country in purifying our water and making it pure. The gentleman from New York has provided appropriate funding for that purpose as well.

In addition, Housing and Urban Development has some wonderful programs. There are some that need cleaning up, but there are some wonderful programs in HUD.

Michigan, in particular, through its Michigan State Housing Development Authority, has done a great deal to provide low-income home ownership opportunities for the people of our State, particularly in my area where we have some faith-based organizations which have developed to take advantage of both MSHDA and HUD funding and have done a magnificent job. I want to especially mention Habitat for Humanity and a local homespun organization we have, the Inner City Christian Federation. The latter has been phenomenally successful.

We have done better at providing home ownership opportunities for low-income individuals than almost anywhere in this country. They are totally dependent on the HUD and MSHDA funding.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and the members of the committee for their good work. I urge adoption of the rule and passage of the conference report.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me remind my colleagues that this rule is customary for the consideration of appropriations conference reports.

Further, the conference report itself is the product of bipartisan cooperation between the President and the Congress. The White House worked with the conference committee to ensure that its priorities were funded, and the President agreed to the provisions in the bill that ensure its fiscal responsibility.

This bill contains many good things that I know my colleagues can support, including the largest increase in veterans health care spending in a decade, increased funding for numerous housing programs, restored funding for important science programs in NASA, and funding for emergencies and disasters that matches the President's request.

All of this, and still the conference report maintains our commitment to a balanced budget while keeping Social Security off limits. We made the tough decisions. We prioritized, and we have a good work product to show for it.

I can congratulate the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and all the conferees who made this process work.

I urge support for the rule and the legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2684, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 328, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 328, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 13, 1999, at page H9983.)

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a terrific day to be here, I think, with the results that we have. It has been a remarkable process beginning back in the spring, the hearings over these many, many different and, by definition, sundry departments, lots of priorities with competing needs. I think that the process worked its way through in a very nonpartisan fashion. Mostly, the competition is between the Departments within the bill.

We had wonderful cooperation from the minority. Specifically the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, was very, very constructive and very, very helpful all the way along, not only in helping us establish priorities, but in getting votes to pass the bill as we first came through the House. I owe him a deep debt of gratitude. He had a very difficult personal period at the same time, and he just kept moving forward with us. Without him, we could not have been successful. So I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

I also thank his staff and my staff who worked so well together, and also the members of the Senate, Senator BOND who chaired the conference, and Senator MIKULSKI, the ranking Democrat from the Senate.

We felt that, by working out the issues amongst ourselves before we sat down and discussed these issues with the White House, we would be in better shape to bring the priorities together. That is what we did.

□ 1100

We had pretty much a consensus legislative position, and then we sat down with the White House and asked them what their priorities were, and it worked fairly well.

The bottom line here is that this bill provides total discretionary and mandatory spending of $93.1 billion, which includes disaster relief of $2.4 billion and also includes the largest-ever increase for veterans' medical care, and also an increase of $2 billion for section 8 housing vouchers.

The bill nets out at $257 million dollars below our budget authority allocation. It also comes out $2 million below our budget allocation for outlays. I think that is a remarkable achievement considering the fact that we met all of the Congress's priorities, including the House and Senate and also the White House's priorities.

We increased VA medical care $1.7 billion above the President's initial request, bringing the total to $19.6 billion. That account is fully offset.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP), the chairman of the full committee, as well as Members, including the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) on our subcommittee who worked so hard on the veterans' issues.

Regarding HUD, which is the largest part of this subcommittee bill, it preserves the taxpayers' substantial investment in existing affordable housing stock by increasing public housing operating subsidies and modernization funds above the President's request.

We felt very strongly that, with the huge investment that we have in public housing and while there are other options, including section 8, we need to take care of the existing housing stock and protect that investment. That we have. I thank the White House for coming forward and providing an additional offset so that we could increase operating subsidies by $135 million.

Operating subsidies are at $3.138 billion, as I said, an increase of $135 million. And the capital improvement account is $2.9 billion, an increase of $345

million. This provides funds for 60,000 new housing vouchers, as well, which are fully offset. That was a priority of Secretary Cuomo and of the White House and of my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN); and we were able to work that issue out so that I think everyone was more than satisfied with the resolution of that issue.

Selective Service. We do provide funds for the regular operations of the Selective Service. The House vote was very strong in taking the position to end Selective Service. However, the Senate position prevailed. I think that debate will continue next year. Although, there are members of the subcommittee, including the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who felt very strongly that we should hold to the Senate position.

The Americorps program is funded at $434.5 million. This is a priority of the President. We knew that this bill would not achieve a Presidential signature if we did not resolve that, and we did.

It also provides $2.5 billion for FEMA for disaster relief. Governor Hunt of North Carolina came in to see me, and I believe he saw the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) with the entire North Carolina delegation, Republican and Democrat, and made a very strong case that we need to have emergency funding.

The CBO said that we would run out of money before the end of January next year, and we felt, quite frankly, that this would help our bill if we had disaster relief in the bill. It does not need to be offset. It is true emergency spending; and, therefore, it increased our allocation but did not break any budget caps. It was important to the people who have been suffering under the flood from Hurricane Floyd that we provide relief and give them some hope.

On NASA, it provides an increase of $75 million for NASA, including a $152 million increase for vital aeronautics programs; and it fully funds current space science missions. I know Administrator Golden was very pleased with the end result. I spoke with him personally.

Also, I know the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) all weighed in very heavily for additional funds for NASA, just to name a few. There was very strong support for improving what the House position was for NASA.

On EPA, we provided $7.59 billion for EPA, which is virtually level spending with fiscal year 1999. The conferees have kept the growth of the agency in check while providing at least $800 million over the budget request for State and local drinking water and waste water construction grants.

We feel very strongly and the House held its position that we need to be there for our communities who are under court order to meet clean water standards. I agree the EPA needs to keep all of our communities' feet to the fire to clean up the water, to raise the drinking water quality standards in all of our lakes and rivers and water features around this country. It is critical. And this bill I think goes farther than many others have in the past to meeting that commitment to clean up our air and to clean up our water.

I am very, very proud, Mr. Speaker, that, this being a Republican-led Congress, that we actually put more money in to resolve those clean water and clean air issues than the President, and I am very proud of that.

I think that, just to be partisan for just one brief moment, our party has gotten criticism over the years, I think undeservedly so. And I think we stepped up to the plate in this bill, met our commitments, supported our local community, whether they were Republican or Democrat communities, supported them to meet the challenge of these court orders that they are under, all in keeping with making water cleaner. And we are doing that.

The water in this country is getting cleaner as we speak, and I think we can all be very proud of that regardless of our party.

Research at EPA is a priority, as well, as the conferees provided $645 million in new spending, a shade under last year.

Lastly, the National Science Foundation reaches an all-time high of $3.9 billion, an increase of $241 million over fiscal year 1999.

I think once again the Congress has shown its commitment to research and development, to the support of our research institutions, primarily our colleges and universities across the Nation who lead the world in research, who are making the investments now that will keep Americans living longer, healthier lives in a cleaner environment, with better jobs, better products, and keeping the United States competitive at the top of the game globally.

This investment will pay huge dividends in the future, as it is doing today. This support once again demonstrates our commitment to science. People like the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and again the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) have argued very strongly for increasing National Science Foundation funds.

Let me conclude my remarks by thanking my subcommittee members, who worked so hard and so long to make this product come out the way it did. I would like to thank our staff, who put in a tremendous amount of work. And it is not just the clerical work that they do. It is the advice that they provide, it is the experience that they have, it is the institutional memory that they bring to the table that makes our job so much easier.

I would also like to thank the White House, President Clinton, OMB Director Jacob Lew for coming to the table I think in a very genuine way seeking to help us to solve some of our problems with us being able to help them solve some of their problems. And when they came and asked for additional spending, they said, we will provide the offsets. And they did provide the offsets.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this is a major commitment on the part of the Congress to a balanced budget. We will have a balanced budget this year, and to a large degree it is because of the work that we did to scrub this budget to get it in under our spending allocation. And we are going to do this. We are going to have this balanced budget on budget without affecting our Social Security Trust Fund.

For the first time in 40 years, at least, we will bring a budget to the American people that is balanced, balanced on each side of the ledger, without reaching across and dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, if it seems that I am very proud of this accomplishment, I am. But there is no way that it could have been accomplished without the support of all the others that I have mentioned.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks by expressing my most sincere appreciation to my chairman the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH). He has been totally fair and totally forthcoming throughout this process and has moved this bill with great skill.

This has been a very difficult year to move appropriations bills, and it is a testament to his legislative ability that we are here this morning with a passable bill. It has been a real pleasure working with him. He is particularly capable. He is a class act.

Mr. Speaker, before I continue, I would like to take a moment to thank the staff who have all put in countless hours since we started our hearing process in February.

First, I would like to thank the committee staff, including both the majority staff, Frank Cushing, Valerie Baldwin, Tim Peterson, Dena Baron, and their detailee Angela Snell; and on the minority side, two skilled and dedicated staffers, Del Davis and David Reich.

I would also like to thank the personal staff of the chairman, Ron Anderson and John Simmons and, of course, my own personal staff, Lee Alman and Gavin Clingham, who have done a fine job working on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is my first year as ranking minority member of this subcommittee and it has been quite an interesting year. I began this appropriations cycle thinking that this bill

could never pass the House. And now, several months later, we are through conference with a signable bill. And not only is it a signable bill, it is a good bill.

Indeed, if one considers the circumstances under which this subcommittee was operating, this is a great bill. This success was made possible by the serious constructive manner in which all sides approached the conference process, by the skill of the chairman, and by the cooperation of the administration, particularly the administration's willingness to find the necessary budget offsets for some spending increases which the administration was urging.

Without repeating the statement of the chairman, I would like to quickly run through just a few of the highlights of this conference report.

First, for veterans' medical care. It provides a $1.7 billion increase over last year's level. This increase is vital in order to help the Department of Veterans' Affairs keep up with the medical needs of our Nation's veterans.

In the housing area, the conference report provides for 60,000 additional incremental section 8 housing assistance vouchers. That is, it appropriates sufficient funds, both to renew all existing section 8 housing assistance contracts and to increase the number of families assisted by 60,000.

This modest expansion of housing assistance is extremely important in light of the serious and growing unmet needs for affordable housing that exists in our country.

The conference report also takes important steps to assist public housing, which remains a very important part of our overall national strategy for meeting the housing needs of low-income people. It increases public housing operating assistance by $320 million over the fiscal year 1999 level to help local housing authorities pay their utility bills and keep up with maintenance needs.

It also provides $2.9 billion for public housing capital assistance, a bit less than the $3 billion provided last year but still well above the levels during the preceding several years.

The measure also includes a $50 million increase in the section 202 program that helps provide housing for low-income elderly people and a $45 million increase in grants for assistance to the homeless.

I would like to express my appreciation to Secretary Cuomo here, who has tirelessly advocated for many of these increases.

Before I leave the housing area, I should also mention that some very important authorizing has been incorporated into our legislation, namely part of H.R. 202.

After this bill passed the House by an overwhelming vote last month, the bipartisan leadership of the banking committee and its housing subcommittee approached our subcommittee and asked if the legislation could be added to the appropriations bill to expedite its enactment.

While I and others of the House conferees would have preferred to adopt H.R. 202 in its entirety just as it passed the House, we were not able to secure the agreement from the Senate conferees to do so.

Nevertheless, the portions of H.R. 202 that we were able to add to the conference agreement takes some important steps to help keep project-based section 8 housing viable and to improve housing programs for the elderly and the disabled.

