It raises the spectrum of an enormously expensive, taxpayer-funded bureaucracy to create and control a new citation system; place a new citation on millions of existing court cases; collect, store and maintain those cases; purchase and operate software, computer and telecommunications systems; and educate the public and legal community in the use of those systems.

It undermines the emerging, private sector-based national information infrastructure with a broadside attack against intellectual property protection.

It makes a mockery out of the National Performance Review by drawing a Federal agency into a gigantic, wasteful, expensive, incredibly complicated set of tasks that Government cannot possibly perform in an efficient manner.

It impinges on the constitutional principle of separation of powers.

And it raises the very real specter of Government censorship over legal information by eventually making the Department of Justice and the political appointees who operate there the sole source of legal information in America.

Madam Speaker, the Department of Justice is legitimately charged with the task of protecting the American people and advancing the cause of justice. But the Department does not belong in the information business.

Finally, I would remind the Department of Justice that programs of the kind being planned here are subject to the approval and funding authorization of the Congress of the United States.

And the Congress is not about to appropriate \$100 million in order to put tens of thousands of the people we represent out of work.

□ 2100

Madam Speaker, I appreciate this time to air this very, very serious problem. I know other Members, Republicans and Democrats alike from the Minnesota congressional delegation, will be speaking on the same subject in the days to come to bring this to the attention of our colleagues here in Congress. Madam Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD the Department of Justice press release, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, DC, September 2, 1994.

#### JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SEEKS IMPROVED PUBLIC ACCESS TO COURT RULINGS

The Justice Department today said it would explore ways to improve public access to federal court opinions, especially by computer, to make legal research more affordable for scholars, public interest groups and users of electronic information.

Currently, most electronic research is done by leasing access to privately owned systems, such as WESTLAW and LEXIS, that electronically search through data bases of federal cases and other materials.

Attorney General Janet Reno said that the Department had received considerable correspondence from members of the legal community concerned about the high cost of electronic access to judicial opinions and the present propriety system most often used to cite federal cases.

Reno said the Department is evaluating various existing non-proprietary methods of citing cases to develop a unified, comprehensive approach acceptable to federal and state courts, attorneys and legal researchers. The Department is also exploring the possibility of a public-domain data base of federal and state judicial opinions. Comment and suggestions from the public are invited, and should be directed to Kent Walker, Counsel to the Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Justice Department, Washington, DC 20530.

At the same time, the Department said it would shortly solicit bids for a computerized legal research system for its own lawyers. The prospective contract would last one year, with four annual options to renew the contract. Because of the relatively short contract periods, the Department expects that the prospective contract would not delay a decision on a new public citation system.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for September 12 and 13, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODLATTE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, on September 13.

Mr. GOODLING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOEHLERT.  
Mr. MCCOLLUM.  
Mr. KING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODLATTE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DORNAN.  
Mr. WOLF in two instances.  
Mr. GEKAS.  
Mr. BLILEY.  
Mr. FISH.  
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.  
Mr. QUILLEN.  
Mr. MCCOLLUM.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REED.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. OWENS.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. POSHARD in three instances.

Mr. MATSUI in two instances.

Mr. STUPAK in three instances.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. CARR of Michigan.

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. BARCIA of Michigan in two instances.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. KENNEDY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAMSTAD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REED.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. FISH.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. SYNAR.

Ms. CANTWELL.

Mr. GILLMOR.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 528. An act to provide for the transfer of certain United States Forest Service lands located in Lincoln County, Montana, to Lincoln County in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 1782. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), to provide for public access to information in an electronic format, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2430. An act to facilitate recovery from the recent flooding in Georgia, Alabama, and Florida resulting from Tropical Storm Alberto by providing greater flexibility for depository institutions and their regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3474. An act to reduce administrative requirements for insured depository institutions to the extent consistent with safe and sound banking practices, to facilitate the establishment of community development financial institution, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3355. An act to control and prevent crime.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 859. An act to reduce the restrictions on lands conveyed by deed under the Act of June 8, 1926.

S. 1066. An act to restore Federal services to the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians.

S. 1357. An act to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationship of the Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa Indians and the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians as distinct federally recognized Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on the following days, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On August 19, 1994:

H.R. 2847. An act to amend the Commemorative Works Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4790. An act to designate the United States courthouse under construction in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Thomas F. Eagleton United States Courthouse."

On August 22, 1994:

H.R. 2178. An act to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4603. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and making supplemental appropriations for these departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

And on August 23, 1994:

H.R. 2942. An act to designate certain lands in the Commonwealth of Virginia as the George Washington National Forest Mount Pleasant Scenic Area.

H.R. 3197. An act to redesignate the postal facility located at 2100 North 13th Street in Reading, Pennsylvania, as the "Gus Yatron Postal Facility."