The second part of the conference agreement of which I am especially proud is the funding for NASA. While the House-passed bill cut NASA substantially, the conference agreement provides $1 billion more and $75 million more than the budget request for NASA. The increases above the request are targeted to the science and aeronautics mission areas, which I think are particularly high priorities.

□ 1115

Some items of note within the NASA section of the conference report include an increase of $25 million for safety-related upgrades to space shuttle; an overall increase of $1.25 million above the budget request for space science, which represents $240 million over the House-passed level; increases of at least $130 million for various aeronautics programs involving development of new technologies for both aircraft and spacecraft; and $19.6 million for the space grant program.

Also in the space science area, the conference agreement provides an increase for the National Science Foundation totaling about $240 million above last year. This increase includes $50 million for the foundation's biocomplexity research initiative.

Also included is $36 million for the construction of a five-teraflop computing facility, capable of trillions of calculations per second. This capability is essential if we are to continue our world leadership in information technology. And in that same vein I am pleased to report that this conference agreement has provided $75 million for the administration's IT-squared initiative.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the agreement appropriates about $2.5 billion in emergency funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, as requested by the administration. This appropriation will allow FEMA to continue to meet urgent needs in North Carolina and other States recently struck by national disasters as well as replenish FEMA's funds so that it will be able to respond quickly whenever the next disaster strikes.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I think we present to the body today a good conference report that is certainly worthy of support. It is by no means an extravagant piece of legislation but it does provide some additional resources to maintain our leadership in science, help meet housing needs, respond to disasters, care for our veterans and accomplish other useful and important things.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the conference report. I again express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York for his leadership.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the VA–HUD conference report. I commend the gentleman from New York, our chairman, and the gentleman from West Virginia, our ranking member, for all their hard work and the hard work of our staff. The gentleman from West Virginia and the gentleman from New York work well together, and I think the product that we have today is fully supportable.

While I am supportive of many provisions of this bill, including critical dollars for housing, most especially for housing for people with disabilities and older Americans, I am especially supportive of additional money for basic scientific research, further space exploration and the additional dollars to protect our environment as well as address so many natural disasters. I specifically want to commend the chairman and ranking member for standing in support of more funding for veterans medical care. We as Members of Congress are united in a most bipartisan manner in this and other regards.

I am pleased that this conference report contains a record $1.7 billion increase for veterans medical care added to the House bill. This additional funding will help countless veterans, many older, sicker, some nearly 100 percent dependent on the system for their health care and will mean increased access to service and improved quality of care. And, yes, we must as we pass these additional dollars reinvigorate our roles as committee members to assure that these dollars are well spent.

I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking minority member on the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as previous speakers have said, there are many things about this bill that are good. It does a lot of things for a lot of people. But I have one simple question: Is there anybody around here, either on the floor or in any other congressional office on the House side of the Capitol who really knows what is going on around here in terms of the overall spending that will result by the end of the year?

Yesterday we passed our biggest bill. That bill accounts for about half of all

discretionary spending in the budget. That bill was $9 billion over the President's request. The defense bill.

Now we have a bill that is either the second or the third largest appropriations bill, and I think we ought to take a look at its increases. Veterans medical care is $1.7 billion above the President. I think that is fine. I would like to see that more. EPA is $400 million above the President. NASA is $75 million above. Now, each of those programs in and of themselves are worthy programs, and I would like in an ideal world to be spending more on all of them. But my question is, with what we did on defense yesterday, with what we are doing on this bill, where are we going to end up? What is the plan? Indeed, is there a plan to deal with our other critical needs?

We have, I think, with the passage of this bill and a number of other bills, we are seeing Congress engage in a gigantic and repetitive shell game. We see double sets of books, we see innovative accounting, we order our own fiscal scorekeeper to simply ignore the fact that one of the bills that we passed will spend $10 billion more than his official numbers would otherwise indicate.

What will the DOD bill do to our education priorities in the country, to our health priorities, to our job training priorities, to our efforts to reduce class sizes, to our efforts to produce school modernization? The answer is, nobody knows, because everybody is playing poker without knowing what their hold card is. You can lose an awful lot of money that way.

So I would simply suggest, do whatever you want to do on this bill, there are good reasons to vote for it in and of itself, but the fact is that this House does not know what it is doing, it does not know what the end game is going to be, and certainly Members need to be aware of the fact that the appropriations bills on their present track contain over $42 billion in spending gimmicks, and, in fact, that means that, despite all of the declarations to the contrary, these budget bills are eating up virtually all of the non-Social Security surplus and are certainly at this point headed down the road to spend close to $20 billion of the Social Security surplus.

I say that simply in the interest of honest accounting, and I say that to simply urge Members once again to ask, where is this all going to wind up? The only way to work out a decent end is for this institution to sit down with the White House and have both parties represented and work out our differences so that we know what each of these bills is doing to other key national priorities that we also have an obligation to deal with.

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin just spoke regarding the offsets in the bill. I would remind him that when we left the House with our bill, we did not use the $4.2 billion advance appropriation that the White House used and that ultimately the Senate used. So I thought that we did it the right way. However, this is a process of compromise and negotiation, and when the House position was different than the Senate and the White House, I felt that it would be in our best interest to work with those two the way they determined their allocation.

Selfishly, it made our job a lot easier to use that offset. But the fact of the matter is that this is an accepted offset. It is scored. All of this bill is offset according to CBO and OMB. They are in agreement that the bill is offset properly. So, therefore, we are within our rules. As the gentleman knows so well, rules can be helpful and they can be a hindrance. In this case, I think the rules were helpful.

As far as the offset, the $4.2 billion advance appropriation, the White House suggested that we use that to fund section 8 vouchers. Section 8 vouchers provide housing for America's poor. So there was a real effort to try to make sure we had additional vouchers, because the program is working. The problem is when you use an advance appropriation, it puts off the problem more or less until next year. The outlay rate in the first year is very low. In the second year it is very high. It creates problems for us in the future to do things this way is the bottom line.

So what we suggested to the White House when we accepted this advance appropriation is, you folks need to sit down with us, with CBO, with the House and Senate leaders in the housing arena, authorizers and appropriators, and resolve this issue, because if we do not deal with it next year properly, this section 8 housing voucher problem could implode.

We do need to deal with this in a realistic way with real money and with a long-term plan. Everybody agrees section 8 is a good program, but we need to make sure we fund it in a proper way. I am not convinced that advance appropriations are the best way to do this, and I think the White House and the Senate would agree with that. So it will be a challenge for us, especially for the authorizers working with us to make sure that if we are going to pursue this section 8 as a viable alternative to public housing, we need to fund it properly.

Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD a chart regarding the overall expenditures of the bill and the breakdown.

The document referred to follows:

H.R. 2684 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I						
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
Veterans Benefits Administration						
Compensation and pensions	21,857,058	21,568,364	21,568,364	21,568,364	21,568,364	-288,694
Readjustment benefits	1,175,000	1,469,000	1,469,000	1,469,000	1,469,000	+294,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities	46,450	28,670	28,670	28,670	28,670	-17,780
Veterans housing benefit program fund program account (indefinite)	300,266	282,342	282,342	282,342	282,342	-17,924
(Limitation on direct loans)	(300)	(300)	(300)	(300)	(300)	.....
Administrative expenses	159,121	156,958	156,958	156,958	156,958	-2,163
Education loan fund program account	1	1	1	1	1	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	.....
Administrative expenses	206	214	214	214	214	+8
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account	55	57	57	57	57	+2
(Limitation on direct loans)	(2,401)	(2,531)	(2,531)	(2,531)	(2,531)	(+130)
Administrative expenses	400	415	415	415	415	+15
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account	515	520	520	520	520	+5
Guaranteed Transitional Housing Loans for Homeless Veterans program account	.....	.....	.....	48,250	48,250	+48,250
(Limitation on direct loans)	.....	.....	.....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+100,000)
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration	23,539,072	23,506,541	23,506,541	23,554,791	23,554,791	+15,719
Veterans Health Administration						
Medical care	16,528,000	16,671,000	18,371,000	17,771,000	18,106,000	+1,578,000
Delayed equipment obligation	778,000	635,000	635,000	635,000	900,000	+122,000
Total	17,306,000	17,306,000	19,006,000	18,406,000	19,006,000	+1,700,000
Contingent emergency funding	.....	.....	.....	600,000	.....	.....
(Transfer to general operating expenses)	(-27,420)	.....	.....	(25,930)	(-27,907)	(-487)
Medical care cost recovery collections:						
Offsetting receipts	-583,000	-608,000	-608,000	-608,000	-608,000	-25,000
Appropriations (indefinite)	583,000	608,000	608,000	608,000	608,000	+25,000
Total available	(17,889,000)	(17,914,000)	(19,614,000)	(19,014,000)	(19,614,000)	(+1,725,000)
Medical and prosthetic research	316,000	316,000	326,000	316,000	321,000	+5,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	63,000	61,200	61,200	60,703	59,703	-3,297
General Post Fund, National Homes:						
Loan program account (by transfer)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70)	(70)	(70)	(70)	(70)	.....
Administrative expenses (by transfer)	(54)	(54)	(54)	(54)	(54)	.....
General post fund (transfer out)	(-61)	(-61)	(-61)	(-61)	(-61)	.....
Total, Veterans Health Administration	17,685,000	17,683,200	19,393,200	19,382,703	19,386,703	+1,701,703
Departmental Administration						
General operating expenses	855,661	912,353	886,000	912,594	912,594	+56,933
Offsetting receipts	(38,960)	(36,754)	(36,754)	(36,754)	(36,754)	(-2,206)
Total, Program Level	(894,621)	(949,107)	(922,754)	(949,348)	(949,348)	(+54,727)
(Transfer from medical care)	(27,420)	.....	.....	.....	(27,907)	(+487)
(Transfer from national cemetery)	(90)	.....	.....	.....	(117)	(+27)
(Transfer from inspector general)	(30)	.....	.....	.....	(30)	.....
National Cemetery Administration	92,006	97,000	97,000	97,256	97,256	+5,250
(Transfer to general operating expenses)	(-90)	.....	.....	.....	(-117)	(-27)
Office of Inspector General	36,000	43,200	38,500	43,200	43,200	+7,200
(Transfer to general operating expenses)	(-30)	.....	.....	.....	(-30)	.....
Construction, major projects	142,300	60,140	34,700	70,140	65,140	-77,160
Construction, minor projects	175,000	175,000	102,300	175,000	160,000	-15,000
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities	90,000	40,000	87,000	90,000	90,000	.....
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries	10,000	11,000	11,000	25,000	25,000	+15,000
Capital asset fund	.....	10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Departmental Administration	1,400,967	1,348,693	1,256,500	1,413,190	1,393,190	-7,777
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs	42,625,039	42,538,434	44,156,241	44,350,684	44,334,684	+1,709,645
Appropriations	(42,625,039)	(42,538,434)	(44,156,241)	(43,750,684)	(44,334,684)	(+1,709,645)
Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	(600,000)	.....	.....
Consisting of:						
Mandatory	(23,378,774)	(23,348,376)	(23,348,376)	(23,396,626)	(23,396,626)	(+17,852)
Discretionary	(19,246,265)	(19,190,058)	(20,807,865)	(20,954,058)	(20,938,058)	(+1,691,793)

H.R. 2684 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE II						
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Public and Indian Housing						
Housing Certificate Fund	10,326,542	7,322,095	10,540,135	6,851,135	7,176,695	-3,149,847
(By transfer)	.....	(183,000)	(183,000)	(183,000)	(183,000)	(+183,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001	.....	4,200,000	.....	4,200,000	4,200,000	+4,200,000
Total funding	10,326,542	11,522,095	10,540,135	11,051,135	11,376,695	+1,050,153
Housing set-asides:						
Expiring section 8 contracts	(9,600,000)	(10,640,135)	(10,540,135)	(10,855,135)	(10,834,135)	(+1,234,135)
Section 8 relocation assistance	(433,542)	(156,000)	.....	(156,000)	(156,000)	(-277,542)
Regional opportunity counseling	(10,000)	(20,000)	.....	.....	.....	(-10,000)
Welfare to work housing vouchers	(283,000)	(144,400)	.....	.....	.....	(-283,000)
Contract administration	.....	(209,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Incremental vouchers	.....	(346,560)	.....	.....	(346,560)	(+346,560)
Administrative fee change	.....	(6,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Voucher for disabled	.....	.....	.....	(40,000)	(40,000)	(+40,000)
Subtotal	(10,326,542)	(11,522,095)	(10,540,135)	(11,051,135)	(11,376,695)	(+1,050,153)
Rescission of unobligated balances:						
Section 8 recaptures (rescission)	-2,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-1,300,000	+700,000
Section 8 carryover and Tenant Protection (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	.....	-943,000	-943,000
Subtotal	-2,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-2,243,000	-243,000
Public housing capital fund	3,000,000	2,555,000	2,555,000	2,555,000	2,900,000	-100,000
Public housing operating fund	2,818,000	3,003,000	2,818,000	2,900,000	3,138,000	+320,000
Subtotal	5,818,000	5,558,000	5,373,000	5,455,000	6,038,000	+220,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	310,000	310,000	290,000	310,000	310,000	.....
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing (HOPE VI)	625,000	625,000	575,000	500,000	575,000	-50,000
Native American housing block grants	620,000	620,000	620,000	620,000	620,000	.....
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(68,881)	(71,956)	(71,956)	(71,956)	(71,956)	(+3,075)
Total, Public and Indian Housing	15,705,542	18,641,095	17,404,135	17,942,135	16,682,695	+977,153
Community Planning and Development						
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	215,000	240,000	225,000	232,000	232,000	+17,000
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,000
Rural housing and economic development	25,000	20,000	.....	25,000	25,000	.....
America's private investment companies program:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	.....	(1,000,000)	.....	.....	(541,000)	(+541,000)
Credit subsidy	.....	37,000	.....	.....	20,000	+20,000
Regional empowerment zone initiative	.....	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Urban empowerment zones	.....	.....	.....	.....	55,000	+55,000
Rural empowerment zones	.....	.....	.....	.....	15,000	+15,000
Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities:						
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	45,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-45,000
Subtotal	45,000	50,000	.....	.....	70,000	+25,000
Community development block grants	4,750,000	4,775,000	4,500,200	4,800,000	4,800,000	+50,000
Emergency funding	20,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-20,000
Section 108 loan guarantees:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(1,261,000)	(1,261,000)	(1,087,000)	(1,261,000)	(1,261,000)	.....
Credit subsidy	29,000	29,000	25,000	29,000	29,000	.....
Administrative expenses	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	.....
Brownfields redevelopment	25,000	50,000	20,000	25,000	25,000	.....
Regional connections	.....	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Redevelopment of abandoned buildings initiative	.....	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
HOME investment partnerships program	1,600,000	1,610,000	1,580,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	.....
Homeless assistance grants	975,000	1,020,000	970,000	1,020,000	1,020,000	+45,000
Homeless assistance demonstration project	.....	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Community planning and development	7,695,000	7,937,000	7,321,200	7,732,000	7,822,000	+127,000
Housing Programs						
Housing for special populations	854,000	854,000	854,000	911,000	911,000	+57,000
Housing for the elderly	(660,000)	(660,000)	(660,000)	(710,000)	(710,000)	(+50,000)
Housing for the disabled	(194,000)	(194,000)	(194,000)	(201,000)	(201,000)	(+7,000)

H.R. 2684 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Federal Housing Administration						
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(140,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(140,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(140,000,000)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(100,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	328,888	330,888	328,888	330,888	330,888	+2,000
Offsetting receipts	-529,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+529,000
Administrative contract expenses	.....	160,000	.....	160,000	160,000	+160,000
Additional contract expenses	.....	4,000	.....	4,000	4,000	+4,000
FHA - General and special risk program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,100,000)	(18,100,000)	(18,100,000)	(18,100,000)	(18,100,000)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	211,455	64,000	64,000	64,000	64,000	-147,455
Administrative expenses (unobligated balances)	.....	(147,000)	(147,000)	(147,000)	(147,000)	(+147,000)
Negative subsidy	-125,000	-75,000	-75,000	-75,000	-75,000	+50,000
Subsidy	81,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-81,000
Subsidy (unobligated balances)	.....	(153,000)	(153,000)	(153,000)	(153,000)	(+153,000)
Non-overhead administrative expenses	.....	144,000	.....	144,000	144,000	+144,000
Additional contract expenses	.....	7,000	.....	7,000	7,000	+7,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-32,657	634,888	317,888	634,888	634,888	+667,545
Government National Mortgage Association						
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	9,383	15,383	9,383	15,383	9,383	.....
Offsetting receipts	-370,000	-422,000	-422,000	-422,000	-422,000	-52,000
Policy Development and Research						
Research and technology	47,500	50,000	42,500	35,000	45,000	-2,500
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair housing activities	40,000	47,000	37,500	40,000	44,000	+4,000
Office of Lead Hazard Control						
Lead hazard reduction	80,000	80,000	70,000	80,000	80,000	.....
Management and Administration						
Salaries and expenses	456,843	502,000	456,843	457,093	477,000	+20,157
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(518,000)	(518,000)	(518,000)	(518,000)	(518,000)	.....
(By transfer, GNMA)	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	.....
(By transfer, Community Planning & Development)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	.....
(By transfer, Title VI)	(200)	(150)	(150)	(150)	(150)	(-50)
(By transfer, Indian Housing)	(400)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(-200)
Total, Salaries and expenses	(985,826)	(1,030,733)	(985,576)	(985,826)	(1,005,733)	(+19,907)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	12,200	.....	.....	.....	.....	-12,200
Office of Inspector General	49,567	38,000	40,000	63,567	50,657	+1,090
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	.....
(By transfer from Drug Elimination Grants)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	.....
Total, Office of Inspector General	(81,910)	(70,343)	(72,343)	(95,910)	(83,000)	(+1,090)
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight	16,000	19,493	19,493	19,493	19,493	+3,493
Offsetting receipts	-16,000	-19,493	-19,493	-19,493	-19,493	-3,493
Administrative Provisions						
Single Family Property Disposition	-400,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+400,000
Sec. 212, calculation of downpayment	15,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-15,000
FHA increase in loan amounts	-83,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+83,000
GSE user fee	.....	-10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Sec. 208 FHA	.....	-319,000	.....	-319,000	-319,000	-319,000
Annual contribution (transfer out)	.....	(-79,000)	(-79,000)	(-79,000)	(-79,000)	(-79,000)
Annual contributions (transfer out)	.....	(-104,000)	(-104,000)	(-104,000)	(-104,000)	(-104,000)
Sec. 212 Rescissions	.....	.....	-74,400	.....	-74,400	-74,400
Sec. 213 National Cities in Schools	.....	.....	5,000	.....	5,000	+5,000
Sec. 214 Moving to Work	.....	.....	5,000	.....	5,000	+5,000
Total, administrative provisions	-468,000	-329,000	-64,400	-319,000	-383,400	+84,600
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development (net)	24,079,378	28,048,366	26,067,049	27,170,066	25,951,223	+1,871,845
Current year, FY 2000 (net)	(24,079,378)	(23,848,366)	(26,067,049)	(22,970,066)	(21,751,223)	(-2,328,155)
Appropriations	(26,047,178)	(23,848,366)	(26,141,449)	(22,970,066)	(24,068,623)	(-1,978,555)
Rescissions	(-2,000,000)	.....	(-74,400)	.....	(-2,317,400)	(-317,400)
Emergency appropriations	(32,200)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-32,200)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001	.....	(4,200,000)	.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(+4,200,000)

H.R. 2684 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE III						
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
American Battle Monuments Commission						
Salaries and expenses	26,431	26,467	28,467	26,467	28,467	+2,036
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board						
Salaries and expenses	6,500	7,500	7,000	6,500	8,000	+1,500
Department of the Treasury						
Community Development Financial Institutions						
Community development financial institutions fund program account	80,000	110,000	70,000	80,000	95,000	+15,000
Microenterprise technical assistance	.....	15,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	15,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-15,000
Total	95,000	125,000	70,000	80,000	95,000	.....
Consumer Product Safety Commission						
Salaries and expenses	47,000	50,500	47,000	49,500	49,000	+2,000
Corporation for National and Community Service						
National and community service programs operating expenses	425,500	545,500	.....	423,500	434,500	+9,000
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,000
Rescission	.....	.....	.....	-80,000	-80,000	-80,000
Office of Inspector General	3,000	3,000	3,000	5,000	4,000	+1,000
Total	438,500	548,500	3,000	348,500	358,500	-80,000
United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims						
Salaries and expenses	10,195	11,450	11,450	11,450	11,450	+1,255
Department of Defense - Civil						
Cemeterial Expenses, Army						
Salaries and expenses	11,666	12,473	12,473	12,473	12,473	+807
Environmental Protection Agency						
Science and Technology	650,000	642,483	645,000	642,483	645,000	-5,000
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	40,000	37,271	35,000	38,000	38,000	-2,000
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	10,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,000
Subtotal, Science and Technology	700,000	679,754	680,000	680,483	683,000	-17,000
Environmental Programs and Management	1,848,000	2,046,993	1,850,000	1,897,000	1,900,000	+52,000
Transfer to STAG (P.L. 106-31)	-1,300	.....	.....	.....	.....	+1,300
Subtotal, EPM	1,846,700	2,046,993	1,850,000	1,897,000	1,900,000	+53,300
Office of Inspector General	31,154	29,409	25,000	32,409	32,409	+1,255
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	12,237	10,753	11,000	10,753	11,000	-1,237
Subtotal, OIG	43,391	40,162	36,000	43,162	43,409	+18
Buildings and facilities	56,948	62,630	62,600	25,930	62,600	+5,652
Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,400,000	1,500,000	1,450,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	-100,000
Delay of obligation	100,000	.....	.....	100,000	100,000	.....
Transfer to Office of Inspector General	-12,237	-10,753	-11,000	-10,753	-11,000	+1,237
Transfer to Science and Technology	-40,000	-37,271	-35,000	-38,000	-38,000	+2,000
Subtotal, Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,447,763	1,451,976	1,404,000	1,351,247	1,351,000	-96,763
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program	72,500	71,556	60,000	71,556	70,000	-2,500
Oil spill response	15,000	15,618	15,000	15,000	15,000	.....
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	2,506,750	1,953,000	2,315,000	2,355,000	2,581,650	+74,900
Categorical grants	880,000	884,957	884,957	895,000	885,000	+5,000
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	20,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-20,000
Transfer from EMP (P.L. 106-31)	1,300	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,300
Subtotal, STAG	3,408,050	2,837,957	3,199,957	3,250,000	3,466,650	+58,600
Montreal Protocol across-the-board reduction	.....	.....	.....	-12,000	.....	.....
Total, EPA	7,590,352	7,206,646	7,307,557	7,322,378	7,591,659	+1,307
Executive Office of the President						
Office of Science and Technology Policy	5,026	5,201	5,108	5,201	5,108	+82
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	2,675	3,020	2,827	2,675	2,827	+152
Total	7,701	8,221	7,935	7,876	7,935	+234