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 13, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3749. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available appropriations totaling \$16,150,000 in budget authority for the Departments of the Interior and Labor, the Corporation for National and Community Service, and the Legal Services Corporation, and to designate these amounts as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 103-297); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3750. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available appropriations totaling \$470,000,000 in budget authority for the Small Business Administration, and to designate the amount as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 103-298); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3751. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3752. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Atomic Energy, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on measures to improve coordination and oversight of the DOD chemical and biological defense program, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1522; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3753. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting a report on future career management systems for U.S. military officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3754. A letter from the Executive Director, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting a report on the status of four savings associations, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1441a(k); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3755. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Analysis of June 1994 Revenue Report", pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3756. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Review of ADASA's Spending and Contractual Administrative Practices", pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3757. A letter from the Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Education, transmitting the statistical report of the National Center for Education Statistics on the condition of education, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1221e-1(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3758. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of Final Regulations—Strengthening Institutions Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3759. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of Final Regulations—State Independent Living Services Program and Centers for Independent Living Program: General Provisions; State Independent Living Services; Centers for Independent Living; and Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3760. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of Final Regulations—Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3761. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the 16th annual report on the progress being made toward the provision of a free appropriate public education for all handicapped children, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1418(f)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3762. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a copy of the 1993 annual report for the EEOC's Office of Program Operations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3763. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the second report on the progress of implementing the Breast and Cervical Cancer Mortality Prevention Act of 1990, pursuant to Public Law 101-354, section 2 (104 Stat. 415); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3764. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Department of the Interior, transmitting the final audit report entitled "Accounting for FY 1992 Reimbursable Expenditures of EPA Superfund Money, Water Resources Division, U.S. Geological Survey," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 7501 note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3765. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on effective care methods for responding to the needs of abandoned infants and young children, pursuant to Public Law 100-505; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3766. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the quarterly reports in accordance with sections 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the March 24, 1979 report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the seventh report by the Committee on Government Operations for the third quarter of fiscal year 1994, April 1, 1994 through June 30, 1994, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a) and 22 U.S.C. 2766(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3767. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 94-33, authorizing the furnishing of assistance from the emergency refugee and migration assistance fund for Palestinian refugees, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(3); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3768. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification terminating the suspension of the issuance of licenses for the export to the People's Republic of China of United States munitions list articles, pursuant to Public Law 101-246, section 902(b)(2) (104 Stat. 85) (H. Doc. No. 103-305); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3769. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a memorandum of justification indicating the President's intent to exercise his authority under section 614(a)(1) of the FAA to provide housing guaranty assistance to South Africa, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2364(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3770. A letter from the Director of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting a report on arms control treaty compliance by the successor states to the Soviet Union and other nations that are parties to arms control agreements with the United States, as well as by the United States itself, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2592; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3771. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Alfred H. Moses, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Romania, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3772. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of Justification for Presidential Determination (94-44) regarding the drawdown of defense articles and services from the stocks of DOD for disaster assistance for Rwanda, pursuant to Public Law 101-513, section 547(a) (104 Stat. 2019); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3773. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3774. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3775. A letter from the Assistant for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the President's Determination (94-43) transferring fiscal year 1994 foreign military financing funds to the peacekeeping operations account and use of funds for enforcement of sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro, pursuant to section 610(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3776. A letter from the Assistant for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting two reports on cases regarding chemical weapons proliferation, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2798(b)(2) and 50 U.S.C. app. 2410c(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3777. A letter from the Assistant for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3778. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting certification that certain amounts appropriated for the Board for International Broadcasting for grants to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Inc. are in excess of the amount necessary and will be placed in BIB's currency reserve fund, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2877(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3779. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1999 resulting from passage of H.R. 2178, H.R. 2243 and H.R. 2942, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3780. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1999 resulting from passage of H.R. 2739, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3781. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1999 resulting from passage of H.R. 4277 and H.R. 868, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3782. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in July 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3783. A letter from the President, Federal Financing Bank, transmitting the fiscal year 1992 management report, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3784. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 31, United States Code, to require executive agencies to verify for correctness transportation charges prior to payment, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

3785. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom

of Information Act for calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3786. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year—if any—and the budget year provided by H.R. 4506 and H.R. 4603, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-578); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3787. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year—if any—and the budget year provided by H.R. 4426 and H.R. 4453, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-578); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3788. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the fiscal year 1993 Federal Housing Administration annual management report, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3789. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3790. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3791. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting recent action taken by the Judicial Conference with respect to health care reform proposals pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3792. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association, transmitting the association's report of audit for the year ending March 31, 1994, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(41), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3793. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an alternative pay adjustment plan for 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5303(b) (H. Doc. No. 103-299); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

3794. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 1992 annual report, "Highway Safety Performance—Fatal and Injury Accident Rates on Public Roads in the United States," pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 401 note; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3795. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army dated June 30, 1994, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations (H. Doc. No. 103-300); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

3796. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army dated June 24, 1994, submitting a report with accompanying papers and illustrations (H. Doc. No. 103-301); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

3797. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department

of the Army dated April 14, 1994, submitting a report with accompanying papers and illustrations (H. Doc. No. 103-302); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