H.R. 2684 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation						
Office of Inspector General (transfer)	(34,666)	(33,666)	(33,666)	(34,666)	(33,666)	(-1,000)
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
Disaster relief	307,745	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	-7,745
(Transfer out)		(-2,900)	(-3,000)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)
Emergency funding	2,036,000	2,480,425			2,480,425	+444,425
Pre-disaster mitigation		30,000				
(Transfer out)		(-2,600)				
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:						
State share loan	1,355	1,295	1,295	1,295	1,295	-60
(Limitation on direct loans)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	
Administrative expenses	440	420	420	420	420	-20
Y2K local government and loan program (contingent emergency appropriations)				100,000		
Funds appropriated to the President (Y2K) (rescission)				-100,000		
Salaries and expenses	171,138	189,720	177,720	180,000	180,000	+8,862
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	3,641					-3,641
Office of Inspector General	5,400	8,015	6,515	8,015	8,015	+2,615
Emergency management planning and assistance	240,824	250,850	280,787	255,850	267,000	+26,176
(By transfer)		(5,400)	(3,000)	(2,900)	(2,900)	(+2,900)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	3,711					-3,711
Radiological emergency preparedness fund	12,849					-12,849
Collection of fees	-12,849					+12,849
new language		-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000
Emergency food and shelter program	100,000	125,000	110,000	110,000	110,000	+10,000
Flood map modernization fund		5,000	5,000		5,000	+5,000
National insurance development fund		(3,730)	(3,730)	(3,730)	(3,730)	(+3,730)
National Flood Insurance Fund (limitation on administrative expenses):						
Salaries and expenses	(22,685)	(24,131)	(24,333)	(24,333)	(24,333)	(+1,648)
Flood mitigation	(78,464)	(78,912)	(78,710)	(78,710)	(78,710)	(+246)
(Transfer out)		(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)
National flood mitigation fund		12,000				
(By transfer)		(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(+20,000)
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	2,870,254	3,401,725	880,737	854,580	3,351,155	+480,901
Appropriations	(826,902)	(921,300)	(880,737)	(854,580)	(870,730)	(+43,828)
Emergency funding	(2,043,352)	(2,480,425)			(2,480,425)	(+437,073)
General Services Administration						
Consumer Information Center Fund	2,619	2,622	2,622	2,622	2,622	+3
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
Human space flight	5,480,000	5,638,000	5,388,000		5,510,900	+30,900
International Space Station				2,482,700		
Launch vehicles and payload operation				3,156,000		
Subtotal	5,480,000	5,638,000	5,388,000	5,638,700	5,510,900	+30,900
Science, aeronautics and technology	5,653,900	5,424,700	4,975,700	5,424,700	5,606,700	-47,200
Mission support	2,511,100	2,494,900	2,269,300	2,495,000	2,515,100	+4,000
Office of Inspector General	20,000	20,800	20,800	20,000	20,000	
Total, NASA	13,665,000	13,578,400	12,653,800	13,578,400	13,652,700	-12,300
National Credit Union Administration						
Central liquidity facility:						
(Limitation on direct loans)	(600,000)	(600,000)				(-600,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds)	(176)	(257)	(257)	(257)	(257)	(+81)
Revolving loan program	2,000		1,000		1,000	-1,000
National Science Foundation						
Research and related activities	2,770,000	3,004,000	2,768,500	3,007,300	2,966,000	+196,000
Major research equipment	90,000	85,000	56,500	70,000	95,000	+5,000
Education and human resources	662,000	678,000	660,000	688,600	696,600	+34,600
Salaries and expenses	144,000	149,000	146,500	150,000	149,000	+5,000
Office of Inspector General	5,200	5,450	5,325	5,550	5,450	+250
Total, NSF	3,671,200	3,921,450	3,636,825	3,921,450	3,912,050	+240,850
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation						
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	90,000	90,000	80,000	60,000	75,000	-15,000

H.R. 2684 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Selective Service System						
Salaries and expenses	24,176	25,250	7,000	25,250	24,000	-176
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	250					-250
Total	24,426	25,250	7,000	25,250	24,000	-426
Total, title III, Independent agencies	28,558,844	29,016,204	24,756,866	26,307,446	29,181,011	+622,167
Appropriations	(26,515,242)	(26,535,779)	(24,756,866)	(26,307,446)	(26,700,586)	(+185,344)
Rescission				(-80,000)	(-80,000)	(-80,000)
Emergency funding	(2,043,602)	(2,480,425)			(2,480,425)	(+436,823)
TITLE IV - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Tennessee Valley Authority Borrowing Authority			-3,000,000			
TITLE V						
H.R. 202 - Preservation of Affordable Housing					-14,000	-14,000
Grand total (net)	95,263,261	99,603,004	91,980,156	97,828,196	99,452,918	+4,189,657
Current year, FY 2000 (net)	(95,263,261)	(95,403,004)	(91,980,156)	(93,628,196)	(95,252,918)	(-10,343)
Appropriations	(95,187,459)	(92,922,579)	(92,054,556)	(93,108,196)	(95,169,893)	(-17,566)
Rescissions	(-2,000,000)		(-74,400)	(-160,000)	(-2,477,400)	(-477,400)
Emergency funding	(2,075,802)	(2,480,425)			(2,480,425)	(+404,623)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001		(4,200,000)		(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(+4,200,000)
(By transfer)	(34,727)	(236,727)	(236,727)	(263,657)	(236,727)	(+202,000)
(Transfer out)	(-61)	(-203,161)	(-203,061)	(-203,061)	(-203,061)	(-203,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(101,149)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(+1,894)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(846,655)	(799,860)	(199,860)	(349,860)	(349,860)	(-496,795)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(359,361,000)	(340,361,000)	(359,187,000)	(339,361,000)	(359,902,000)	(+541,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(561,502)	(561,333)	(561,333)	(561,333)	(561,333)	(-169)
Total amounts in this bill	95,263,261	99,603,004	91,980,156	97,828,196	99,452,918	+4,189,657
Scorekeeping adjustments	-3,145,802	-6,290,000	-2,090,000	-6,290,000	-6,290,000	-3,144,198
Total mandatory and discretionary	92,117,459	93,313,004	89,890,156	91,538,196	93,162,918	+1,045,459
Mandatory	22,312,774	21,258,376	21,258,376	21,306,626	21,306,626	-1,006,148
Discretionary	69,804,685	72,054,628	68,631,780	70,231,570	71,856,292	+2,051,607

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in support of the conference report. Though I voted against the original VA–HUD bill as it left this House, I tend to support this conference report. My concern at that time was that, though the original bill had good funding for veterans care, it significantly underfunded the NASA account. I am very pleased to see that the NASA funding problem was corrected in this bill. I want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia and the gentleman from New York for their very, very hard work. They had a very, very difficult job. I really want to commend all the members of the conference committee on both sides of the aisle. I believe that this is a bill that Democrats and Republicans on both sides should be able to support.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), a very effective, hardworking member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. I urge my colleagues to vote for this report. I do not think that anyone realizes the amount of cooperation and coordinated effort that was put into this between our ranking member and our chairperson and the hardworking staff and the members. I think there is sort of an attunement among the members of the VA–HUD committee. I think we work very well together for a common goal. There is a commitment there, there is expertise there, and this process was one that was apparent to all of us, that in the end it would create a very good result.

□ 1130

I am particularly happy about the housing part of the bill. Of course there are other parts of it that I take great pride in also, but I want to applaud what we did for veterans, what we did for NASA, what we did for EPA; but I am particularly proud of what the committee did for housing in that people I represent have a very dire need for better housing, and this conference report took this into consideration and provided considerably new support for affordable housing and to create better housing for low-income Americans. We know what the situation is in this country with rent, and this committee addressed that; and I want to applaud them and to ask my colleagues to please support this. It is worthy of their consideration.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. Let me first comment briefly on the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I was disappointed that he came in and basically rained on the parade here, because frankly I think everyone in this Chamber and everyone in the House is very pleased with this bill and with the result that the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the ranking member have achieved. I am personally very pleased with it.

Furthermore, on the issue of Social Security and dipping into Social Security, I hope we do not dip into Social Security this year, but even if we would have to dip into it slightly, as the gentleman from Wisconsin observed, I would just point out that during the last year that he controlled the Committee on Appropriations the dip into Social Security was well over $60 billion, the entire amount available.

Now let me get to the main point that I wanted to make, and that is to thank the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for their work on this bill.

I was responsible for circulating a letter which was signed by over 80 House Members and sent to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations urgently requesting that the National Science Foundation budget be increased above the House figures as they came out of this chamber. I am very pleased that Chairman Walsh was able to accomplish that. In fact, he did yeoman's work on the entire budget, but particularly on the budget of the National Science Foundation. Furthermore, what he has done on environmental issues is also very worthy, and I certainly appreciate it. I thank him and the rest of the members of the committee for their fine work on this bill.

I urge that we adopt the conference report.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), another hardworking member of our subcommittee and a very effective one.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong and enthusiastic support of the VA–HUD and independent agencies' conference report. I will echo some of the comments that have been made already particularly by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), a few minutes ago. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) knows and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) knows, I represent the Marshall Space Flight Center and NASA Center back in Alabama. That first mark that we endured was quite a hit on NASA.

I appreciate the gentleman from New York's work; I appreciate the gentleman from West Virginia's work to make sure that we restored that cut. We would do it, and we, in fact, did do it; but, as has been said, this does not just happen. It is because of the determination of the chairman, the determination of the ranking member that issues like this can be brought back to the table and kept alive. So I thank them very much on behalf of the NASA employees that I represent, as well as the staff of the subcommittee as well. I am a new member of this subcommittee. They have made the experience of working on this subcommittee very, very pleasurable.

This is a good bill, a bill that the Members should vote for. The conference report is a fair conference report. Our investment in veterans' health care issues, the emergency funds to FEMA, especially in light of the devastation brought on by Hurricane Floyd, the significant reinvestment in HUD, the re-commitment to NASA as well. All of those are reasons why this conference report should pass, and I thank my ranking member, and I thank the chairman for being so patient with some of us that were in an awkward position as we negotiated through this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the VA–HUD and Independent Agencies Conference Report. In this bill we have been able to provide a substantial investment in Veteran's Health Care, provide emergency funds to FEMA to address the devastation brought on by Hurricane Floyd, and significantly invest in HUD and NASA. So this is a good bill, negotiated in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just take a few minutes to express my appreciation for all of the hard work that Chairman WALSH and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN have put into this bill in order to get us to this point. I also want to express my appreciation for all of the hard work of the staff over the last few weeks. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member to this subcommittee. And it was just my luck that the very year that I was able to finally come over to the subcommittee—NASA, which has Marshall Space Flight Center in my district, took a $1.4 billion dollar hit in the House subcommittee mark. Our continued investment in NASA today will inevitably pay off down the line in terms of real and tangible benefits. I am also pleased that we were able to reach agreement on some of the more sticky issues dealing with HUD's funding.

Under the conference agreement, we were able to provide funding for an additional 60,000 section 8 vouchers, increase the funding to public housing operating assistance, and provide additional funds for HUD's homeless assistance and prevention programs. In addition, the compromise reached on the Community Builders program demonstrates what invaluable resources these public servants have been to HUD's management reform process and to communities across the country. I know that negotiations around these issues were tense, so I'm glad we were able to come to a suitable compromise.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report we are considering today. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill so that it can be sent to the President and signed into law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time; and I rise, Mr. Speaker, in strong

support of this conference agreement, and I do want to thank wholeheartedly the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their indefatigable efforts to increase two important agencies in our Nation's scientific enterprise, NASA and the National Science Foundation. I have a deep concern that the very tight budget allocations that were imposed on that House bill did not provide these agencies with adequate funding, and I am pleased that the conference report increases the House levels and restores enough funding for these agencies to sufficiently meet their critical national missions.

As my colleagues know, before this conference report there might have been a loss of about 2,500 jobs and one half of them from Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia region, also impacting contractors. This is Goddard Space Center, university R&D, important scientific projects. Scientific research and growth is critical to our Nation's continued economic prosperity, and I want to commend the chairman for recognizing the importance of maintaining our technological preeminence.

I also want to comment that I am pleased that the conferees have funded the housing opportunities for persons with AIDS, the HOPWA program at $232 million. This is $7 million above the fiscal year 1999 program. This program enjoys wide bipartisan support, and it is the only Federal program that provides cities and States with the resources to specifically address the housing crisis facing people with AIDS, and it is also financially solvent. It saves us money actually doing that.

I further want to applaud the conferees for including provisions of H.R. 202 to provide grants to States to preserve privately owned affordable housing servicing low-income individuals and families. Additionally, this conference provides HUD with authority to offer enhanced vouchers to elderly and disabled residents.

Finally, I want to comment on the fact that $300,000 for the Potomac River Visions Initiative is included in this conference report. This long-range project will preserve and enhance the resources of the Potomac River watershed. My colleagues, you can see that I enthusiastically support this conference report.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the distinguished authorizer.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the chairman and ranking member are entitled to congratulations for doing a very good job in very difficult circumstances. The difficult circumstances is the unrealistically low budget allocation that they were given, and I think the job they did as well as what they left undone, not because of their own faults, but because of what they had to work with, is very important for us to focus on. What they did was to show that we can work within a given amount of resources in both a bipartisan way, and we can also overcome some of the committee jurisdictional problems that sometimes beset us.

As the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, I work with the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO), along with the appropriators so the language that we developed and put through the House in the authorizing area to protect existing tenants in various subsidized programs is now made part of the law and funded simultaneously, and that is very important.

We have a lot of people out there in housing and have been out there for a while who were threatened with the loss of their housing, and they can now be assured, those who are in these programs, the section 8 program and the assisted housing program, that existing tenancies will be protected, and protected not just for a year, but as long as they are around; and I think that is a very important commitment that we ought to reaffirm.

In addition, I am very pleased that they voted some new vouchers because we have an enormous housing crisis in this country. We have millions of hard-working Americans who cannot afford to live decently or can do that only by biting into other parts of their income, and it was important that we did it. But it is also important to note how much we have left undone, and I want to say I am particularly struck that so many of my Republican colleagues have come to the floor and accurately praised this bill for funding government programs.

But let us be clear of what we are talking about. We are talking about my Republican colleagues joining us and congratulating ourselves for spending government money because there is too often a kind of semantic separation, a disconnect, in which everybody is for the particulars and nobody is for the general, and let us understand this.

One cannot have a whole that is smaller than the sum of the parts; one cannot be for more housing for the elderly, for adequately funding the National Science Foundation, take credit for better veterans' health, do more for environmental protection, and simultaneously boast at how little money they are spending, and that is the dilemma we are in. We have a political and idealistic attachment to striking the whole, while we have a realistic understanding of the importance of the parts, and the time has come no longer to subject people like the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from West Virginia to the need to do contortions, jumps and loops.

Let us get a more realistic overall amount so that next year when Republicans and Democrats again come and congratulate ourselves for intelligently spending tax dollars on various important social needs, we will have done it with a lot less acrobatics.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from West Virginia and the gentleman from New York for a bill that really speaks to the needs of Hurricane Floyd victims in North Carolina. I toured last week on behalf of this Congress, and I saw the tragedy in its worst possible case. People can look to us here in Washington, the Federal Government. Because of this bill they know we care, they know we are going to do something to help them rebuild their lives and their businesses. They know that we are aware and will move as quickly as we can to help them in their hour of need again.

I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for their efforts. A good bill. I heartily support it.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the VA HUD conference agreement. I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and also the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for their excellent work in dramatically improving this bill since it left this House. I also want to thank Secretary Cuomo for his tireless efforts and commitment to the housing needs of those with minimum resources in this country. As someone who represents one of the highest housing cost areas in the Oakland/San Francisco Bay area, I am especially supportive of this effort.

The conference report is really a better bill because it includes additional section 8 housing preservation and tenant protection. We are rapidly losing hard-gained section 8 housing because of high rents. This bill now allows for some rent increases to preserve such housing. It also gives additional protections to tenets by promoting housing preservation with specific mechanisms to bring in local resources to work with HUD to do everything possible to protect our existing housing stock for low income tenets.

The shocking fact of housing in this country is that there are from 5 million to over 12 million people who are in housing that is grossly substandard who have to pay over 50 percent of their income for housing. The Washington Post had an excellent story on this just 2 days ago. How we respond to such facts, to me, is a true test of our ethical and moral sense.

This bill comes a bit closer to our desperate housing needs by providing $690 million and 60,000 section 8 vouchers more than the House bill. It also better attends to the housing needs of our elderly and disabled by increasing

living facilities which are assisted, service coordinators, capital repairers, elderly housing debt forgiveness and other mechanisms; and for our very important veterans it provides 1.7 billion more than fiscal 1999 and 1.8 billion more than requested by the administration.

Of course like some, I too am not pleased with the funny accounting devices; but we must see this as a cup that is half full rather than half empty. I ask my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of the Committee on Science.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference committee report, and I would just like to suggest that the people who are doing the work on VA–HUD appropriations have a very tough job.

□ 1145

It is, perhaps, one of the toughest assignments in Washington to try to handle the appropriations for VA–HUD, because it includes such a broad range of issues that we have to deal with and a broad range of concerns and interest groups.

I oversee the NASA budget in terms of the authorization side of the House, and I work very closely with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH). And I want my colleagues to know that just the authorizing process is hard, and I know that the appropriations side of it has to be twice as hard with people putting pressure on us from all directions.

Those involved with this VA–HUD conference actually have had to deal not just with the authorizers versus the appropriators and NASA, but they have had to deal with pressures from interest groups from as wide a variety as any group in this Congress.

So I appreciate the job that they have done. I might have a few disagreements, but the fact is that they have done a good job with what they could do and especially in a time like this when there has been such maximum pressure on them from not only the different groups that need to be taken care of, but also the overall country's need to balance the budget and how to proceed with the budget restrictions that we have.

So I will be supporting this measure today, and I am very happy that we have established a good working relationship between the authorizers and the appropriators, and we will continue to try to do that in the time ahead. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this conference report.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the bill. This is a vastly improved bill over the original House bill because there are significant improvements in housing programs, NASA, EPA and veterans' medical care.

I especially want to compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), my friend and New York colleague, who really has done an excellent job in terms of putting this bill together and working to include everybody into this bill. Housing funding is increased $2.4 billion, raising the funding to $28.6 billion. NASA's budget increased. Veterans' medical care increased by $1.7 billion, and there is $3 million, of interest for me particularly, in the subcommittee report for renovations to the Bronx VA, the Veterans Administration, which will be working in connection with Mount Sinai School of Medicine. There is also $1 million in the subcommittee report for the Carl Sagan Center and the Children's Hospital at Montefiore Medical Center in Bronx, New York. Those are two very important programs.

So this bill is a vast improvement over the original bill. I look forward to voting for the bill today and working with the Chairman to make these projects a reality. I again want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), for the fine work that he has done.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

(Mr. MCINTOSH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his leadership on this VA–HUD bill, particularly for wrestling with many very difficult questions. One of them that we have taken up in my oversight subcommittee is the question of the EPA's continued effort to implement the Kyoto protocol, in spite of language that was put into the bill last year indicating that it was the intent of Congress not to use funds appropriated for that purpose.

I will report to the body and to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) that during the conference on October 6, Mr. Gary Guzy, who is the EPA's general counsel, reported and stuck by their position that they have the ability to regulate carbon dioxide, in spite of the fact that the structure of the statute, the intent of the Clean Air Act is that they do not have the authority to regulate that substance.

At this time, I would include a letter from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Commerce and chaired the conference in 1990 when the Clean Air Act amendments were passed. His letter said, in part, ''The House and Senate conferees never agreed to designate carbon dioxide as a pollutant for regulatory or other purposes.''

I will include that letter at this point in the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, October 5, 1999.

Hon. DAVID M. MCINTOSH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs, Committee on Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that you have asked, based on discussions between our staffs, about the disposition by the House-Senate conferees of the amendments in 1990 to the Clean Air Act (CAA) regarding greenhouse gases such as methane and carbon dioxide. In making this inquiry, you call my attention to an April 10, 1998 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) memorandum entitled ''EPA's Authority to Regulate Pollutants Emitted by Electric Power Generation Sources'' and an October 12, 1998 memorandum entitled ''The Authority of EPA to Regulate Carbon Dioxide Under the Clean Air Act'' prepared for the National Mining Association. The latter memorandum discusses the legislative history of the 1990 amendments.

First, the House-passed bill (H.R. 3030) never included any provision regarding the regulation of any greenhouse gas, such as methane or carbon dioxide, nor did the bill address global climate change. The House, however, did include provisions aimed at implementing the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

Second, as to the Senate version (S. 1630) of the proposed amendments, the October 12, 1998 memorandum correctly points out that the Senate did address greenhouse gas matters and global warming, along with provisions implementing the Montreal Protocol. Nevertheless, only Montreal Protocol related provisions were agreed to by the House-Senate conferees (see Conf. Rept. 101–952, Oct. 26, 1990).

However, I should point out that Public Law 101–549 of November 15, 1990, which contains the 1990 amendments to the CAA, includes some provisions, such as sections 813, 817 and 819–821, that were enacted as free-standing provisions separate from the CAA. Although the Public Law often refers to the ''Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990,'' the Public Law does not specify that reference as the ''short title'' of all of the provisions included the Public Law.

One of these free-standing provisions, section 821, entitled ''Information Gathering on Greenhouse Gases Contributing to Global Climate Change'' appears in the United States Code as a ''note'' (at 42 U.S.C. 7651k). It requires regulations by the EPA to ''monitor carbon dioxide emissions'' from ''all affected sources subject to title V'' of the CAA and specifies that the emissions are to be reported to the EPA. That section does not designate carbon dioxide as a ''pollutant'' for any purpose.

Finally, Title IX of the Conference Report, entitled ''Clean Air Research,'' was primarily negotiated at the time by the House and Senate Science Committees, which had no regulatory jurisdiction under House-Senate Rules. This title amended section 103 of the CAA by adding new subsections (c) through (k). New subsection (g), entitled ''Pollution Prevention and Control,'' calls for ''non-regulatory strategies and technologies for air pollution prevention.'' While it refers, as noted in the EPA memorandum, to carbon dioxide as a ''pollutant,'' House and Senate conferees never agreed to designate carbon dioxide as a pollutant for regulatory or other purposes.

Based on my review of this history and my recollection of the discussions, I would have difficulty concluding that the House-Senate conferees, who rejected the Senate regulatory provisions (with the exception of the above-referenced section 821), contemplated

regulating greenhouse gas emissions or addressing global warming under the Clean Air Act. Shortly after enactment of Public Law 101–549, the United Nations General Assembly established in December 1990 the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee that ultimately led to the Framework Convention on Climate Change, which was ratified by the United States after advice and consent by the Senate. That Convention is, of course, not self-executing, and the Congress has not enacted implementing legislation authorizing EPA or any other agency to regulate greenhouse gases.