3798. A letter from Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army dated June 24, 1994, submitting a report with accompanying papers and illustrations (H. Doc. No. 103-303); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

3799. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army dated June 30, 1994, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations (H. Doc. No. 103-304); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

3800. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1994 Social Security Administration annual report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 904, 30 U.S.C. 936(b), 42 U.S.C. 1382(e)(3)(B), and 42 U.S.C. 421(i); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3801. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the State Department's intent to reprogram fiscal year 1994 funds to support the troops of the Multinational Coalition as they relate to Haiti; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

3802. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GAO/GGD-94-83a); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

3803. A letter from the Inspector General, National Endowment for the Art, transmitting a report titled "Restrictions on Lobbying", pursuant to Public Law 101-121, section 319 (103 Stat. 752); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Appropriations.

#### 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. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H.R. 4391. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 1995; with an amendment (Rept. 103-716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H.R. 4308. A bill to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to authorize appropriations for allocations under that act for wetlands conservation projects; with amendments (Rept. 103-717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H.R. 3300. A bill to amend the act popularly known as the "Sikes Act" to enhance fish and wildlife conservation and natural resources management programs on military installations; with an amendment (Rept. 103-718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions

were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEJDENSON:

H.R. 5022. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a permanent, confidential database and toll-free telephone line for the collection of medical information concerning members of the Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 5023. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the lowest rate of income tax imposed on taxpayers other than corporations from 15 percent to 12.5 percent, to provide for a carryover basis of property acquired from a decedent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself and Mr. HOBSON):

H.R. 5024. A bill to require that the Director of the National Park Service construct a national training center at the National Afro-American Museum and Cultural Center, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.R. 5025. A bill to eliminate a maximum daily diversion restriction with respect to the pumping of certain water from Lake Powell, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TORKILDSEN:

H.R. 5026. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on copper-8-quinolinolate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

H.R. 5027. A bill to provide for the applicability of Federal minority setaside requirements to Hispanic-Americans of Spanish or Portuguese origin; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself and Ms. Cantwell):

H.R. 5028. A bill to make technical corrections to an act preempting State economic regulation of motor carriers; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.J. Res. 407. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 408. Joint resolution to designate June 11, 1995, as "D-day Widows and Orphans National Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

473. By the SPEAKER; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, relative to the flow of illegal drugs into the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

474. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

475. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the 10th amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

476. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in recognition of Texas' 150 years of statehood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

477. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, relative to the U.S. Customs Service establishing an Informed Compliance Center; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

Mr. LANTOS introduced a bill (H.R. 5029) for the relief of Billy I. Meyer; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 127: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WALKER, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 323: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 349: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 411: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 441: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 786: Mr. COX.

H.R. 1110: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1374: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1517: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1552: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1673: Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 1719: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 1843: Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2043: Ms. CANTWELL.

H.R. 2050: Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 2175: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2292: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 2293: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 2460: Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 2873: Mr. PAXON and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2888: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 3207: Mr. FROST, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GORDON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 3261: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 3293: Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 3306: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 3546: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. LIGHT-FOOT.

H.R. 3560: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 3645: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 3687: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3727: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 3862: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3866: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 3971: Mr. KING and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 3987: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 4051: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4074: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4091: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 4356: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. KING, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 4371: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4404: Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4412: Mr. WHITTEN.

H.R. 4514: Mr. KLEIN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WISE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HAMBURG, and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 4618: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 4669: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 4710: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 4734: Mr. OWENS and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 4742: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 4744: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 4789: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 4805: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 4826: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 4830: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. COX, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 4831: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 4841: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 4883: Mr. PAXON, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 4887: Mr. GEJDNENSON.

H.R. 4893: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 4897: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. KLEIN.

H.R. 4898: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. KLEIN.

H.R. 4912: Mr. QUINN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SWETT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DICKS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KIM, Mr. HORN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. APPELEGATE.

H.R. 4919: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 4946: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 4949: Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. QUINN, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 4971: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 4976: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 5011: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 282: Mr. LIVINGSTON and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 327: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.J. Res. 349: Mr. BEVILL.

H.J. Res. 376: Mr. PAXON.

H.J. Res. 378: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.J. Res. 398: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas

H. Con. Res. 148: Mr. RIDGE and Mr. BAKER of California.

H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H. Con. Res. 199: Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 262: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. DUNN, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KYL, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 268: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H. Con. Res. 269: Mr. HYDE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 270: Mr. ROGERS.

H. Con. Res. 276: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MANN, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ZIMMER, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WISE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. PETER GEREN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. FARR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. YATES, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 282: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. WALSH.

H. Res. 402: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. FROST, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H. Res. 424: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H. Res. 510: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. TALENT.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

125. By the SPEAKER: Petition of office of the attorney general, Jackson, MS, relative to State health care fraud control units; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

126. Also, petition of office of the attorney general, Carson City, NV, relative to State health care fraud control units; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

127. Also, petition of office of the attorney general, Wilmington, DE, relative to State health care fraud control units; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.