I hope that this is responsive.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Ranking Member.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, the law and the legislative history is clear about this point, and there are some questions that still remain in this bill because it contains the language, which I wholly endorse, authored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) saying that EPA cannot spend funds to further implement the Kyoto protocol, but there are some unanswered questions in the legislative report whether the House intent on that or the Senate intent prevails, or, as I would hope would happen, they would both be governing on the executive branch as they spend funds from this bill.

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

With regard to the previous speaker's comments, I would just like to make clear that there have been efforts as the process has moved forward, both this year and last year, to effect authorizations in the clean air area on our appropriation bill. It is a particularly complicated subject, difficult for the authorizers to deal with, as is evidenced by the way it is dealt with by them, and the appropriations bill is a particularly inappropriate place to try to deal with them.

The appropriations process is an inappropriate place to deal with clean air authorizing issues; trying to impact interpretations in that area and comments as we debate a conference report is equally or more inappropriate place to deal with it. There is a difference on the Kyoto issue between the House and the Senate report. The administration has its interpretation of that.

Going back to the compromise language on Kyoto that was contained in last year's appropriation report, they would maintain that that is the interpretation that applies this year. The gentleman can add his interpretation on that and they can debate it, but I would submit that comments offered in the course of this debate on this conference report do not impact the legislative intent in any way with regard to the Kyoto issue.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time at this time, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the VA–HUD conference report.

When the bill was debated on this floor, I offered two amendments. One would have restored funding for HOPWA, the Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS, to the level of the fiscal year 1999 budget which was provided for in the Senate bill, but was not provided for in the House bill. The HOPWA amendment was accepted by this body.

Unfortunately, the second amendment which I offered which sought to increase funding for new Section 8 vouchers; that is, to provide funding for new Section 8 vouchers and increase the public housing operating fund was not accepted.

I am happy that reason and compassion have prevailed in the conference report. The conference report provides $347 million to fund 60,000 new Section 8 housing vouchers and to increase the public housing operating fund. Furthermore, HOPWA's funding was increased by $7 million above the Senate level. The report will go a long way in assisting people with AIDS and assisting people in finding affordable housing to make the necessary repairs they so desperately need. We have not provided new Section 8 housing vouchers for over 2 years.

The need for housing assistance remains staggering. Today, over 5 million low-income families pay more than 50 percent of their income for rent or live in severely substandard housing. Not one of these 5 million families receives any Federal housing assistance. Their needs are desperate and in this bill today, in this conference report, we have chosen to begin to address the severity of those needs; and that is progress.

So again, I urge support of the VA–HUD conference report.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

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

I rise to applaud the work of my colleagues in the House and the other body.

Two months ago, the Committee on Appropriations reported out a House spending bill that cut $1 billion from critical housing programs. This was done while our Nation faces a dire crisis in housing. In Chicago alone, 35,000 families are on the waiting list for public housing; and, across the country, over 5 million households faced worst-case housing needs. Not only were these cuts proposed in the face of great need, but they were proposed in a time of great plenty. Our economy is in the middle of its strongest run ever, and the Federal Government is reporting budget surpluses. It hardly seemed like the time to cut critical investment in housing for seniors, families, and others on low and fixed incomes.

Today, however, House and Senate conferees have improved that bill and are reporting a bill that actually increases spending for housing. There is over $400 million more than the President requested for public housing programs. Homeless assistance is increased $25 million over last year. The HOPWA program will receive $7 million more than last year. Housing for persons with disabilities will receive $5 million more than last year. Housing for our Nation's elderly will get $50 million more than last year, and the conferees funded 60,000 new rental vouchers for families to use in the private rental market.

Moreover, the conference increased spending in economic development programs. These programs allow State and local governments to encourage business and create good-paying jobs. When the housing budget was first proposed late last summer, I and other colleagues in the House and people and organizations across the country rose in outrage. We ought to have fought cutting housing when we had so much while so many people had so little. But now, I am happy to rise and applaud the final product, which has done an about-face and increases investment in people by increasing our investment in their housing and jobs.

I urge my colleagues to give a resounding vote in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the time. I just want to respond to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN. He and I have had a lot of agreements; we have had some disagreements. And I notice that in his comments he made reference to language that appeared in the fiscal year 1999 report. I am here to say that we differ strongly on that; and I think as a Member of this committee, as a senior Member, that I should state that the language, the intent of both the House and the Senate should be referred to. It should be referenced, and it should not just simply be fiscal year 1999, because that language is in the ash can of history, in my judgment. We should look at fiscal year 2000.

So my belief is that it is important that I at least get that out as an additional view of this report. It does not say that we are not going to have this debate in the future, but I do believe it is clear that he and I differ. And I think I should get that report, that comment on the record.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Regrettably, I feel compelled to respond to the gentleman from Michigan.

If he is trying to establish a legislative history with regard to the Kyoto language, I repeat that I think this is a poor place to do it. The facts are that there is language in the House report on that subject. The language in the

Senate report differs, and there could not be any consensus drawn of the congressional intent with regard to that topic by looking at the 2000 report, the report accompanying this bill. The language in the 1999 report accompanying the VA appropriations was agreed to by both the House and the Senate.

I leave it to the lawyers, if it gets to that, to debate what actually reflects the legislative intent of the Congress on that topic. However, I would note that the Senate worked long and hard for 2 years now on this language. That language was agreed to by both bodies in last year's report. This year, there was not agreement on the Kyoto language between the House and the Senate. So that I do not think one can draw a conclusion that the Congress has spoken on that issue in unison this year.

□ 1200

On the other hand, one could draw a conclusion that the last time the Congress spoke on the issue in agreement was in the 1999 report.

Not that this clarifies anything, except to suggest that I would not agree with the gentleman that the language coming out of the report accompanying this year's bill would determine legislative intent in any way on this topic.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just take one second, once again, to thank my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for his cooperation on this bill. I have enjoyed working with the gentleman.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude with similar expressions of appreciation for his many courtesies during this process, and for his allowing the minority all along the process to participate in a very meaningful way in bringing this bill to the floor.

Again, I repeat that it is a testament to his skill and legislative leadership that we are bringing this kind of a bill to the floor in a very bipartisan way in a year in which it is terribly difficult to do that.

If the chairman would allow me to express appreciation to members on the minority side of the subcommittee, to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), they were all very hard-working members on the subcommittee throughout the year to bring this bill where we are today.

I very much appreciate their efforts in working with them, as well as the chairman and the majority members.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I note that the statement of the managers in the VA–HUD FY 2000 Conference Report directs HUD to honor its prior agreements for Section 8 projects which already have gone through one of the Reengineering Demonstration Programs and entered into a HUD use agreement providing for budget-based rents. This direction was inserted in the conference report to ensure that the limited number of such projects which did not also have their mortgages restructured at the time, would not now have to go through a mortgage restructuring—which can only be done at significant cost and expense to the project and to the government.

One such project, Canal Park Tower, is located in my district in downtown Akron, Ohio, where it provides more than 190 efficiency units for the elderly and disabled. Canal Park Tower provides on-site congregate meals and support services for the project's residents. Canal Park Tower is an important element in Akron's effort to meet the needs of its low-income elderly and disabled.

Last Year, after receiving a Section 8 commitment from HUD, the owner entered into a use agreement with HUD under which the project's rents were reset on a budget basis instead of being restructured. Under the use agreement, the owner was required to continue to accept Section 8 assistance and to continue to provide low-income housing for a 20-year period. The owner had earlier made a different proposal to HUD which involved mortgage restructuring. In the end, HUD determined the project inappropriate for mortgage restructuring. At HUD's insistence, the project went forward with budget-based rents.

The Managers recognized that it would be unfair at this late date to force the owner to go through a mortgage restructuring. In doing so, the managers have resolved a nagging issue that has worried residents and low-income housing advocates throughout Akron. I am sure I am not alone in commending them for their attention to this narrow issue.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the FY 2000 VA–HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Conference Report. My colleagues have worked hard to craft a bill that a majority of us can support, and I applaud their efforts. The conference report provides vital funding to help address our nation's housing needs, fund science and technology research, and keep our commitment to our veterans.

Although the bill does not fund all of our housing priorities, it does take a significant step towards helping low- and moderate-income Americans afford a safe place to live by providing 60,000 new Section 8 vouchers to help families with worst-case housing needs. The bill also provides substantial increases in support for public housing programs, homeless assistance, housing for persons living with AIDS, senior housing, and programs for disabled citizens.

The conference report also includes funding for economic development projects in our cities and towns. The Community Development Block Grants, HOME, and Brownfields Redevelopment programs all received additional funding in this bill.

In addition, the bill provides $70 million for the Urban and Rural Empowerment Zones. While this is substantially less than these communities were promised, I will continue to work with my colleagues to secure full funding for this important initiative next year.

With respect to Veterans Affairs, the conference report provides $44.3 billion for the programs and benefits administered by the Department of Veterans. This represents a four percent, or $1.7 billion, increase above Fiscal Year 1999 levels. Of the amounts provided in the conference report, $19.6 billion is for veterans medical care, $21.6 billion is for compensation benefits for veterans who suffer from service connected disabilities, $65 million is provided for construction and renovation on VA facilities, and $48 million is provided for transitional housing for the thousands of homeless veterans across the country.

Additonally, the conference report proclaims success for the future of cutting edge science and technology. NASA will receive $13.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2000. This is an eight percent increase from the original numbers previously proposed in the House of Representatives.

Through civilian space flight, exploration, scientific advancement, and the development of next-generation technologies, NASA has successfully ensured U.S. leadership in world aviation and space exploration. Clearly this bill represents a victory for the United States and its future in space exploration. While I regret that the International Space Station will only be funded at $2.3 billion, I am pleased that NASA has been given the resources to continue its mission to conduct space and aeronautical research, development, and flight activities to maintain U.S. superiority in aeronautics and space exploration. I look forward to promoting space endeavors in the future.

Along with NASA, the National Science Foundation (NSF) also was granted an eight percent increase over the original H.R. 2684 levels. With the $3.9 billion appropriated, NSF can continue to support basic and applied research, science and technology policy research, and science and engineering education programs. This bill provides $697 million for NSF to continue its math and science education initiatives.

Through grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements, NSF supports fundamental and applied research in all major scientific and engineering disciplines. NSF funding is a key investment in the future of advanced technologies and reaffirms America's strong and longstanding leadership in scientific research and education.

As a result of these long-awaited and anxiously anticipated increases in funding of critical programs that are key to our nation's well-being and future success, I am pleased to support this bill.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the House of Representatives to speak in strong support of funding increases for the Department of Veterans Affairs. Last month I was proud to support the passage of H.R. 2684, the FY 2000 Veterans Affairs/Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies (VA/HUD) Appropriations Act. The bill contained $1.7 billion more than FY 1999 and $1.8 billion more than the President's request for FY 2000 VA Appropriations.

The Veterans Integrated Services Network 12 (VISN 12) conducted a study and reported six options to save money within the VISN. Of the six options, only one would not move services from the North Chicago VA to other VA hospitals within the VISN, or completely close the North Chicago hospital. This option study was delivered to my office the day after the

House passed its version of H.R. 2684, thus preventing any legislative action by the House, which could prevent any reorganization or closure within VISN 12.

Today, I was pleased to read the Conference Report containing strong language to include veterans groups, medical schools having an affiliation with a VA hospital, employee representatives, and any other interested parties as stakeholders to be consulted by the Department of Veterans Affairs before any reorganization within VISN 12 occurs. Although, the VA hospital in North Chicago only borders my district, a large number of veterans from my district use the North Chicago hospital for treatment. Many of the veterans from the northeastern part of the state seek medical treatment at North Chicago, because the only other option is to travel a minimum of an hour either north to Milwaukee or south to Chicago.

Unfortunately, the Conference Report to H.R. 2684 increases spending $7.5 billion over the House-passed version, but does not provide additional funding for VA programs. However, the Conference Report does spend more money on programs like NASA, $13.7 billion, $999 million more than the House approved initially, $7.5 billion for EPA, an increase of $284 million over the House version and, $438.5 million for AmeriCorps, which the House version eliminated. Finally, the Conference Report restores a $3 billion reduction to the Tennessee Valley Authority's (TVA) borrowing authority just to name a few increases.

I am very supportive of our veterans in Illinois, but because of these increases in spending noted, I am unable to vote in favor of the Conference Report to H.R. 2684.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conference Report to H.R. 2684, the ''FY 2000 VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act.'' Let me commend the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. WALSH, and the Ranking Member, Mr. MOLLOHAN, for their tremendous work in completing one of the most complex and jurisdictionally-diverse funding bills before Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of provisions that are included in the bill before us under title V, entitled ''Preserving Affordable Housing for Seniors and Families into the 21st Century.'' This legislation is the product of months of work among Republicans and Democrats in both bodies and the Administration to deal with one of the most pressing social needs in recent years—the need for safe, secure, affordable housing.

Our proposal addresses the so-called Section 8 ''opt-out'' problem where hundreds of thousand of affordable housing units would have been at risk of being lost over the next several years as rental assistance contracts with the Federal Government expire in increasing numbers. Our legislation protects seniors, individuals with disabilities and low-income families living in assisted housing from displacement in opt-out circumstances, and encourages the preservation of the housing as affordable where possible. ''Preserving Affordable Housing for Seniors and Families into the 21st Century'' passed the House freestanding on September 27, 1999, by an overwhelming vote of 405 to five.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House today is one of the most important housing bills in recent years, and would affect the lives of millions of low-income families across the country. The loss of affordable housing in my home state of Iowa first generated national attention to the critical nature of the problem. More than 15,000 families in Iowa, and more than 500,000 across the country would potentially be at risk of losing their homes if we do not act.

Without the cooperation and assistance of Members from both sides of the aisle as well as the Administration we could not be here today. Under the leadership of Secretary Andrew Cuomo, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has been a key player throughout the entire process in our efforts to protect vulnerable families from displacement and to preserve affordable housing. Our work together on this legislation is one of the most significant efforts of truly bipartisan cooperation of the 106th Congress.

Above all, let me recognize the Chairman of the Housing Subcommittee and author of the bill, Mr. LAZIO, for his leadership and tireless dedication to provide affordable housing and community development opportunities to those least able to provide for themselves.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2684, this year's VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, is truly the culmination of bipartisan efforts to meet the critical shelter needs of many of our most vulnerable citizens. I want to commend my friend and fellow New Yorker, JIM WALSH, the Chairman of the VA/HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, for producing a bill of which all of us in the House and Senate can be proud. I also want to thank Mr. WALSH for working closely with me to ensure that certain provisions from housing authorization bills that I have sponsored and supported are included in this bill.

Let me briefly explain some of these provisions, which compose Title V of H.R. 2684. This portion of the bill contains many original provisions from H.R. 202, the ''Preserving Affordable Housing for Senior Citizens and Families into the 21st Century Act'' a bill Chairman LEACH and I introduced this year. Also contained in this appropriations bill are provisions from H.R. 1336, the ''Emergency Residents Protection Act,'' which was introduced by Chairman LEACH, Rep. Jim WALSH, and myself earlier this year. There are also parts of H.R. 1624, the ''Elderly Housing Quality Improvement Act'', introduced by Mr. LAFALCE, Ranking Member of the Banking Committee.

These various authorization bills have been the subjects of numerous Committee hearings during the 106th Congress. Majority and Minority Committee staff worked, along with the Administration, for the last several months to develop a bipartisan consensus product supported by the Committee Republican and Democratic leadership, and which combined the best ideas from these various pieces of legislation into a new H.R. 202. The Banking Committee reported out the resulting legislation by unanimous vote. H.R. 202 passed the House under suspension of the rules on September 27th by a vote of 405 to 5. In short, Mr. Speaker, the provisions of H.R. 202 enjoy overwhelming, bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, this bill encompasses a broad spectrum of ideas. And they are all the right ideas to help America's seniors and other vulnerable citizens find affordable housing.

On the horizon, a gray dawn is approaching where more and more Americans will live longer and enjoy more active, healthy lives. More than 33 million people in the United States are now 65 years of age and older, and by the year 2020 that number will grow to almost 53 million. That is one in every six Americans. In this environment of a graying population, we should celebrate this new-found longevity, but we must not overlook the fact that millions of senior citizens will suffer a crisis of safe, affordable housing if we fail to prepare for it. These senior citizens, who created the foundation of greatness of this nation that we all enjoy today, deserve to know that they will be taken care of.

These seniors are the same people who guided America through the Great Depression; the same people who served us on the front lines and on the assembly lines in world War II; the same people who led the nation to superpower strength following the war. Some may have even lost a leg or their sight in the war or in a factory accident. They have provided an almost unspeakable service to each and every American alive today and made sacrifices which some of us with fewer years can hardly imagine.

We would be failing them if we did not help provide them the same security they have given us. They deserve the sense of security that would come from knowing they can stay in their current housing and continue to build a life there. And they deserve the peace of mind that comes with knowing they have a place to lay their head at night.

This bill would provide that peace of mind. This bill in fact reauthorizes the Section 202 program, the primary method of federal assistance for low-income senior citizens, and the section 811 program, which provides affordable housing for disabled citizens. In addition, the legislation creates a commission to study elderly housing issues and recommend how best to provide for the elderly. This bill also contains streamlined refinancings of Section 236 projects so we can provide more resources to these projects for the benefit of the residents. Finally, certain reforms to the Section 811 program affecting the size of projects, supported by advocacy groups for the disabled, are also included in the legislation.

The provisions in this bill are designed to protect our seniors, the disabled, and our vulnerable families from displacement or drastic rent increases. Indeed, by incorporating much of H.R. 1336, Title V of this bill addresses the so-called Section 8 ''opt-out problem'', which is caused by owners opting not to renew their Section 8 contracts upon expiration. The Housing Subcommittee held hearings earlier this year on the problem of expiring Section 8 contracts, and found that a significant number of owners that were indicating they planned to ''opt out'' of the Section 8 program. Five hundred thousand units were ''at-risk'' over the next five years of being lost as affordable housing.

Mr. Speaker, the Section 8 opt-out problem was characterized by many as the most significant housing crisis facing our nation. With this bill, this Congress has taken affirmative, concrete action to solve this housing problem.

Finally, while some of the provisions of H.R. 202 are not included in Title V, we hope to accomplish many of the same goals through report language. As an example, this legislation directs HUD to streamline the existing Home Equity Conversion Mortgage program, allowing seniors more flexibility to maximize the equity in their homes. Mr. Speaker, to the extent that

certain reforms in H.R. 202, pertaining to the 202 elderly and 811 disabled program are not included in this bill, it is my intent to work with the Minority and our authorizing counterparts from the Senate to see that these improvements are in fact enacted in the next session. I look forward to that risk.

This bill truly incorporates a 21st century model of housing, where creativity and partnering combine to result in a compassionate piece of legislation that will result in security and peace of mind for some of our most cherished citizens. Today we stand with our seniors and provide them a variety of programs that will help them as they more into their twilight years.

I thank Chairman Walsh for his leadership, and thank all the members of the Appropriations Committee for working with the Republican and Democratic authorizers from the Banking Committee, in such a bipartisan manner to solve these problems.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend a sincere thanks to Chairman WALSH, and the Ranking Member, Mr. MOLLOHAN, for their support of funding Sacramento projects included in the conference report on H.R. 2684, the VA–HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations for FY 2000.

I would first like to thank the committee in providing support to the Sacramento Combined Sewer System. The City of Sacramento's 100 year old combined sewer system is no longer capable of handling both the stormwater and sanitary wastewater flows it was designed to carry. The City remains committed to providing a minimum 50 percent of the cost share in meeting the construction-related needs of this project. It will complement overall efforts to improve the California Bay-Delta's water quality and will greatly assist the City's efforts to protect the public health. Most importantly, the project will stop the flow of sewage into City streets and the Sacramento River, which serves as the primary source of drinking water for more than 20 million Californians.

Additionally, I also appreciate the committee's continued support for the Sacramento River Toxic Pollutant Control Program. The Sacramento River currently exceeds water quality criteria recommended by the state of California and EPA for metals such as copper, mercury and lead. Past funding provided by Congress has been used to successfully organize a multiyear monitoring and management effort with a regional stakeholder group that includes representatives of federal, state, and local agencies, agriculture and industry organizations, environmental organizations, and public interest groups. Together, the region has developed an integrated water quality monitoring program in collaboration with other ongoing efforts in the watershed, leveraging resources among programs and producing consistent reliable information on important water quality characteristics. Continued funding will allow the region to move forward with critical steps needed in the development of the pollutant reduction plan.

Finally, I am grateful that the Committee was willing to provide much needed funding to the Franklin Villa Housing Development in Sacramento. The Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA), which serves the interests of both the City and the County of Sacramento, has identified Franklin Villa as one of the most pressing priorities for the region. Once a senior center, the units in Franklin Villa became privately held, most by absent organizations, national non-profit entities, local government representatives, and private sector companies such as Freddie Mac. SHRA also is working closely with the Department of Housing and Urban Development on issuers relating to the revitalization plan, including current efforts aimed at concluding a joint agreement on the management of HUD-owned units. With a full-scale revitalization plan developed, and with work continuing at the local and national levels to move the plan forward, the primary obstacle that remains is the availability of sufficient funding.

Existing housing programs from the Department of Housing and Urban Development such as the HOME Program and the HOPE VI Program cannot be brought to bear on the Franklin Villa project because these important programs only target public housing, not privately-held housing. Therefore, federal seed funding for the Franklin Villa project, absent congressional direction, would not be available.

Again, I remain grateful for the assistance given to these projects that are so vital to the needs of the Sacramento community. I commend the leadership of the committee and the commitment put forth by the conferees to address these important issues.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the VA/HUD Conference Report is a good bill for housing. Unlike the House-passed bill, the conference report addresses the twin goals of housing preservation and expanding affordable housing opportunities for the 5.3 million American families with worse case housing needs.

The conference report funds 60,000 new Section 8 vouchers, the second year in a row that we have provided incremental vouchers. The bill keeps our promise with last year's public housing reform bill—providing almost $700 million more for public housing than the bill passed by the House. And, it includes funding increases for critical housing programs like homeless prevention, elderly and disabled housing, housing for persons with AIDS, and fair housing enforcement.

Equally important, the bill provides a comprehensive response to the Section 8 ''opt-out'' crisis, which threatens us with the loss of hundreds of thousands of affordable housing units. By building on HUD's mark-up-to-market initiative, announced earlier this year, we preserve the best portion of our affordable housing stock and fully protect all tenants who live in units we are unable to preserve. This is a carefully crafted approach, which targets scarce resources to preserve projects in tight rental markets and protect tenants most at risk, while giving HUD flexibility to preserve additional housing.

The conference report is also a good bill for community development. Funding is provided for the APIC New Markets initiative, to leverage billions of dollars of private capital for under-served and economically depressed areas. However, since such funding is conditioned on enactment of authorizing legislation, I call on the House to hold hearings and act expeditiously on this legislation.

The conference report also increases funding for CDBG, provides $70 million for Enterprise Zones and Empowerment Communities, and restores cuts made in the House bill in the brownfields redevelopment program.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to conferees for including a number of provisions from H.R. 1624, the ''Elderly Housing Quality Improvement Act,'' which I introduced earlier this year, along with Reps. VENTO, KANJORSKI, and a number of other members. Following is an explanation of the provisions from H.R. 1624 which are being included in the conference report.

A major focus of H.R. 1624 is the capital repair and maintenance of our federally assisted elderly housing stock. As units built in the 1970s and 1980s have aged, project sponsors, many of them non-profits, too often lack the resources for adequate repair and maintenance. There are four provisions in the conference report that are taken from H.R. 1624 that give elderly affordable housing sponsors more resources and flexibility in this area.

Section 532(b) of the conference report [Section 3(d) of H.R. 1624] helps non-federally-insured Section 236 projects by letting them keep their ''excess income,'' as insured projects are currently allowed to do. Excess income is rent that uninsured projects can collect, but must currently give back to the federal government. This change will help non-profits who lack access to capital, and will help preserve Section 8 housing owned by for-profits.

Section 522 of the conference report [Section 2 of HR 1624] authorizes a new capital grant program for capital repair of federally assisted elderly housing units. Funds are to be awarded on a competitive basis, based on the need for repairs, the financial need of the applicant, and the negative impact on tenants of any failure to make such repairs.

Section 533 of the conference report [Section 3(b) of H.R. 1624] amends an existing grant program, created by the 1997 mark-to-market legislation, which authorizes HUD to make multi-year grants to federally insured affordable housing projects from funds recaptured when existing Section 236 projects prepay their loans and surrender their Interest Reduction Payment (IRP) subsidies. Section 533 of the conference report accelerates the availability of these multi-year grants to an up-front capital grant, so that sponsors may use the funds for much-needed capital repairs. This accelerated availability of funds is achieved at no cost to the government.

Finally, while not included in the conference report, Section 3(a) of H.R. 1624 was incorporated into the managers report language for the conference report. The intent of Section 3(a) of H.R. 1624 is to facilitate the refinancing of high interest rate Section 202 elderly housing projects. The managers report language tracks this provision by directing HUD to guarantee that a Section 202 sponsor may keep at least 50% of annual debt service savings from a refinancing—as long as such savings are used for the benefit of the tenants or for the benefit of the project.

A second major focus of the bill is to make assisted living facilities more available and affordable to lower income elderly. Assisted living facilities provide meals, health care, and other services to frail senior citizens who need assistance with activities of daily living. Unfortunately, poorer seniors who can't afford assisted living facilities are often forced to move into nursing homes, with a lower quality of life, at a higher cost to the federal government.

To address this affordability problem, Section 522 [Section 2 of H.R. 1624] of the conference report also authorizes funds under the newly created capital grant program to be

used for the conversion of existing federally assisted elderly housing to assisted living facilities. I would note that the VA/HUD bill funds $50 million in fiscal year 2000 under this authorization for the conversion of Section 202 properties to assisted living facilities.

Section 523 of the conference report [Section 5 of H.R. 1624] authorizes the use of Section 8 vouchers to pay the rental component of any assisted living facility. This would make 200,000 senior citizens currently receiving vouchers eligible to use such vouchers in assisted living facilities. This flexibility, designed to enhance the continuum of care, is accomplished at no cost to the federal government.

A third major area of focus of H.R. 1624 is the promotion of the use of service coordinators, which help elderly and disabled tenants grain access to local community services, thereby preserving their independence. Section 4(a) of H.R. 1624 doubled funding for grants for service coordinators in federally assisted housing—by authorizing $50 million in fiscal year 2000 for new and renewal grants. The conference report adopts this recommendation—by using this $50 million funding level.

Cumulatively, the provisions in H.R. 1624 which are being enacted into law through Title V of the conference report help seniors age in place, preserve their independence and self-sufficiency, and provide affordable alternatives to nursing home care.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2684, the Veterans (VA), Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. First, this Member would like to thank the distinguished Chairman of the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee (Mr. WALSH), the distinguished Ranking Minority Member (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and all members of the conference committee for the important but difficult work they did under the current tight budget constraints.

The conference committee undoubtedly struggled to complete the tough task of allocating limited resources among many deserving programs. As a Member of the House Banking Committee, the committee with jurisdiction over Federal housing programs, this Member is very interested in how funds are appropriated in this area. Although there are numerous deserving programs included in this funding bill, this Member would like to emphasize four points.

First, this Member especially appreciates the $550,000 Community Development Block Grant appropriation for the development in Lincoln, Nebraska, of the North 27th Street Community Center by Cedars Youth Services, Inc., a leading social service provider in the City of Lincoln. These funds will be used to construct a community center on the corner of 27th and Holdrege Streets to serve as the focal point for a variety of services and support to strengthen and revitalize the surrounding neighborhood. Social services, such as Head Start preschool classes, as well as neighborhood-strengthening activities, such as preventive health care and recreational opportunities, will be provided at the North 27th Street Community Center.

The site of this new community center in the Clinton School neighborhood contains the highest percentage of families living in poverty in Lincoln, has greater incidences of crime than most neighborhoods, and its local elementary school is experiencing an alarming dropout rate. The neighborhood has over 1,500 children living there, but no licensed child care center, no public library, no swimming pools, and no health care facilities. As a result of these deficiencies, the North 27th Street Community Center's primary focus would be children.

Second, this Member is very pleased that H.R. 2684 contains the largest appropriation ever, $19,386,700,000, to fund veterans health programs. Veterans fought to protect our freedom and way of life. As they served our nation in a time of need, the Federal Government must remember them in their time of need. The people of the U.S. owe our veterans a great deal and should keep the promises made to them.

Third, this Member, in particular, would like to comment favorably upon the treatment of some housing programs. Section 8, Section 184, Section 202, and Section 811 programs probably were funded as adequately we can under the budgetary restraints. In particular, this Member commends the $6 million appropriation for the Section 184 program, the American Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program, which he authored. This seems to be a program with excellent potential which, this Member notes without appropriate modesty in recognizing the support received from many colleagues, is for the first time providing private mortgage fund resources for Indians on reservations through a Federal Government guarantee program for those Indian families who have in the past been otherwise unable to secure conventional financing due to the trust status of Indian reservation land.

Fourth, this Member is pleased that the conference report restores funding for Americorps at the FY99 level.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this Member urges his colleagues to support the conference report on H.R. 2684.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2684, the Department of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000 is the most critical funding bill for American science.

All scientific endeavors we marvel at today started with intensive basic research. Today's basic research is the seedcorn for our future economic endeavors and basic research has provided the scientific foundation for all the significant discoveries we have made in medicine, telecommunications and manufacturing. This conference report recommends a level of $3.912 billion for NSF and will provide a $240 million boost to NSF activities over the FY 1999 enacted level. Included in this amount is $2.996 billion for the Research and Related Activities account. This is nearly $200 million or 7% over the FY99 level and will support crucial research activities at NSF.

Key among these activities is the support for basic research in Information Technology (IT). The conferees have increased funding for IT by over $126 million from last year's level, more than was apportioned in either the House or Senate FY 2000 bills. Included in this amount is $36 million for Terascale computing. These large increases are in keeping with the legislative intent set out in H.R. 2086, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act (NITRD) of 1999.

H.R. 2086 charts a new course for IT research at the federal level. The Committee on Science passed the bill by a vote of 41–0. I expect the bill will be taken up by the full House prior to our recess. The bill has been endorsed by the co-chairs of the President's Information Technology Advisory Commission (PITAC) as well as numerous other university and industry groups that recognize the need for long-term support of IT research. I thank the conferees for appropriating sufficient funds for NITRD and making the programs authorized in H.R. 2086 a reality. This investment in IT research will pay large dividends for future generations of Americans.

NSF is not the only agency that falls under the purview of IT research in this funding bill. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are both funded at levels consistent with H.R. 2086. Both of these agencies have important roles to play in furthering basic IT research.

Also included in this bill is a provision to rename the United States-Mexico Foundation for Science in commemoration of the Science Committee's former Chairman and Ranking Member, George E. Brown. George was dedicated to improving scientific collaboration between the United States and Mexico. The George E. Brown/United States-Mexico Foundation for science is a fitting tribute to a man known by his colleagues as ''Mr. Science.''

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is funded at an overall level of $7.592 billion. Within this amount, $645 million is devoted to EPA science and technology programs. This is adequate funding for EPA's science and technology needs.

Under this conference agreement, NASA is funded at $13.653 billion. This amount is $75 million above the President's request and $12 million below the FY1999 enacted level. Within this amount, the International Space Station is funded at $2.33 billion, $30 million more than FY 1999 and $152 million below the President's request. In the past, the cost growth associated with the Space Station program has resulted in cuts to critical science programs at NASA. The $2.33 billion level should enable NASA to meet station obligations without robbing from critical science programs.

Likewise, a recent NASA Inspector General's report raises serious questions over whether the Triana spacecraft represents the best use of NASA's limited research dollars. This bill requires a study by the National Academy of Sciences regarding the scientific merit of the Triana project before work can proceed. I can only hope that the Academy will look at the relative merit of funding Triana as it compares with other NASA programs such as Space Science. Unfortunately, it appears that the review will not focus on how the mission was originally selected, thus, leaving the NASA IG's questions unanswered. Certainly, the NASA resources committed to Triana would be better spent on science projects selected through a peer review process. Restoring funding to Space Science, which has made such strides in performing NASA missions ''faster, cheaper, and better'' would be a better use of limited resources.

Unfortunately, despite the strong commitment to science incorporated within this bill, NASA's decision to end-run the joint efforts by House and Senate authorizers by insisting on

the inclusion of a damaging legislative rider requires my opposition to this bill. NASA's legislative rider threatens the future of space commercialization and was slipped into this otherwise scientifically sound bill without a single hearing or any public debate. This new commercial development program puts NASA in the untenable position of weighing business risks, market potential, and an individual venture's probability of success. NASA, as a federal agency, is not competent to make these decisions, which are best left to private markets. The Science Committee has been working with NASA and the private sector to address the area of space commercialization. Yet NASA decided to skirt public debate and secure its own preeminence in an area outside of its capabilities. This demonstrates a callousness and arrogance that I cannot support or condone. As a long-time supporter of NASA, I'm deeply disappointed the agency would choose to intentionally circumvent the Science Committee, its strongest congressional advocate.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that I support the increased funding levels for science in this measure, I cannot support this conference report.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 18, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—18

Boswell
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Crane
Evans
Filner
Hefley
Hoekstra
Holt
Hostettler
McInnis
Paul
Salmon
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews
Carson
Conyers
Green (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Kingston
Scarborough
Young (AK)

□ 1223

Mr. MCINTOSH 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.

Stated for:

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 500, I was on the floor, inserted my voting card, but for some unexplained reason my vote was not recorded. I meant to have voted ''yea.''

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 329 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 329

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2679) to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish the National Motor Carrier Administration in the Department of Transportation, to improve the safety of commercial motor vehicle operators and carriers, to strengthen commercial driver's licenses, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title shall be considered as read. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by a Member designated in the report. That amendment shall be considered as read, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against that amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments