United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 30, 2001 No. 108

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 30, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT B. ADERHOLT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1954. An act to extend the authorities of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 until 2006, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1218. An act to extend the authorities of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 until 2006.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, other than the majority or minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1071, a bill to increase authorization for the National Sea Grant College Program. The idea of the Sea Grant College Program was originally suggested by Mr. Athelstan Spilhaus. In a 1964 editorial he wrote, ''Establishment of the land grant colleges was one of the best investments this Nation ever made. That same kind of imagination and foresight should be applied to exploitation of the sea.''

In 1965, Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island introduced legislation to establish sea grant colleges on campuses nationwide as centers of excellence in marine and coastal studies. With the adoption in 1966 of the National Sea Grant College Act Program, Congress established an academic industry government partnership intended to enhance the Nation's education, economy and environment in the 21st century.

Today, Mr. Speaker, more than 54 percent of our Nation's population lives along the coast. But funding for the National Sea Grant College Program is only 3 percent of the equivalent Federal funding for the Land Grant College Program.

Like many Members of Congress, I am fully supportive of the Land Grant Program. But the point to be made is that the Land Grant receives $900 million a year in Federal funding for this program. The Sea Grant receives approximately only $60 million. Is it not time for us to consider this disparity and increase funding for the National Sea Grant College Program?

Mr. Speaker, in support of increasing funding, I ask my colleagues to consider these facts. Since 1960, the square mileage of coastal urban lands has increased by over 130 percent. Between 1996 and 2015, U.S. coastal population is expected to increase by the equivalent of 5 major cities or 25 million people. Every day approximately 1,300 acres of coastal lands are developed into urban lands. Every week there are more than 14,000 new housing starts in the coastal areas of our Nation. Every year more than 180 million people visit the Nation's coasts, affecting coastal infrastructure and resources.

Simply put, the Nation's investment in coastal science has lagged behind coastal population and development. Simply put, the Federal Government cannot by itself meet the tremendous demand for environmental knowledge and services, nor can it maintain expensive in-house staff, facilities or technologies. Universities are critical to the development of the scientific and human resources base needed to address coastal issues.

The National Sea Grant College Program engages the Nation's top universities through a network of some 30 Sea Grant programs and 200 affiliated institutions located in coastal and Great Lakes States and Puerto Rico. Sea Grant taps the talents of the preeminent university scientists who conduct mission-critical research and development in state of the art laboratories and facilities. Sea Grant utilizes a highly effective network of extension and communications professionals to transfer research results to users. Sea Grant has a 30-year track record of success and relevance. Sea Grant is nonregulatory and maintains a reputation for objectivity and credibility in its research and outreach.

There is no other Federal program that has the combination of university-based capabilities, outreach structure, flexibility, cost-effectiveness and emphasis on coastal resource management. Given the importance of the coast to the Nation's economic and social well-being, it is for this reason I am introducing H.R. 1071, a bill to increase authorization for the National Sea Grant College Program from a

Printed on recycled paper.

mere $63 million to $100 million per year.

Many of my colleagues have joined me in supporting this modest increase. As many are aware, the National Sea Grant College Program has a broad base of bipartisan support.

The 105th Congress passed reauthorization for the program without a single dissenting vote in either Chamber. I believe this is largely due to the fact this is a shoestring budget. Sea Grant continues to expand its capabilities in areas of national interest. The Sea Grant Program is looking to the sea to find new pharmaceuticals and medicines, and maybe even a cure for cancer. Sea Grant is on the cutting edge of marine science and aquaculture research.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Fisheries, Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, I have always been troubled by the fact that the U.S. has to import over $9 billion worth of seafood and shellfish from foreign countries. I am convinced if we are committed to more resources to the National Sea Grant Program, we might be able to create new growth and economic development and become a world exporter rather than importer of seafood and shellfish. I am also convinced if we can find the means to devote billions of dollars to space, we can certainly find a way to add $37 million a year to the National Sea Grant Program.

Mr. Speaker, if we can find a means now to go to Mars, and we believe what is beneath the ocean, I believe it is time to improve the Sea Grant Program.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1071—a bill to increase authorization for the National Sea Grant College Program. The idea of a Sea Grant College Program was originally suggested by Athelstan Spilhaus. In a 1964 editorial, he wrote:

> Establishment of the land-grant colleges was one of the best investments this nation ever made. That same kind of imagination and foresight should be applied to exploitation of the sea.

In 1965, Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island introduced legislation to establish Sea Grant Colleges on campuses nationwide as centers of excellence in marine and coastal studies. With the adoption in 1966 of the National Sea Grant College Grant Act, Congress established an academic/industry/government partnership intended to enhance the Nation's education, economy, and environment in the 21st century.

Today, more than 54 percent of our Nation's population lives along the coast. But funding for the National Sea Grant College Program is only about 3 percent of the equivalent federal funding for the Land Grant College Program.

Like many Members of Congress, I am fully supportive of the Land Grant College Program. But the point to be made is that Land Grant receives nearly $900 million in federal funding per year. Sea Grant receives approximately $60 million. Isn't it time for us to consider this disparity and increase funding for the National Sea Grant College Program?

Mr. Speaker, in support of increased funding, I ask my colleagues to consider these facts:

Since 1960, the square mileage of coastal urban lands has increased by over 130 percent;

Between 1996 and 2015, U.S. coastal population is expected to incresae by the equivalent of 5 major new cities, or 25 million people;

Every day, approximately 1,300 acres of coastal lands are developed into urban lands;

Every week, there are more than 14,000 new housing starts in coastal areas; and

Every year, more than 180 million people visit the Nation's coasts, affecting coastal infrastructure and resources.

Simply put, the Nation's investment in coastal science has lagged behind coastal population and development. Simply put, the Federal Government cannot by itself meet the tremendous demand for environmental knowledge and services, nor can it maintain expensive in-house staff, facilities, or technologies. Universities are critical to the development of the scientific and human resource base needed to address coastal issues.

The National Sea Grant College Program engages the Nation's top universities through a network of 30 Sea Grant programs and 200 affiliated institutions located in coastal and Great Lake States and Puerto Rico. Sea Grant taps the talents of pre-eminent university scientists who conduct mission-critical research and development in state-of-the-art laboratories and facilities. Sea Grant utilizes a highly effective network of extension and communications professionals to transfer research results to users. Sea Grant has a 30-year track record of success and relevance. Sea Grant is nonregulatory and maintains a reputation for objectivity and credibility in its research and outreach.

There is no other Federal program that has the combination of university-based capabilities, outreach structure, flexibility, cost-effectiveness, and emphasis on coastal resource management. Given the importance of the coast to the Nation's economic and social well-being, I introduced H.R. 1071—a bill to increase authorization for the National Sea Grant College Program from $63 million to $100 million per year.

Many of my colleagues have joined with me in supporting this modest increase. As many are aware, the National Sea Grant College Program has a broad base of bipartisan support. The 105th Congress passed reauthorization for the program without a single dissenting vote in either Chamber.

I believe this is largely due to the fact that on a shoestring budget, Sea Grant continues to expand its capabilities in areas of national interest. Sea Grant is looking to the sea to find new pharmaceuticals and medicines—and maybe even a cure for cancer. Sea Grant is also on the cutting edge of marine science and aquaculture research.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, I have always been troubled by the fact that the U.S. imports over 9 billion dollars' worth of seafood and shellfish per year. I am convinced that if we committed more resources to the National Sea Grant College Program, we might be able to create new growth and economic development and become a world exporter, rather than importer, of seafood and shellfish.

I am also convinced that if we can find the means to devote billions of dollars to space, we can certainly find a way to add $37 million a year to fund the National Sea Grant College Program. For now, Sea Grant funds on average less than $2 million per State program. Due to limited resources, many geographic regions are not represented—including the Western Pacific—which alone has a huge Economic Exclusive Zone. Some States like Mississippi and Alabama share funding while other eligible States and territories like Pennsylvania, Vermont, and American Samoa have no institutional Sea Grant programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that it is time for Congress to address the issue of increased authorization for the National Sea Grant College Program. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1071.

DEFENSE SCIENCE BOARD REPORT ON REDUCING THE FUEL BURDEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as we begin debate this week on a comprehensive energy package, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recently released report by the Defense Science Board entitled, ''More Capable Warfighting Through Reduced Fuel Burden.'' The bill we bring on the House floor will talk about lots of conservation measures, but we should also look to the Federal Government, which has a large use of energy.

The bill we will be considering is an omnibus energy bill, H.R. 4, Securing America's Energy Future Act, and provides, among other things, incentives for the efficient use of energy and investments in new energy efficient technologies.

The Federal Government is beholden under this legislation to take the lead in reducing energy consumption. If they are asking the American people to reduce energy consumption, obviously the Federal Government should do so, too, and to realign its focus on using energy efficient technologies.

The report released by the Defense Science Board highlights the need for the Department of Defense to also realign its focus on using energy efficient technologies, too. This was quoted in the report: ''Military fuel consumption for aircraft, ships, ground vehicles and facilities makes the Department of Defense the single largest consumer of petroleum in America, perhaps in the world.''

The United States has deployed its forces more times during the entire Cold War period. As a result, our fuel requirements have also risen. The report goes on to quote that ''the Naval force depends each day on million of gallons of fuel to operate around the globe. The Air Force. . .spends approximately 85 percent of its fuel budget to deliver, by airborne tankers, just 6 percent off its annual jet fuel usage.''

Mr. Speaker, it is without a doubt that fuel cost is directly associated with our military readiness. As we struggle with Congress' current budget

allocations to provide the military with the funds needed to elevate our readiness levels, provide for pay increases, health care and housing, we would be remiss if we did not examine ways for the Department of Defense to increase its attention on energy efficiency.

By no means, however, should the Department of Defense sacrifice performance requirements just to save a few gallons of fuel. I doubt that any Member would propose such action. However, the DSB report recommends including energy efficiency as a requirement under DOD's procurement process and investing in new improvements through the science and technology community. It is a significant step in the direction of curtailing energy consumption in a responsible manner while maintaining the performance in overall military capability.

The report also notes that the Department of Defense Joint Vision 2010 and 2020 ''explicitly recognize that improving platform and system level fuel efficiency improves agility, while concurrently reducing deployment times and support/logistic requirements.'' All of us must remember the buildup of our forces between Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Most would agree that never would an adversary allow such a cushion for the U.S. to position itself for battle. The DSB report states, ''The largest element of the total fuel cost in DOD is the cost of delivery.''

So naturally, improving on the daily use of fuel for both combat and support units could reduce the logistics need while allowing units to deploy and remain in the field for a sustained period of time. Though H.R. 4 allows for Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, to acquire specific Energy Star products, I believe we should extend the focus to weapons platforms and logistic requirements. As we move to lighter, more mobile forces, it is imperative that we improve our logistics capability and reduce the logistics tail.

Finally, the report notes that ''efficiency is a strong component of agility.'' I hope my colleagues will keep this in mind as we continue debate on energy policy and as it applies to all aspects of this country, including our Federal Government and the Department of Defense.

JO OBERSTAR: A TESTIMONIAL, ST. BARTHOLOMEW CHURCH, JULY 30, 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago my wife Jo succumbed to breast cancer after an 8-year struggle with that disease. Today in her memory I deliver the eulogy testimonial I offered in St. Bartholomew Church on this day.

Marshall Lynam, well known to Hill denizens, tells the story of Lyndon Johnson who, on learning that his secretary of many years had been diagnosed with breast cancer, called the chief executive officer of the Mayo Clinic and said, ''I am sending my secretary out there, and I want you to cure her, hear?''

The awed and startled, to say the least, CEO responded: ''We will be glad to treat her, Mr. President, but you have one of the greatest cancer research and treatment centers in the world, the M.D. Anderson Clinic, in Houston.''

''You are right,'' said Lyndon. ''I will send her there and make them cure her.''

□ 1245

Jo got the best care there was. But cure was not in the forecast. I want—as she wanted—her doctors to understand that, for the Christian, death is not defeat. The medical community is so focused on heroic efforts to extend life that sometimes we forget that death is a natural consequence of having lived. What matters is the quality of both life and death.

From the spiritual perspective, all of us were focused wrong: it wasn't the cancer that needed healing; it was our empty hearts, yearning for meaning, for purpose and love, which needed healing and filling.

Jo called us to that vocation of prayer, of love for each other, especially love for the least among us. Countless were those who said: ''I don't pray very often or too well, but I will for you.'' And they did. They felt better for it and were healed where it counts most: in the spirit.

Jo had the roomiest heart I ever knew. She made space in it for everyone, concerned always and first for the well-being of others.

She found the good in everyone and expanded it, as in: ''That dear sweet JOHN DINGELL'' or, ''Bob Roe is such a honey.'' (To which I muttered: ''Yes, but you're not trying to get a bridge out of him.'')

Why does a person die at the height of their powers, with seemingly so much life yet to live? Why a long, lingering illness with so much suffering?

If you die at 90, there is a sense of life fully lived and people reflect back on ''a job well done.'' But when death comes to one so young and vibrant, there is a sense of promise unfulfilled, of life yet to be lived. Maybe the answer is that we appreciate more fully, more passionately, the contributions of that young life so untimely taken.

The other question persists just as stubbornly: what is the purpose of so long a suffering? I believe suffering can only be understood in the spiritual sense. We had the privilege of suffering with Jo; to be spiritually purified by that suffering, and the opportunity to heal ourselves. It also gave us time to say good-bye in real ways.

Two years ago, the Speaker appointed me to the President's Commission on Aviation Security and Terrorism, the Pan Am 103 Commission. Our inquiry took us to Lockerbie, Scotland, where the constable of Dumfries told the commission members of the many long hours he and his staff spent with family members responding patiently to their myriad questions about that senseless tragedy. When I asked why he felt it important to spend so much time with the family members, the constable replied: ''They never got to say good-bye to their loved ones. Talking to us was a way for them to say good-bye.''

Jo personified an inspiring, faith-centered humility. Whether it was a parking space suddenly opening up on a crowded street; or the sun breaking through a gloomy day; or one of her U.S.-Canada legislative change programs working out just right, her instinctive response was: ''You see, God is good; glory be to God.''

She knew more members of the Canadian Parliament than most Canadians and more members of the U.S. Congress than most Americans. Yet she always thought that they needed a two-page letter of invitation to the sessions and a full page thank-you letter afterward. She also remembered to thank the least store clerk for a kindness and the lab technician in the oncology unit for inserting the needle gently to draw blood. As my Grandmother Oberstar said: ''She appreciates.''

Last Thursday, a remarkable event occurred in the hospital room after a communion service with Father Bill George. Jo sat upright in bed, oxygen mask full on, and proceeded to what I can only call a commissioning. To son Ted: ''I want you to clean up the database on my computer, clear out the unnecessary information, and these are the codes . . .'' which she began reeling off rapid fire. ''Ted, you're not writing this down; you won't remember it all.'' And then, ''Ted, I want you to organize the liturgy for the Mass of Resurrection—and remember, Ted, I want it to be a Mass of celebration; I want trumpet music.''

Then, turning to our eldest daughter: ''Noelle, there are a lot of family photographs around the house that I have never been able to organize and to display. Please, see that they are mounted and arranged throughout the house to remember and celebrate our family. Be sure to finish your education, or I'll come back to haunt you—and that goes for Annie and Monica, as well.''

''Jim, I want you to go through all those boxes of my various programs for the Centre. Send to Ottawa the program documents; throw out the unnecessary papers, and burn my personal notes, those spiral notebooks.''

To which I responded: ''Of course, I'll take care of all that, but I think I'll just take all those papers into the Hill where we have a good disposal system.''

''Did you hear me? I said, burn the personal note!''

''Yes, dear!''

Then, turning to nephew Tim Garlick: "Tim, the most important things in life are faith, family, friends, and love. Your family has given you solid values; live by them, or I'll come back to haunt you, too. Complete your education; get your degree; but remember, at the end of life, when you're dying, degrees won't come and hold your hand."

The Scripture teaches us—it was St. Paul—"These three remain: faith, hope, and love; but the greatest of these is love," Jo had all three of those qualities in abundance; and indeed, her greatest quality was love.

Her test is now over. St. Paul also said: "I have run the race; I have fought the good fight." Jo taught us the purpose of life and showed us the meaning and dignity of death. The test now is for us, Ted, Noelle, Annie, Monica, the nieces and nephews, and all whom she met and loved—to be better than our talents and good as her God-inspired example.

CONGRATULATING BISHOP JOHN J. MYERS ON BEING NAMED ARCHBISHOP OF NEWARK, NEW JERSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to a friend of many in central Illinois, a personal friend of mine, John J. Myers, His Eminence John J. Myers, the bishop of Peoria, who a week ago today was named the new archbishop of the diocese of Newark, New Jersey. I can tell the folks who reside in the diocese of Newark, you are in for a real treat.

Bishop Myers, who has served for 11 years as the bishop of the Peoria diocese, was born on the prairie in Earlville, Illinois, a very small farming community. He comes from a very large family. He went to Loras College in Dubuque, Iowa, and was trained and studied in Rome. At the point that the hierarchy of the church made the decision to send Bishop Myers to Rome for his training, I think everyone realized that he was on a glide path to become one of the real leaders of the Catholic Church not only in central Illinois but in America.

He has served with great distinction in the Peoria diocese, which is made up of 26 counties in central Illinois, for the last 11 years. Bishop Myers' most notable accomplishment during the 11 years that he served as bishop of Peoria is the fact that he has ordained over 100 priests into the Peoria diocese, an extraordinary record for a bishop in the United States.

He will succeed Cardinal McCarrick. Cardinal McCarrick was recently named the cardinal for the archdiocese of Washington, D.C. He has some big shoes to fill, but I know that Bishop Myers is up to the test and the task of succeeding Cardinal McCarrick in the archdiocese of Newark, New Jersey.

Bishop Myers is a personal friend of mine. He and I became acquainted in the late 1960s when both he and I were teachers at Holy Family School in Peoria. That was his first assignment, right out of seminary and his first assignment as a priest. I was teaching junior high social studies at Holy Family School, and he and I became very, very good friends. Our friendship has endured for these many decades, since the late 1960s. He baptized two of our four children and was present at the wedding of our daughter Amy 2 years ago.

Bishop Myers is a leader in the church. That is why he has ascended to such an important position as the archdiocese of Newark. He has made many, many profound proclamations and statements and written extensively on the teachings of the church.

The recent articles that have appeared in the local newspapers and in national newspapers will point out very important information, but most significantly the feelings of many of the parishioners, many of the people who live in the Peoria diocese, about their strong feelings for what a holy, religious, intelligent, smart and one of the real leaders of our church Bishop Myers is as demonstrated by the people that he has served so ably during the 11 years as bishop of Peoria.

I worked with Bishop Myers on the consolidation of two very well known high schools in the Peoria area, one 125 years old and one 25 years old. It was a very controversial matter that he and I worked on. I was the president of the local Catholic school board there and he was the coadjutor bishop of Peoria. These were very, very difficult times, but we made the right decision with respect to consolidating those two schools. Like many of the decisions that Bishop Myers has made, he selected a campus that was perhaps not as appealing to some of the people of the Peoria area but it turns out that this high school, now known as Notre Dame High School, is one of the finest high schools in Illinois and certainly one of the finest Catholic high schools in central Illinois.

I know that there was a significant article in the Peoria Journal Star, the local newspaper in Peoria, where the bishop lives, sort of the center and the heart of our diocese yesterday where many people were complimenting him and pointing out some of the significant decisions that he has made as the leader of our diocese.

And so it is with great joy and great honor that I stand here in the House of Representatives and let all Americans know and certainly let Members of the House know, Mr. Speaker, that we are all proud of Bishop Myers, we wish him Godspeed, and look forward to his leadership of the archdiocese of Newark.

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE, AN EXAMPLE FOR OUR TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a man who changed his world, and ours, forever, a man whom historians have called "the George Washington of humanity."

Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 168th anniversary of the death of William Wilberforce, a member of Parliament in Great Britain who spent his life working to abolish the slave trade in the British empire.

William Wilberforce was the son of a wealthy merchant in Hull, England, born in 1759. At the age of 20 after graduating from St. John's College, Cambridge, Wilberforce won a seat in the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, the young member of Parliament quickly became a rising star in British government. He was a close friend of the Prime Minister, William Pitt, and many thought that young Wilberforce might succeed Pitt as Prime Minister one day. But in 1784, Wilberforce's priorities were dramatically realigned. After meeting the great Christian hymn writer and theologian John Newton, Wilberforce underwent what he described later as the "great change."

William Wilberforce's conversion to Christianity was much like that of the Apostle Paul. According to biographers, previously the young parliamentarian had "ridiculed evangelicals mercilessly." Wilberforce himself wrote of his first years in the Parliament saying, "I did nothing, nothing that is to any purpose. My own distinction was my darling object."

With his conversion, however, Wilberforce found a greater purpose in life than personal advancement. He joined a group of like-minded Anglican members of the Parliament known as the Clapham Sect. Wilberforce would write that "God Almighty has set before me two great objects, the suppression of the slave trade and the reformation of manners."

Mr. Speaker, Wilberforce spent the rest of his life fighting against all odds to abolish the slave trade in the British empire. Slavery was so ingrained in Great Britain's imperial culture and so integral to the empire's economy that the first time Wilberforce presented a bill to abolish it in 1791, it was crushed 163–88.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that 1 month after Wilberforce's death on July 29, 1833, after fighting unrelentingly for abolition over the previous 42 years, Parliament passed the slavery abolition act, freeing all slaves in the British empire and setting a tone for freedom of humankind across the world.

William Wilberforce has served as an example for me, Mr. Speaker, and I commend him to all Members of Congress concerned with changing our times for the better. As biographer Douglas Holladay said, Wilberforce's life was animated by his deeply held personal faith, by a sense of calling, by

banding together with like-minded friends, by a fundamental belief in the power of ideas and moral beliefs to change the culture through public persuasion.

This week, Mr. Speaker, as we debate in this Chamber the very value and the dignity of human life in the cloning debate, as our President mulls over the very value and dignity of nascent human life in the difficult decision this President faces in funding research of human embryos, let us reflect on this anniversary of the passing of the great abolitionist William Wilberforce, and may we each of us in this Chamber always be inspired by his example and may we always aspire to those words he most assuredly heard 168 years ago: ''Well done, good and faithful servant.''

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Let the peoples praise You, O God. Let all the peoples praise You. O God be gracious and bless this Chamber of the House of Representatives. Let Your face shed its light upon us. Make Your ways known here and across the Earth so all nations learn of Your saving help. Let the peoples praise You, O God. Let all the peoples praise You.

Let America be glad and exalt, for You rule the world with justice. With fairness You rule all peoples. You guide all the nations on Earth. Let the peoples praise You, O God. Let all the peoples praise You.

Our land has yielded plenty, for God our God has blessed us. May You, O God make us a blessing to others till the end of the Earth revere You. Let the peoples praise You, O God. Let all the peoples praise You. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TURNER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

TIME TO ESTABLISH A WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL REGARDING SADDAM HUSSEIN'S CRIMES

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, last week Saddam Hussein ordered Iraqi units to fire upon U.S. surveillance aircraft enforcing the United Nations no-fly zone protecting the Kurdish people of Iraq. It is clear from this record that Saddam Hussein is becoming an increasing security threat to the international system.

Based on the achievements of the U.N. war crimes tribunal with the arrest of Slobodan Milosovic, we have a clear record of unilateral and multilateral action to support the rule of law and international human rights.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to look for a U.N. war crimes tribunal on Iraq, to look at Iraq's violation of the peace with regard to its invasion of Iran, Saddam Hussein's ordering the execution of 5,000 civilians in Halabja, and its invasion of Kuwait.

Now is the time, as we review sanctions and our policy toward Iraq, to start a multilateral effort to establish a U.N. war crimes tribunal.

ST. LOUIS ALDERMAN'S DECISION

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, politicians have always been known for gas, but a St. Louis alderman had to make an important decision. In the midst of a heated debate, she had to urinate. Now if that is not enough to threaten a filibuster, the Member said, and I quote, ''Rather than leave the Chamber, my staff surrounded me with blankets,'' and Mr. Speaker, the rest is history. The woman did void.

Unbelievable. What is next? Chamber port-a-potties? How about window urinals? Beam me up. I yield back the fact that when taxpayers say politics stink they are not talking about the Roto-Rooter man.

CALIFORNIA NEEDS BALANCED, LONG-TERM ENERGY PLAN

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve to know when they need electricity that a steady supply will be ready and available. Unfortunately, California's consumers and business cannot count on steady electricity this summer.

That is not right. It is time to place the peoples' quality of life and family budgets before politics. California needs to solve its electricity crisis with a balanced, long-term plan that uses technology to provide clean, reliable electricity for all the families in the Golden State.

Leaders in California have a responsibility to make sure that electricity is plentiful and affordable. Californians are suffering because their State government increased government regulations of the energy industry.

Today politicians in California are demanding additional government regulations as a pathway to relief from consequences of their earlier government regulations. This is the wrong approach; and by avoiding the real source of the problem, it can only prolong the electricity crisis.

Mr. Speaker, this problem took years to develop, and it will not be fixed overnight. California needs to solve its electricity shortage with a broad and balanced plan that taps a variety of sources to produce a sufficient supply of electricity.

SUPPORTING THE GANSKE-DINGELL-NORWOOD-BERRY PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2563, the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry Patients' Bill of Rights, and to urge its passage.

Patients in my district and throughout the country have been waiting far too long for protection against HMO abuses; but they want real reform, not a sugar pill that may go down well with the managed care industry but provides no relief for patients.

H.R. 2563 is the only bill that would provide real relief, and the Republican leadership ought to schedule it for a vote. Just look at who supports it and who rejects the Fletcher placebo.

The International Association of Firefighters supports it, because it provides real protection to local firefighters, unlike the Fletcher bill. The Paralyzed Veterans of America believes H.R. 2563 has the strongest provisions in numerous areas critical to high-quality health care for people with disabilities. The League of Women Voters supports the Ganske-Dingell bill because it provides strong and needed protections, while the Fletcher bill ''establishes an appeals process that will put the rights of health plans ahead of patients''; also, the American Nurses Association, the American College of Obstetricians.

We should listen to those groups. We should listen to the patients. We

should pass an effective and affordable Patients' Bill of Rights, H.R. 2563, now.

COMMUNICATION FROM FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATOR, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Dianna J. Ruskowsky, Financial Administrator, Committee on Education and the Workforce:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, July 27, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I have received a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DIANNA J. RUSKOWSKY,
Financial Administrator.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote on the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT EXTENSION

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2602) to extend the Export Administration Act until November 20, 2001.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2602

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979.

Section 20 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2419) is amended by striking ''August 20, 2001'' and inserting ''November 20, 2001''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2602 and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2602, the extension of the Export Administration Act of 1979, a measure approved on a voice vote last week by the Committee on International Relations.

Enactment of this measure is intended to reauthorize the existing Export Administration Act for a 3-month period, through November 20 of this year, permitting Congress to fashion a comprehensive rewrite of this 21-year-old statute.

The Export Administration Act was extended for 1 year in the 106th Congress, through August 20 of this year; and it is now clear in the final week of our current session that a major EAA reform measure will not be enacted before that date.

The prompt enactment of this stopgap authorization will, however, enable the Bureau of Export Administration of the Department of Commerce to continue to administer and enforce our export control system, and in particular, to protect licensing information.

I would also point out to my colleagues that any lapse in the current EAA authorities would mean an automatic reduction in the level of fines for criminal and administrative sanctions against individuals and companies found to be in violation of our export control regulations.

A comprehensive EAA reform measure, S. 149, the Export Administration Act of 2001, is expected to be placed on the Senate floor schedule later this week or shortly after we return from the August recess, and the Committee on International Relations will consider a very similar version of this bill on Wednesday, August 1.

I would urge my colleagues to support this important stopgap authorization measure to maintain the integrity of our Nation's export control system.

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

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

First, I want to commend my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. The current Export Administration Act will expire on August 20. On that day, the ability of the United States to implement dual use export controls will come to an end.

The Senate has not yet acted on its legislation on this matter, and it is highly unlikely that it will do so before September. We are slated to mark up in the Committee on International Relations a version of the Senate bill later this week, but it will not go through the Committee on Armed Services, nor will it reach the House floor prior to September.

The authority to maintain export controls, Mr. Speaker, can be continued under an executive order, as was done in recent years. But the lack of statutory authority will compromise the administration's ability to implement fully controls on militarily-useful goods and technology.

Obviously, more time is needed to enact a new bill. Our temporary legislation will accomplish bridging this gap by extending statutory authority until November, 2001. This is the only responsible course of action, given the circumstances, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding time to me to speak on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the opportunity we have to have an extension of the current statutory provisions. I hope that, as we take the time to reexamine this, we look at the long-term sweep of this legislation.

□ 1415

I have had some great concerns myself that there may be less here than meets the eye. There is an opportunity now across the world for people to buy a computer product that is far more powerful than was used to generate the hydrogen bomb, for instance.

We have had situations where American enterprises have been hamstrung by slow-moving bureaucracy on the Federal level that cannot keep pace with the rapid changing technology. There are jokes at times about handheld devices that teenagers have that could potentially have been subjected to this legislation in times past. I think we have to be very, very careful about how we craft this legislation. There are opportunities for us to simply divert business to other countries to hamstring American enterprise that in the long term will just encourage the development of this technology and help finance the technology in other countries while it undermines the potential for development here at home.

I hope that over the course of the 6 months we can use this opportunity to review the impact we have had over the course of the history of this legislation and to really ask ourselves whether or not we are being fair in terms of American industry and if it will have the intended consequences. But if we move forward, I hope that the leadership of our committee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) will make sure the tools are available for the administration to be able to effectively administer it so that we do not get caught in a hammerlock and be unable to make sure it works as properly intended.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his thoughtful remarks.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his tremendous contribution to this and other legislation before our committee.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2602.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT WORLD CONFERENCE AGAINST RACISM PRESENTS UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS GLOBAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 212) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance presents a unique opportunity to address global discrimination, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 212

Whereas since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, the international community has taken significant steps to eradicate racism, xenophobia, sexism, religious intolerance, slavery, and other forms of discrimination;

Whereas national and international measures to combat discrimination and promote equality, justice, and dignity for all individuals have proven inadequate;

Whereas the United Nations World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance (''WCAR''), to be held in Durban, South Africa, from August 31 through September 7, 2001, aims to create a new world vision for the fight against racism and other forms of intolerance in the twenty-first century, urge participants to adopt anti-discrimination policies and practices, and establish a mechanism for monitoring future progress toward a discrimination-free world;

Whereas the causes and manifestations of contemporary racism, xenophobia, sexism, religious intolerance, slavery, and other forms of discrimination are many and increasingly complex and subtle;

Whereas all states and societies that have sponsored, encouraged, or tolerated slavery, including states involved in the transatlantic slave trade, the Indian Ocean slave trade, or the trans-Saharan slave trade, benefited economically while inflicting extreme pain, suffering, and humiliation on millions of African people;

Whereas victims of racism, xenophobia, sexism, religious intolerance, slavery, and other forms of discrimination have suffered and continue to suffer from the deprivation of their fundamental rights and opportunities;

Whereas to varying degrees, states, societies, and individuals have adopted the notion that racial, cultural, religious, and social diversity can enrich a country and its citizens;

Whereas participants of the WCAR currently plan to discuss remedies, redress, and other mechanisms to provide recourse at national, regional, and international levels for victims of racism, xenophobia, sexism, religious intolerance, slavery, and other forms of discrimination;

Whereas the achievement of full and effective equality between peoples requires that states, civic groups, and individuals cooperate to address the real difficulties in attaining societies free of discrimination;

Whereas some preparatory materials for the WCAR take positions on current political crises which, if adopted in the final WCAR Declaration and Program of Action, could exacerbate existing tensions;

Whereas the attempt by some to use the WCAR as a platform to resuscitate the divisive and discredited notion equating Zionism with racism, a notion that was overwhelmingly rejected when United Nations Resolution 3379 (1975) was rescinded in 1991, would undermine the goals and objectives of the conference; and

Whereas the United States encourages respect for an individual's human rights and fundamental freedoms without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) encourages all participants in the United Nations World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance (''WCAR'') to seize this singular opportunity to tackle the scourges of racism, xenophobia, sexism, religious intolerance, slavery, and other forms of discrimination which have divided people and wreaked immeasurable suffering on the disempowered;

(2) recognizes that since racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerance exist to some extent in every region and country around the world, efforts to address these prejudices should occur within a global framework and without reference to specific regions, countries, or present-day conflicts;

(3) exhorts the participants to utilize the WCAR to mitigate, rather than aggravate, racial, ethnic, and regional tensions;

(4) urges the WCAR to focus on concrete steps that may be taken to address gross human rights violations that were motivated by racially and ethnically based animus and on devising strategies to help eradicate such intolerance; and

(5) commends the efforts of the Government of the Republic of South Africa in hosting the WCAR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) opposed to the resolution?

Mr. LANTOS. I am in favor of the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) will control 20 minutes in opposition to the resolution.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The forthcoming World Conference Against Racism ought to represent an opportunity for the people and the governments of the world to look for ways to address the ongoing harm caused by continuing racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerance, as the formal title of the conference refers to them.

Both in our own Nation and around the world, clashes between communities, whether at their origins, based on ethnic, tribal, clan, racial, national, religious or caste differences have a tremendously debilitating effect on our lives. This is almost self-evident. Yet it is worthwhile to provide, through the United Nations, the opportunity for representatives of governments and civil society to sit down and exchange experiences in dealing with ongoing racism and related forms of intolerance, and other vestiges. In addition, we can and should take the opportunity to frame a declaration and a plan of action on the topic of the conference that expresses the sentiments of the world's governments.

The current administration, along with the Members who are cosponsoring this resolution, hope that a conference will be a positive, forward-looking one. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has framed a sensitive, appropriate resolution that expresses our hopes with regard to this conference.

But he and I, and our administration, do not share certain concerns as we approach the conference. The opportunity of a world conference on anything always seems to present an irresistible opportunity to some in the international community to hijack the conference and move it into areas far from its real purposes, and so we have in the draft declaration language, which can only be understood as intended to minimize the Holocaust and to indicate that the only State worthy of condemnation by name in the world is Israel. We also have efforts to bring in issues such as compensation for actions of the distant past, such as the transatlantic slave trade.

Mr. Speaker, today in Geneva, a Preparatory Conference is underway to see if some of these issues can be worked out. If they are not worked out, the administration will use the only leverage it really has, which is to absent itself,

at least at the high level, from the conference. That is altogether proper as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes no threats. It merely sets out our position, and it does so in admirable terms, and it should be supported by my colleagues.

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

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

The Lantos resolution attempts to place tape on the mouth of the United States and the world community to say what the U.S. and the rest of the world can or cannot say in South Africa. By comparison, the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus introduced a resolution that puts no words in the mouth of the Bush administration, but merely suggests that the U.S. participate in the World Conference Against Racism by sending Colin Powell as head of the U.S. delegation, and that the United States should support financially the conference.

With respect to what the U.S. can and cannot and should and should not say, the Johnson resolution urges the Bush administration to adopt policy positions at the WCAR that seek to advance an understanding of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerance. Amnesty International just wrote a letter to President Bush urging the same position.

On July 25, Amnesty International USA urged the Bush administration to increase its commitment to the conference by appointing a delegation led by Secretary of State Colin Powell and assuming a leadership role in the preconference preparation. In a letter sent to President Bush, AIUSA, Amnesty International USA, called on the administration to resolve controversies that have marred preparations for the WCAR. Amnesty International USA urged President Bush not to allow current controversies over draft language to serve as a pretext for nonparticipation. We believe that such problems can be best addressed by a senior delegation representing the U.S. at the conference and not through a boycott.

The letter goes on to state, the Bush administration must participate in efforts to eradicate racism at home and abroad and must seize the opportunity to move beyond the empty rhetoric on race of previous administrations by vigorously joining the debate at the World Conference Against Racism.

Additionally, Human Rights Watch just issued a report saying that the U.S. should participate. Human Rights Watch said national and international panels should be created with maximum transparency and public participation to identify and acknowledge past abuses and to guide action to counter their present-day effect. Groups that suffer today should be compensated by governments responsible for these practices, said Kenneth Roth, Executive Director of Human Rights Watch. Those most seriously victimized today by past wrongs should be the first priority for compensation to end their victimization.

Human Rights Watch proposed the establishment of national panels. The panels should serve as truth commissions aiming to reveal the extent to which a government's past racist practices contribute to contemporary deprivation domestically and abroad, Roth said. They should educate the public, acknowledge responsibility and propose methods of redress and making amends.

Kofi Annan and President Bush are at the National Urban League today, but the National Urban League supports our position that the U.S. should agree to go and support no matter what is on the agenda. The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights wrote a letter to Bush along the exact same lines as the Johnson resolution; that is that the U.S. should go to the conference; that the U.S. should financially support the conference; and that U.S. participation will help to bring significant issues into sharper focus at home and abroad.

Importantly, the Leadership Conference letter to President Bush states, the United States should not limit its participation in this important global event, even when faced with issues that our government feels threatened fundamental American values. Rather, the U.S. should actively engage difficult topics and work to change those that belie core U.S. principles. If the U.S. does not participate in the World Conference Against Racism, what will that prove? Do we not lose by telling our friends and others what they can say and what they cannot say; do we not lose friends and prestige by doing that? I do not believe that the Bush administration has to be told what to say and what not to say. I do believe that with the moral force of our position and the strength of our argument, we should be able to prevail without the appearance of issuing threats or intimidation.

Thirty percent of the American population consists of people of color. We have a stake in this conference. I believe the majority of Americans who are not of color would like to see the United States lead in this issue to get rid of the problems of race and intolerance at home and to help the rest of the world deal with the problem of racism and intolerance abroad.

The United States should participate in the WCAR, the House should encourage that participation, and the Johnson resolution should have been on the House floor today.

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

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

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as the founding Democratic chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the scourge of racism remains one of the most tragic aspects of international life today. Slavery, xenophobia, sexism, religious intolerance, hate crimes, racial profiling, we must renew our commitment and redouble our efforts to combat each of these manifestations of racism plaguing our globe today.

□ 1430

Racism is at the root of countless international conflicts and it is a formidable barrier to international cooperation. It remains a stubborn and shameful stain on humanity.

The U.N. Conference on Racism is the first time that the world will have come together to confront this scourge in a serious and systematic way. Among other critical issues the conference will confront the plight of millions of African people who have suffered from extreme pain, hardship and humiliation from the slave trade and its lingering effects.

The conference intends to explore this issue in a comprehensive way discussing not only the transatlantic slave trade but also the Arab slave trade across the Indian Ocean and the Sahara Desert.

It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that the United States assume a leadership role in combatting racism worldwide. Our national experience with slavery and our commitment to civil rights compels us to take a lead in the broader worldwide struggle to eradicate racism. Our resolution makes clearly that the goals and objectives of this important conference deserve the strong support of the United States. If the conference adheres to its original purposes, U.S. participation clearly will contribute to its success.

Tragically, Mr. Speaker, some are standing in the way of a genuine dialogue on these painful issues by seeking to hijack the U.N. Conference on Racism into a racist attack against specific states. A draft resolution sponsored by a number of Arab states tends to equate Zionism with racism and thereby singles out Israel for attack.

Our resolution denounces this attempt to single out an individual state and to undermine the conference by using it as a platform for a hate-filled political agenda.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of our resolution and getting the U.N. Conference on Racism back on track. The work of combatting racial discrimination and reducing racial tensions worldwide is far too important to be sidetracked by disruptive and hateful political interests. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 212.

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 212.

The upcoming U.N. World Conference Against Racism is an important opportunity to condemn discrimination in all forms and dispel the hatred and misunderstanding that promotes it.

By holding it in Durban, South Africa, it is supposed to be a celebration of the world's triumph over apartheid, and a call to action against the ongoing injustice of slavery, genocide, religious oppression, gender discrimination, and other forms of intolerance that continue to plague our world.

That is why I am deeply concerned that Arab countries have tried to overshadow these objectives by hijacking the conference to bash Israel. Language inserted in the draft declarations revives hateful anti-Jewish lies that Zionism is racism and that Israel practices ethnic cleansing and apartheid.

This targeted attack on Israel is another blatant attempt by the enemies of peace to undermine the peace process and make political dialogue between Israelis and Palestinians impossible. If it succeeds in poisoning the U.N. conference declarations, it will inevitably become a new platform for Palestinian incitement against Israel and fuel the cycle of terrorist attacks and violence.

This resolution underscores U.S. support for the underlying goals and objectives of the U.N. World Conference. I am hopeful, therefore, that the Bush administration will be successful in the final preconference meeting in Geneva this week in bringing the conference agenda back on track. Otherwise its domination by extremist anti-Israeli bias will be harmful to Israel, its allies, and the purpose of the U.N. Conference itself, and will earn the condemnation of those who believe in an end to racism and bigotry.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

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

Mr. Speaker, in November of 1975, Israel's Ambassador to the United Nations stepped up to the General Assembly as they debated the ludicrous proposition that Zionism is racism and held that resolution aloft and said that that proposition was worth no more than the piece of paper it was written on and tore that paper apart and left the well of the General Assembly. He was right then and those of us today who combat the notion that Zionism is racism are right as well.

It is ludicrous, it defies imagination to suggest that Zionism and racism are the same thing. I would suggest to friends of the United Nations as I am a friend of the United Nations that continuing to test that proposition, that revisiting that issue 25 years later is wrongheaded. It defies common sense and it strains the patience of people like me and Members of Congress like me who believe in the value of the United Nations.

This is a bad idea. It is a senseless resolution. It is going back in time and it is not worthy of the United Nations or U.S. support in the United Nations.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, next month's U.N. World Conference against Racism in Durban, South Africa is an extremely important conference which offers the world community an unprecedented opportunity to address racism and global discrimination. For this dialogue to be constructive, it must take place in an atmosphere of tolerance and mutual respect. Thus, it is essential to ensure that the Conference does not degenerate into a sideshow of hateful and extreme views that revives such lies as the shameful assertion that Zionism is racism.

The Conference attendees must not be diverted from the essential task of confronting racism through a Draft Declaration for the Conference that revives the despicable falsehood that Zionism is a ''movement which is based on racial superiority.'' Nor can the United States sit idly by and passively accept language that minimizes the historical significance of the Holocaust and the evil of anti-Semitism, or which in any way questions the legitimacy of our long-time ally, the State of Israel.

I completely reject the false choice between abandoning the United States' participation in this Conference and supporting the State of Israel. There is no inconsistency in attending this Conference and rejecting anti-Zionist, anti-Israel or anti-Semitic rhetoric. The United States can and must do both.

As Mr. LANTOS so cogently observed, racism is at the root of countless international conflicts, and is a formidable barrier to international cooperation. It remains a stubborn and shameful stain on humanity, one that I believe that the United States must address whenever it has an opportunity.

Thus, notwithstanding my concerns about certain aspects of the Draft Declaration for the Conference, I believe that the United States must attend the World Conference against Racism with a high level delegation, hopefully one led by our Secretary of State Colin Powell.

I understand and recognize the concerns have been raised about various aspects of the Conference's proposed agenda, but I fervently believe that the way to deal with these controversial issues is for the United States to participate fully in all aspects of developing the Conference's agenda and in all aspects of the Conference. Thus, I support H. Res. 212, the Ballenger-Lantos Resolution. I also urge the leadership to bring Representative MCKINNEY's Resolution, H. Res. 211, to the floor. Passing H. Res. 211 will clearly put the House on record as supporting full U.S. participation in the World Conference against Racism without any precondition.

This participation should extend to all subjects that may be covered at the Conference, including such discussion as may take place concerning the subject of slavery and reparations, an issue in which Mr. CONYERS and I and many other Members of the Congress and the American public are intensely interested.

I know that strong differences of opinion exist on the subject of reparations and I would hope and expect that this subject will be only one of a great many that may be considered at the Conference. But however much (or little) attention reparations may receive, surely, the mere consideration of this issue is not a reason for anyone to suggest that the United States not participate in the Conference.

There's a simple solution to these issues. The United States should participate fully in the Conference and take whatever steps our Delegation deems necessary to reject and disassociate the United states from any ''Zionism as Racism' language or any other anti-Israel language at the Conference.

Mr. Speaker, we know who our friends and our enemies are. Our friend is Israel and all others in the Middle East who seek a just and lasting peace. Our enemy is racism. We need not, and must not, sacrifice one to pursue the other. They are entirely compatible.

In my view, we accomplish nothing if we simply duck the issues to be addressed at the Conference by not attending or by sending a low-level delegation that lacks the authority to speak forcefully for the United States on issues of such critical importance. The subject of racism is simply too important not to be addressed in a meaningful way.

Mr. Speaker, when racism is the subject, the United States must never be a ''no-show,'' no matter what the provocation. The United States should make the most of this historic occasion to deal with racism in a systematic way through full U.S. participation in the World Conference. I urge all my Colleagues to support H. Res. 212 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming World Conference Against Racism ought to be a moment to look forward to ways to deal with ''racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerance,'' as the formal title of the conference refers to them.

It is clear that the issue of racism needs to be dealt with. We need to allow our governments and NGOs an opportunity to share thoughts and come up with an appropriate plan of action.

The problem is that people who really do not care whether or not the conference is successful are trying to hijack it.

They have succeeded in getting language into the draft conclusions reviving the old canard that ''Zionism equals racism'' and minimizing the Holocaust. Of all the countries on the face of the earth, they have named only Israel as a miscreant on the issue of racism.

Of course, our Administration is working hard against this effort.

If they do not succeed, I hope that the Administration will consider several alternatives. One would be not to go. Another would be to send someone of the stature of a Colin Powell to tell the assembled nations how we have dealt with our race problem—not perfectly, but with some success over the years. And then, he should continue to denounce the document for what will be its fatal flaws, and walk out. But there should certainly be no ''business as usual''.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an excellent one. I am proud to be associated with it. It says just what needs to be said: we want a good world conference.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support this resolution.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 212 that expresses the importance of the Bush Administration sending a high-level delegation to participate at the United Nations World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance (WCAR) scheduled August 31 through September 7, 2001.

The United States of America where I am proud to be a citizen and who I proudly fought for in the Korean War, is a major global power that is called upon daily by nations around the world for leadership and guidance. As a global power, historically we have been outspoken on important matters concerning human rights abuses and civil rights offenses around the world. Our legacy is freedom for all human beings.

We as a nation must once again exhibit the strong leadership that is our heritage and do the right thing by fully participating in the upcoming World Conference Against Racism. It is unconscionable that the Administration would even consider not attending such an important conference or provide the leadership needed to address this very important issue of world racism. Our full attendance is the only way we can ensure that the conference fulfills its primary purpose of addressing the issue of racism around the world.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the world conference against racism is an important meeting to people of African descent, and indigenous people all over the world. It is critical that this country fully participate and demonstrate its commitment to ending racism, racial intolerance, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance in this country and all over the world. A full discussion and a strong resolution decrying racism and the support of agreed to means of addressing its impact are important to the health of our nation and the well-being of the entire global community. Having a substantive declaration decrying racism, colonialism, and the forceful subjugation of people will not in and of itself make us whole, but it will foster a long overdue healing process.

Mr. Speaker, I want my country to fully participate, to be involved in all discussions and work with the other countries of the world to develop such a resolution and programs. It neither serves this country or the world well for it to be gagged on this important issue.

While I support this resolution in its supporting the United States participation, I feel that the resolution introduced by Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON which calls on the highest level of participation, for funding, and which urges the adoption and advancing of policy positions that indicate clearly that our country understands the ling k between racism in its current day forms and is firm in its commitment to ending its impact on indigenous communities an communities of color all over the world.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 212, expressing the Sense of Congress on the UN World Conference Against Racism.

I want to thank and express my appreciation to my colleague, Congressman LANTOS, for authorizing this legislation.

I believe this bill is a step in the right direction. In addition, I firmly believe that the United States must not boycott this conference.

The World Conference Against Racism will provide an important and credible platform to discuss slavery, xenophobia, sexism, religious intolerance, hate crimes and other forms of racism.

In addition, it is long past due for the United States to formerly acknowledge its role in the institution of Trans-Atlantic Slavery and to begin the healing process for more than 30 million African Americans—many of whom are descendants of slaves.

Representatives from the Bush administration have stated that the United States will not send an official delegation to the World Conference Against Racism in Durban, South African if language regarding slavery and reparations, is included in the WCAR agenda.

However, I strongly believe that the Bush Administration's position on excluding the discussion on slavery and reparations is wrong and must be reconsidered. The United States' unwillingness to address this issue sends the wrong message.

The United States Government sanctioned slavery in this country for hundreds of years, completely devastating the lives of generations and generations of Africans in America. It is imperative that this government, which played such a massive role in slavery, be at the table in discussions about slavery, its lasting impact, and on reparations.

On the International Relations Committee, we regularly question the human rights practices in other countries. I believe it is equally important that we apply this same scrunity to our own society and examine the very visible vestiges of slavery manifested by the current racial and economic divides we experience today.

When we do, we realize that as a country, we have not yet conquered the twin problems of racism and economic inequality.

Ours is a country where people of color are regularly pulled over by our police force because they are simply the wrong color, or in the wrong neighborhood, or driving the wrong kind of car. It's happened to me, it's happened to millions of African Americans and other minorities.

Ours is a country where millions of young men of color are behind bars. Our justice system claims to be blind, yet look at the skin color of those in prison, of those sitting on death row. Those are black and brown faces staring out from behind those bars.

Ours is a country where the votes of African Americans and other minorities are less likely to be counted than those of white Americans.

Ours is a country where blacks earn less than whites, are less likely to own homes than whites, and are still subject to the economic marginalization that has marked this nation for centuries.

Ours is also a nation that is struggling to overcome many of these deep-rooted problems. It is time for America to also recognize that many of these problems are rooted in slavery.

We can do more and we must.

Racism is a fundamental question of human rights.

Racial prejudice underlies much of the conflict and injustice in the modern world. It fuels wars, drives ethnic cleansing, and exacerbates economic inequities.

Racial barriers compound health problems: HIV/AIDS disproportionately affects communities of color. This terrible disease is sweeping across Africa where millions are dyining. We may not know how to cure AIDS yet, but we know how to prevent it and we know how to treat it. We know how, but every day six thousand Africans die from AIDS. Six thousand a day.

In the United States the AIDS crisis is having a devastating effect in the African American community. Although African Americans make up only 12 percent of the population, they make up more than 34 percent of reported AIDS cases, and African American children and women comprise two-thirds, respectively, of all pediatric and female AIDS cases in the United States.

The World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance will represent a historic opportunity to find real solutions and provide real assistance to the victims of racial discrimination.

We must send a strong message to the Bush Administration that we will no longer bury our heads in the sand.

Minimally, the United States Government should apologize for the horrific institution of slavery and explore methods to address the current economic, health, and social inequalities experienced in daily life by the descendants of slaves: African Americans.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 212, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SENSE OF HOUSE THAT U.N. SHOULD TRANSFER UNCENSORED VIDEOTAPE TO ISRAELI GOVERNMENT REGARDING HEZBOLLAH ABDUCTION OF THREE ISRAELI DEFENSE SOLDIERS

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 191) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately transfer to the Israeli Government an unedited and uncensored videotape that contains images which could provide material evidence for the investigation into the incident on October 7, 2000, when Hezbollah forces abducted 3 Israeli Defense Force soldiers, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 191

Whereas on October 7, 2000, Hezbollah forces illegally crossed the Israeli border with Lebanon and kidnapped 3 Israli Defense Force soldiers, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad;

Whereas 9 months after the kidnapping, Hezbollah released no information as to the whereabouts and conditions of these soldiers;

Whereas the events leading up to, surrounding, and immediately following the kidnapping remain unknown;

Whereas after long denial the United Nations admitted to possession of a videotape that contains images which could provide material evidence for the investigation into the incident on October 7, 2000;

Whereas this videotape would help to assess the conditions of the soldiers and assist in the investigation to determine the identities of the kidnappers and their methods; and

Whereas to date the United Nations is reluctant to transfer an uncensored form of the videotape to Israeli Government authorities investigating this incident: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately transfer an unedited and uncensored form of the videotape that contains images which could provide material evidence for the investigation into the incident on October 7, 2000, when Hezbollah forces abducted 3 Israeli Defense Force soldiers, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad, as well as any other material evidence the United Nations may possess, to the Israeli Government to assist its investigation of this incident.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 191, sponsored by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The United Nations has done important work in Lebanon over the years, keeping the peace as best it could in an area where stability has been threatened by the presence of various Lebanese and Palestinian factions and by Israeli responses to them.

Recently, it seems to have failed in part of its mission. Lebanese-based Hezbollah fighters were able to cross into Israeli territory and kidnap three Israeli soldiers. It turns out that a videotape that may well provide information to help resolve the kidnapping, although not the kidnapping itself, was made by the U.N. forces.

After denying the existence of the tape for some time, it now appears that the tape does exist. The U.N. should do all it can to help resolve the disappearance of the men, including the provision of relevant evidence.

The case has attracted widespread attention, not least in northern Illinois. I appreciate the diligent efforts of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and his constituents, as well as the efforts of his cosponsors, in keeping this humanitarian nightmare from fading from our memories pending its final, and I hope its peaceful and successful resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to congratulate my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for bringing this important resolution to the body. I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for his support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution concerns a matter that unfortunately illustrates the singularly biased attitude and behavior that the United Nations and its constituent bodies and some of its personnel traditionally have shown towards our ally, the Democratic State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, on October 7 of last year, Hezbollah terrorists illegally crossed from Lebanon into Israel and kidnapped three Israeli soldiers. Nearly 10 months later, Hezbollah has neither released information about the soldiers' conditions and whereabouts, nor has it allowed any third parties, even the International Red Cross to meet with them. Shortly after the kidnapping, Israel sources learned that U.N. peacekeepers in Lebanon had shot a videotape that likely reveals the terrorists' identities.

□ 1445

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 191. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for authoring this important resolution before us today.

In October of 2000, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad were abducted while on routine patrol of Israel's northern border. At the present time these men are believed to be held by Hezbollah on Lebanese soil.

I am extremely troubled by the fact that the United Nations has the ability to assist in discovering the whereabouts of these men and has failed to turn over what may be pertinent information to the Israeli Government. For an organization that is a champion for human rights around the world to obstruct the recovery of these men is inconceivable.

I join my colleagues in calling on Secretary-General Kofi Annan to act expeditiously in seeing that any and all information leading to the rescue of these Israeli soldiers be handed over without further delay. Since these men were captured last year, I have been in constant contact with their families. I had the opportunity to meet their families in January of this year. The fact that the United Nations has evidence that could ultimately bring their sons, fathers and brothers back to them is the last shred of hope that any of these families have. I cannot stand by and allow that to be taken away from them as well.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I commend my friend from New York for his eloquent statement.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 191, sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

295 days ago, three Israeli soldiers were kidnapped from Israeli territory near the Lebanese border.

It developed months later that the United Nations had made a videotape that contains significant information that could lead to a solution to this case.

The UN, however, first concealed the existence of the tape and subsequently has refused to release an uncensored version of it to Israel.

This resolution simply calls on the UN to do what it should do—to help resolve a case that tugs at our heartstrings.

I appreciate the tireless efforts of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) to keep this case alive. I hope, together with him and his constituents, and my own constituents, for a safe return for these men.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of a House Resolution 191. House Resolution 191 is of importance to my constituents and to the state of Israel and, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I urge its immediate passage.

House Resolution 191 expresses the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should immediately transfer to the Israeli Government an unedited and uncensored videotape. That videotape contains images which could assist those investigating the October 7, 2000, kidnapping of 3 Israeli Defense Force soldiers, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad.

Nine months after the kidnapping, Hezbollah has released no information as to the whereabouts and conditions of these soldiers. While events leading up to the kidnapping remain unknown, the United Nations has admitted to possession of a videotape that contains images which could provide evidence for the investigation into the incident.

It is hard to imagine the level of concern that must be felt by the family members of the three kidnapped soldiers. The fact that the United Nations may have information that could help resolve this situation is also troubling. The United Nations should not be making it more difficult for Israeli authorities and the family members of Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad. Instead, it should be actively assisting Israeli authorities to secure information about these three individuals. I join my colleagues in strong support of this resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 191.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NATIONAL MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS ACT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1858) to make improvements in mathematics and science education, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Mathematics and Science Partnerships Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) 12 years ago the President of the United States convened the Nation's Governors to establish common goals for the improvement of elementary and secondary education.

(2) Among the National Education Goals established was the goal that by the year 2000 United States students would be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.

(3) Despite these goals, 8th graders in the United States showed just average performance in mathematics and science in the Third International Mathematics and Science Study-Repeat and demonstrated lower relative performance than the cohort of 4th graders 4 years earlier.

(4) The United States must redouble its efforts to provide all of its students with a world-class education in mathematics, science, engineering, and technology.

(5) The American economy has become the most robust in the world, not through state planning and government intervention, but through the hard work and innovation of its citizens. This success is founded in our constitutional tradition of respect for individual liberty to pursue personal career objectives.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''Director'' means the Director of the National Science Foundation;

(2) the term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given such term by section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001);

(3) the term ''eligible nonprofit organization'' means a nonprofit research institute or a nonprofit professional association with demonstrated experience delivering mathematics or science education as determined by the Director;

(4) the term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given such term by section 14101(19) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801(19));

(5) the term ''State educational agency'' has the meaning given such term by section 14101(29) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801(29));

(6) the term ''elementary school'' has the meaning given that term by section 14101(14) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801(14)); and

(7) the term ''secondary school'' has the meaning given that term by section 14101(26) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801(26)).

SEC. 4. DUPLICATION OF PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall review the education programs of the National Science Foundation that are in operation as of the date of enactment of this Act to determine whether any of such programs duplicate the programs authorized in this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—(1) As programs authorized in this Act are implemented, the Director shall terminate any existing duplicative program or merge the duplicative program into a program authorized in this Act.

(2) The Director shall not establish any new program that duplicates a program that has been implemented pursuant to this Act.

(c) REPORT.—(1) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall review the education programs of the National Science Foundation to ensure compliance with the provisions of this section.

(2) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall complete a report on the review carried out under this subsection and shall submit the report to the Committee on Science, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(3) Beginning one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall, as part of the annual budget submission to Congress, submit an updated version of the report required by paragraph (2).

SEC. 5. MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.

The Director may establish matching fund requirements for any programs authorized by this Act except those established in title IV.

SEC. 6. COORDINATION.

In carrying out the activities authorized by this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall consult and coordinate with the Secretary of Education to ensure close cooperation with programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–10).

TITLE I—MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS

Subtitle A—Mathematics and Science Education Partnerships

SEC. 101. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Director shall establish a program to award grants to institutions of higher education or eligible nonprofit organizations (or consortia thereof) to establish mathematics and science education partnership programs to improve the instruction of elementary and secondary science education.

(2) Grants shall be awarded under this section on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(b) PARTNERSHIPS.—(1) In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an institution of higher education or eligible nonprofit organization (or consortium thereof) shall enter into a partnership with one or more local educational agencies that may also include a State educational agency or one or more businesses, or both.

(2) A participating institution of higher education shall include mathematics, science, or engineering departments in the programs carried out through a partnership under this subsection.

(c) USES OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this section shall be used for activities that draw upon the expertise of the partners to improve elementary or secondary education, or both, in mathematics or science, or both. Such activities may include—

(1) recruiting and preparing students for careers in elementary or secondary mathematics or science education;

(2) offering professional development programs, including summer or academic year institutes or workshops, designed to strengthen the capabilities of existing mathematics and science teachers;

(3) offering innovative programs that instruct teachers on using technology more effectively in teaching mathematics and science, including programs that recruit and train undergraduate and graduate students to provide technical support to teachers;

(4) developing distance learning programs for teachers or students, including developing courses, curricular materials and other resources for the in-service professional development of teachers that are made available to teachers through the Internet;

(5) offering teacher preparation and certification programs for professional mathematicians, scientists, and engineers who wish to begin a career in teaching;

(6) developing assessment tools to measure student mastery of content and cognitive skills;

(7) developing or adapting elementary and secondary school curricular materials, aligned to State standards, that incorporate contemporary research on the science of learning;

(8) developing undergraduate mathematics and science courses for education majors;

(9) using mathematicians, scientists, and engineers employed by private businesses to help recruit and train mathematics and science teachers;

(10) developing a cadre of master teachers who will promote reform and improvement in schools;

(11) developing and offering mathematics or science enrichment programs for students, including after-school and summer programs;

(12) providing research opportunities in business or academia for students and teachers;

(13) bringing mathematicians, scientists, and engineers from business and academia into elementary and secondary school classrooms; and

(14) any other activities the Director determines will accomplish the goals of this section.

(d) SCIENCE ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS FOR GIRLS.—Activities carried out in accordance with subsections (c)(11) and (12) shall include elementary and secondary school programs to encourage the ongoing interest of girls in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology and to prepare girls to pursue undergraduate and graduate degrees and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, or technology. Funds made available through awards to partnerships for the purposes of this subsection may support programs for—

(1) encouraging girls to pursue studies in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology and to major in such fields in postsecondary education;

(2) tutoring girls in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology;

(3) providing mentors for girls in person and through the Internet to support such girls in pursuing studies in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology;

(4) educating the parents of girls about the difficulties faced by girls to maintain an interest and desire to achieve in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology, and enlisting the help of parents in overcoming these difficulties; and

(5) acquainting girls with careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology and encouraging girls to plan for careers in such fields.

(e) RESEARCH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS.—Activities carried out in accordance with subsection (c)(11) may include support for research projects performed by students at secondary schools. Uses of funds made available through awards to partnerships for purposes of this subsection may include—

(1) training secondary school mathematics and science teachers in the design of research projects for students;

(2) establishing a system for students and teachers involved in research projects funded under this section to exchange information about their projects and research results; and

(3) assessing the educational value of the student research projects by such means as tracking the academic performance and choice of academic majors of students conducting research.

(f) STIPENDS.—Grants awarded under this section may be used to provide stipends for teachers or students participating in training or research activities that would not be part of their typical classroom activities.

SEC. 102. SELECTION PROCESS.

(a) APPLICATION.—An institution of higher education or an eligible nonprofit organization (or a consortium thereof) seeking funding under section 101 shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

(1) a description of the partnership and the role that each member will play in implementing the proposal;

(2) a description of each of the activities to be carried out, including—

(A) how such activities will be aligned with State and local standards and with other activities that promote student achievement in mathematics and science;

(B) how such activities will be based on a review of relevant research;

(C) why such activities are expected to improve student performance and strengthen the quality of mathematics and science instruction; and

(D) in the case of activities carried out in accordance with section 101(d), how such activities will encourage the interest of women and minorities in mathematics, science, engineering, and technology and will help prepare women and minorities to pursue postsecondary studies in these fields;

(3) a description of the number, size, and nature of any stipends that will be provided to students or teachers and the reasons such stipends are needed;

(4) how the partnership will serve as a catalyst for reform of mathematics and science education programs; and

(5) how the partnership will assess its success.

(b) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—In evaluating the applications submitted under subsection (a), the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the ability of the partnership to effectively carry out the proposed programs;

(2) the extent to which the members of the partnership are committed to making the partnership a central organizational focus;

(3) the degree to which activities carried out by the partnership are based on relevant research and are likely to result in increased student achievement;

(4) the degree to which such activities are aligned with State or local standards; and

(5) the likelihood that the partnership will demonstrate activities that can be widely implemented as part of larger scale reform efforts.

(c) AWARDS.—(1) The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that partnership grants be awarded under section 101 in a wide range of geographic areas and that the partnership program include rural, suburban, and urban local educational agencies.

(2) Not less than 50 percent of the partnerships funded under section 101 shall include businesses.

(3) The Director shall award grants under this subtitle for a period not to exceed 5 years.

SEC. 103. ACCOUNTABILITY AND DISSEMINATION.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Director shall evaluate the partnerships program established under section 101. At a minimum, such evaluations shall—

(1) use a common set of benchmarks and assessment tools to identify best practices and materials developed and demonstrated by the partnerships; and

(2) to the extent practicable, compare the effectiveness of practices and materials developed and demonstrated by the partnerships authorized under this subtitle with those of partnerships funded by other State or Federal agencies.

(b) DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS.—(1) The results of the evaluations required under subsection (a) shall be made available to the public, including through the National Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Education Digital Library, and shall be provided to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(2) Materials developed under the program established under section 101 that are demonstrated to be effective shall be made available through the National Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Education Digital Library.

(c) ANNUAL MEETING.—The Director shall convene an annual meeting of the partnerships participating under this subtitle to foster greater national collaboration.

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this subtitle $200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

Subtitle B—Teacher Research Scholarship Program

SEC. 111. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Director shall establish a program to award grants to institutions of higher education or eligible nonprofit organizations (or consortia thereof) to provide research opportunities in mathematics, science, and engineering for elementary or secondary school teachers of mathematics or science. Such institutions of higher education or eligible nonprofit organizations may include one or more businesses or Federal or State laboratories as partners under the program.

(2) Grants shall be awarded under this section on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—Grant recipients under this section—

(1) shall recruit and select teachers and provide such teachers with opportunities to conduct research in academic, business, or government laboratories;

(2) shall ensure that the teachers have mentors and other programming support to ensure that their research experience will contribute to their understanding of mathematics, science, and engineering and improve their performance in the classroom;

(3) shall provide teachers with a scholarship stipend; and

(4) may provide room and board for residential programs.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—(1) Not more than 25 percent of the funds provided under a grant under this section may be used for programming support for teachers.

(2) The Director shall issue guidelines specifying the minimum and maximum amounts of stipends recipients may provide to teachers under this section.

(d) DURATION.—A teacher may participate in research under the program under this section for up to 1 calendar year or 2 sequential summers.

SEC. 112. SELECTION PROCESS.

(a) APPLICATION.—An institution of higher education or an eligible nonprofit organization (or a consortium thereof) seeking funding under section 111 shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

(1) a description of the research opportunities that will be made available to elementary or secondary school teachers, or both, by the applicant;

(2) a description of how the applicant will recruit teachers to participate in the program and the criteria that will be used to select the participants;

(3) a description of the number, types, and amounts of the scholarships that the applicant intends to offer to participating teachers; and

(4) a description of the programming support that will be provided to participating teachers.

(b) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—In evaluating the applications submitted under subsection (a), the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the ability of the applicant to effectively carry out the proposed program;

(2) the extent to which the applicant is committed to making the program a central organizational focus; and

(3) the likelihood that the research experiences and programming to be offered by the applicant will improve elementary and secondary education.

(c) AWARDS.—(1) The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that grants be awarded under this subtitle in a wide range of geographic areas and to assist teachers from rural, suburban, and urban local educational agencies.

(2) The Director shall award grants under this subtitle for a period not to exceed 5 years.

SEC. 113. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for the National Science Foundation to carry out this subtitle $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

TITLE II—NATIONAL SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION DIGITAL LIBRARY

SEC. 201. IN GENERAL.

The Director shall establish a program to expand the National Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Education Digital Library (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the ''Digital Library'') program to enable timely and continuous dissemination of elementary and secondary science, mathematics, engineering, and technology educational resources, materials, practices, and policies through the Internet and other digital technologies. The expanded Digital Library shall—

(1) contain an Internet-based repository of curricular materials, practices, and teaching modules;

(2) contain, to the extent practicable, an Internet-based repository of information about national and regional conferences related to the improvement of elementary and secondary mathematics, science, engineering, and technology education, including, if appropriate, links to materials generated by those conferences.

(3) provide users of the Digital Library with access to all materials in the Digital Library through a single entry point;

(4) contain only materials that have been peer-reviewed and tested to ensure factual accuracy and effectiveness and that are aligned with recognized State and other widely recognized professional and technical mathematics and science standards;

(5) present materials in a format that is consistent, facilitates ease of comparison and use by classroom teachers, and contains appropriate links to other Federal educational clearinghouses; and

(6) provide materials related to mathematics and science partnership programs, including—

(A) links to all of the programs developed through the mathematics and science partnerships established under subtitle A of title I;

(B) data related to assessment and evaluation and final program reports developed under subtitle A of title I, including both positive and negative outcomes of the program;

(C) materials developed by the partnerships under subtitle A of title I that have been demonstrated to be effective; and

(D) a mechanism for users to make comments or suggestions regarding the use and effectiveness of posted materials.

SEC. 202. GRANTS AND CONTRACT.

(a) GRANTS.—The Director may award grants to institutions of higher education or other qualified entities—

(1) to design all or parts of the Digital Library;

(2) to provide assistance to schools in the selection and adaptation of curricular materials, practices, and teaching methods made available through the Digital Library; or

(3) to carry out the activities described in both paragraphs (1) and (2).

Grants awarded under this subsection may cover the costs of acquiring and reviewing educational materials for dissemination through the Digital Library.

(b) OPERATION.—The Director may contract out the operation and management of the Digital Library.

(c) COMPETITIVE AWARDS.—Grants and contracts shall be awarded under this section on a competitive basis.

SEC. 203. CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall affect the rights, remedies, limitations, or defenses under title 17, United States Code.

SEC. 204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for the National Science Foundation to carry out this title $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

TITLE III—STRATEGIC EDUCATION RESEARCH PROGRAM

Subtitle A—Centers

SEC. 301. ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTERS FOR RESEARCH ON LEARNING AND EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Director shall award grants to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) to establish 4 multidisciplinary Centers for Research on Learning and Education Improvement.

(2) Grants shall be awarded under this subsection on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Centers shall be to conduct and evaluate research in cognitive science, education and related fields and to develop ways in which the results of such research can be applied in elementary and secondary classrooms to improve the teaching of mathematics and science.

(c) FOCUS.—(1) Each Center shall be focused on a different challenge faced by elementary or secondary school teachers of mathematics and science. In determining the research focus of the Centers, the Director shall consult with the National Academy of Sciences and take into account the extent to which other Federal programs support research on similar questions.

(2) The proposal solicitation issued by the Director shall state the focus of each Center and applicants shall apply for designation as a specific Center.

SEC. 302. SELECTION PROCESS.

(a) APPLICATION.—An institution of higher education (or a consortium of such institutions) seeking funding under this title shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(1) the initial research projects that will be undertaken by the Center and the process by which new projects will be identified;

(2) how the Center will work with other research institutions and schools to broaden the national research agenda on learning and teaching;

(3) how the Center will promote active collaboration among physical, biological, and social science researchers;

(4) how the Center will promote active participation by elementary and secondary mathematics and science teachers and administrators; and

(5) how the Center will reduce the results of its research to educational practice and assess the success of new practices.

(b) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—In evaluating the applications submitted under subsection (a), the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the ability of the applicant to effectively carry out the research program and reduce its results to effective educational practice;

(2) the experience of the applicant in conducting research on the science of teaching and learning and the capacity of the applicant to foster new multidisciplinary collaborations;

(3) the capacity of the applicant to attract precollege educators from a diverse array of schools and professional experiences for participation in Center activities; and

(4) the capacity of the applicant to attract and provide adequate support for graduate students to pursue research at the intersection of educational practice and basic research on human cognition and learning.

(c) AWARDS.—The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that the Centers funded under this section conduct research and develop educational practices designed to improve the educational performance of a broad range of students, including those from groups underrepresented in mathematics, science, and engineering.

SEC. 303. ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

The Director shall convene an annual meeting of the Centers to foster collaboration among the Centers and to further disseminate the results of the Centers' activities.

SEC. 304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for the National Science Foundation to carry out this title $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

Subtitle B—Fellowships

SEC. 311. EDUCATION RESEARCH TEACHER FELLOWSHIPS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) The Director shall establish a program to award grants to institutions of higher education or eligible nonprofit entities (or consortia thereof) to provide research opportunities related to the science of learning to elementary and secondary school teachers of science and mathematics.

(2) Grants shall be awarded under this section on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—Grant recipients under this section—

(1) shall recruit and select teachers and provide such teachers with opportunities to conduct research in the fields of—

(A) brain research as a foundation for research on human learning;

(B) behavioral, cognitive, affective, and social aspects of human learning;

(C) science and mathematics learning in formal and informal educational settings; or

(D) learning in complex educational systems;

(2) shall ensure that participating teachers have mentors and other programming support to ensure that their research experience will contribute to their understanding of the science of learning;

(3) shall provide programming, guidance, and support to ensure that participating teachers disseminate information about the current state of education research and its implications for classroom practice to other elementary and secondary educators and can use that information to improve their performance in the classroom;

(4) shall provide participating teachers with a scholarship stipend; and

(5) may provide room and board for residential programs.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—(1) Not more than 25 percent of the funds provided under a grant under this section may be used for programming support for participating teachers.

(2) The Director shall issue guidelines specifying the minimum or maximum amounts of stipends grant recipients may provide to teachers under this section.

(d) DURATION.—A teacher may participate in research under the program under this section for up to 1 calendar year or 2 sequential summers.

(e) APPLICATION.—An institution of higher education or eligible nonprofit entity (or a consortium thereof) seeking funding under this section shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

(1) a description of the research opportunities that will be made available to elementary or secondary school teachers, or both, by the applicant;

(2) a description of how the applicant will recruit teachers to participate in the program, and the criteria that will be used to select the participants;

(3) a description of the number, types, and amounts of the scholarships that the applicant intends to offer to participating teachers; and

(4) a description of the programming support that will be provided to participating teachers to enhance their research experience and to enable them to educate their peers about the value, findings, and implications of education research.

(f) REVIEW OF APPLICANTS.—In evaluating the applications submitted under subsection (e), the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the ability of the applicant to effectively carry out the proposed program;

(2) the extent to which the applicant is committed to making the program a central organizational focus; and

(3) the likelihood that the research experiences and programming to be offered by the applicant will improve elementary and secondary education.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for carrying out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

TITLE IV—ROBERT NOYCE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term ''mathematics and science teacher'' means a mathematics, science, or technology teacher at the elementary or secondary school level;

(2) the term ''mathematics, science, or engineering professional'' means a person who holds a baccalaureate, masters, or doctoral degree in science, mathematics, or engineering and is working in that field or a related area;

(3) the term ''scholarship'' means an award under section 405; and

(4) the term ''scholarship recipient'' means a student receiving a scholarship;

(5) the term ''stipend'' means an award under section 406;

(6) the term ''stipend recipient'' means a science, mathematics, or engineering professional receiving a stipend; and

(7) the term ''cost of attendance'' has the meaning given such term in section 472 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087ll).

SEC. 402. SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Director shall establish a program to award grants to institutions of higher education (or consortia of such institutions) to provide scholarships and programming designed to recruit and train mathematics and science teachers. Such program shall be known as the ''Robert Noyce Scholarship Program''.

(2) Grants shall be provided under this section on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(b) USE OF GRANTS.—Grants provided under this title shall be used by institutions of higher education—

(1) to develop and implement a program to encourage top college juniors and seniors majoring in mathematics, science, and engineering at the grantee's institution to become mathematics and science teachers, through—

(A) administering scholarships in accordance with section 405;

(B) offering programs to help scholarship recipients to teach in elementary and secondary schools, including programs that will result in teacher certification; and

(C) offering programs to scholarship recipients, both before and after they receive their baccalaureate degree, to enable the recipients to become better mathematics and science teachers, and to exchange ideas with others in their fields; or

(2) to develop and implement a program to encourage science, mathematics, or engineering professionals to become mathematics and science teachers, through—

(A) administering stipends in accordance with section 406;

(B) offering programs to help stipend recipients obtain teacher certification; and

(C) offering programs to stipend recipients, both during and after matriculation, to enable recipients to become better mathematics and science teachers and exchange ideas with others in their fields; or

(3) for both of the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

SEC. 403. SELECTION PROCESS.

(a) APPLICATION.—An institution of higher education (or a consortium of such institutions) seeking funding under this title shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

(1) a description of the scholarship or stipend program, or both, that the applicant intends to operate, including the number of scholarships or the size and number of stipends the applicant intends to award, and the selection process that will be used in awarding the scholarships or stipends;

(2) evidence that the applicant has the capability to administer the scholarship or stipend program in accordance with the provisions of this title; and

(3) a description of the programming that will be offered to scholarship or stipend recipients during and after their matriculation.

(b) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—In evaluating the applications submitted under subsection (a), the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the ability of the applicant to effectively carry out the program;

(2) the extent to which the applicant is committed to making the program a central organizational focus;

(3) the ability of the proposed programming to enable scholarship or stipend recipients to become successful mathematics and science teachers;

(4) the number and quality of the students that will be served by the program; and

(5) the ability of the applicant to recruit students who would otherwise not pursue a career in teaching.

SEC. 404. AWARDS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Director shall designate institutions awarded grants under this title as ''National Teacher Scholarship Centers''.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that grants be awarded under this title in a wide range of geographic areas and to prepare students for jobs in rural, suburban, and urban local educational agencies.

(c) DURATION.—Grants awarded under this title shall be for a period of 10 years.

SEC. 405. SCHOLARSHIP REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Scholarships under this title shall be available only to students who are—

(1) majoring in science, mathematics, or engineering; and

(2) in the last 2 years of a baccalaureate degree program.

(b) SELECTION.—Individuals shall be selected to receive scholarships primarily on the basis of academic merit, with consideration given to financial need and to the goal of promoting the participation of minorities, women, and people with disabilities.

(c) AMOUNT.—Scholarships under this title shall be in the amount of $7,500 per year, or the cost of attendance, whichever is less. Individuals may receive a maximum of 2 years of scholarship support.

(d) SERVICE OBLIGATION.—If an individual receives a scholarship, that individual shall be required to complete, within 6 years after graduation from the baccalaureate degree program for which the scholarship was awarded, 2 years of service as a mathematics or science teacher for each year a scholarship was received. Service required under this subsection shall be performed at a school receiving assistance under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–10).

SEC. 406. STIPENDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Stipends under this title shall be available only to mathematics, science, and engineering professionals who, while receiving the stipend, are enrolled in a program to receive certification to teach.

(b) SELECTION.—Individuals shall be selected to receive stipends under this title primarily on the basis of academic merit, with consideration given to financial need and to the goal of promoting the participation of minorities, women, and people with disabilities.

(c) AMOUNT.—Stipends under this title shall be for an amount of up to $7,500 per year, but in no event more than the cost of attendance. Individuals may receive a maximum of 1 year of stipend support.

(d) SERVICE OBLIGATION.—If an individual receives a stipend under this title, that individual shall be required to complete, within 6 years after graduation from the program for which the stipend was awarded, 2 years of service as a mathematics or science teacher for each year a stipend was received. Service required under this subsection shall be performed at a school receiving assistance under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–10).

SEC. 407. CONDITIONS OF SUPPORT.

As a condition of acceptance of a scholarship or stipend under this title, a recipient shall enter into an agreement with the institution of higher education—

(1) accepting the terms of the scholarship or stipend pursuant to sections 405 and 409 or section 406;

(2) agreeing to provide the awarding institution of higher education with annual certification of employment and current contact information and to participate in surveys provided by the institution of higher education as part of an ongoing assessment program; and

(3) establishing that any scholarship recipient shall be liable to the United States for any amount that is required to be repaid in accordance with the provisions of section 409.

SEC. 408. COLLECTION FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.

(a) MONITORING COMPLIANCE.—An institution of higher education (or consortium thereof) receiving a grant under this title shall, as a condition of participating in the program, enter into an agreement with the Director to monitor the compliance of scholarship and stipend recipients with their respective service requirements.

(b) COLLECTION OF REPAYMENT.—(1) In the event that a scholarship recipient is required to repay the scholarship under section 409, the institution shall be responsible for collecting the repayment amounts.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), any repayment shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(3) A grantee may retain a percentage of any repayment it collects to defray administrative costs associated with the collection. The Director shall establish a single, fixed percentage that will apply to all grantees.

SEC. 409. FAILURE TO COMPLETE SERVICE OBLIGATION.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—If an individual who has received a scholarship under this title—

(1) fails to maintain an acceptable level of academic standing in the educational institution in which the individual is enrolled, as determined by the National Science Foundation;

(2) is dismissed from such educational institution for disciplinary reasons;

(3) withdraws from the baccalaureate degree program for which the award was made before the completion of such program;

(4) declares that the individual does not intend to fulfill his service obligation under this title; or

(5) fails to fulfill the service obligation of the individual under this title,

such individual shall be liable to the United States as provided in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNT OF REPAYMENT.—(1) If a circumstance described in subsection (a) occurs before the completion of one year of a service obligation under this title, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the individual, within one year after the date of the occurrence of such circumstance, an amount equal to—

(A) the total amount of awards received by such individual under this title; plus

(B) the interest on such amounts which would be payable if at the time the amounts were received they were loans bearing interest at the maximum legal prevailing rate, as determined by the Treasurer of the United States,

multiplied by 2.

(2) If a circumstance described in subsection (a)(4) or (a)(5) occurs after the completion of one year of a service obligation under this title, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the individual, within one year after the date of the occurrence of such circumstance, an amount equal to—

(A) the total amount of awards received by such individual under this title minus $3,750 for each full year of service completed; plus

(B) the interest on such amounts which would be payable if at the time the amounts were received they were loans bearing interest at the maximum legal prevailing rate, as determined by the Treasurer of the United States.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—(1) The National Science Foundation may provide for the partial or total waiver or suspension of any service obligation or payment by an individual under this title whenever compliance by the individual is impossible or would involve extreme hardship to the individual, or if enforcement of such obligation with respect to the individual would be unconscionable.

(2) Any obligation of an individual under this title for payment under subsection (b) may be released by a discharge in bankruptcy under title 11, United States Code, only if such discharge is granted after the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the first date that such payment is required.

SEC. 410. REPORT.

(a) DATA COLLECTION.—Institutions receiving grants under this title shall supply to the Director any relevant statistical and demographic data on scholarship recipients and stipend recipients the Director may request, including information on employment required by section 407.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to Congress a report assessing the impact of the implementation of this title on drawing into teaching top mathematics and science students, including students from groups underrepresented in mathematics, science, and engineering.

SEC. 411. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this title $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

(b) SPECIFIC APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to support the activities described in subsections (b)(1)(A) and (C) and (b)(2)(A) and (C) of section 402, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011.

TITLE V—REQUIREMENTS FOR RESEARCH CENTERS

SEC. 501. REQUIREMENTS FOR RESEARCH CENTERS.

The Director shall ensure that any National Science Foundation program that awards grants for the establishment of research centers at institutions of higher education after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) requires that every center offer programs for elementary and secondary mathematics and science teachers and students to increase their understanding of the field in which the center specializes; and

(2) uses the quality of a center's proposed precollege education programs as a criterion in determining grant awards.

TITLE VI—EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES

Subtitle A—Research Centers

SEC. 601. EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Director shall establish a program to award grants to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) to establish centers to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of information technologies in elementary and secondary mathematics and science education.

(2) Grants shall be awarded under this subtitle on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—Centers established under this subtitle shall, at a minimum—

(1) identify educational approaches and techniques that are based on the use of information technology and that have the potential for being effective in classroom settings;

(2) develop methods to measure the effectiveness of various applications of information technology in mathematics and science education, including methods to measure student performance;

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of the use of technology in elementary and secondary mathematics and science education in a variety of classroom settings; and

(4) identify the key variables that influence educational effectiveness and the conditions necessary to implement successfully an approach or technique determined to be educationally effective for a particular educational setting;

(5) ensure that the results of such evaluations are widely disseminated; and

(6) develop a program to work with local educational agencies to help them apply the results of the research conducted under this section.

SEC. 602. SELECTION PROCESS.

(a) APPLICATION.—An institution of higher education (or a consortium of such institutions) seeking funding under this subtitle shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(1) the approaches to the use of information technology that the center will initially evaluate, how it chose those approaches, how it will seek out any additional approaches, and how assessment procedures would be developed and applied;

(2) how the center will work with local educational agencies to evaluate the approaches in classrooms;

(3) how the center will disseminate the results of its work; and

(4) how the center will develop an outreach program to work with local educational agencies to help them apply the results of its research.

(b) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—In evaluating the applications submitted under subsection (a), the Director shall consider, at a minimum, the ability of the applicant to effectively evaluate information technology approaches and to help local educational agencies apply the results of those evaluations.

(c) AWARDS.—The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that the program established under this subtitle evaluates information technology—

(1) in a wide range of grade levels and geographic areas;

(2) in rural, suburban, and urban schools; and

(3) with a wide variety of students in terms of race, ethnicity, and income.

SEC. 603. DOCUMENTATION AND DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The results of the research and evaluations conducted in accordance with section 601 shall be documented and widely disseminated, including through publication in peer-reviewed scholarly journals.

(b) WORKSHOPS, CONFERENCES, AND WEB SITES.—The Director is authorized to sponsor and support workshops, conferences, and dedicated web sites to disseminate information about the activities of the educational technology research centers established under section 601.

(c) DEPOSIT IN LIBRARY.—Information about effective approaches and techniques, including information and materials necessary for their implementation, shall be deposited in the Digital Library.

SEC. 604. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out the program established under section 601—

(1) $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004; and

(2) $30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 and 2006.

Subtitle B—Assistance

SEC. 611. EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY ASSISTANCE.

Section 3 of the Scientific and Advanced Technology Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–476; 42 U.S.C. 1862i) is amended by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may make awards on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis to associate-degree granting colleges, bachelor-degree granting institutions, or education service agencies (or consortia thereof) to establish centers to assist elementary and secondary schools in the use of information technology for mathematics, science, or technology instruction.

''(2) ACTIVITIES.—Activities of centers funded under this subsection may include—

''(A) helping schools evaluate their need for information technology;

''(B) training teachers on how to best use information technology in instruction; and

''(C) providing other information and training to help schools and teachers ensure that they have access to appropriate information technologies and are using them to maximum advantage.

''(3) APPLICATION.—An application to receive funds under this subsection shall include, at a minimum—

''(A) a description of the services that will be provided to schools and teachers;

''(B) a list of the schools expected to be served;

''(C) a description of how the applicant will draw on the expertise of its faculty and students to assist schools and teachers; and

''(D) a description of how the applicant will operate the program after funding made available by this subsection has expired.

''(4) SELECTION.—In evaluating applications submitted under paragraph (3), the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

''(A) the ability of the applicant to effectively carry out the program;

''(B) the number of schools and students who would be served and the their need for assistance;

''(C) the extent to which the applicant has worked with participating schools to ensure that priority problems would be addressed by the assistance provided under this subsection; and

''(D) the ability of the applicant to continue to provide assistance after funding under this subsection has expired.

''(5) AWARDS.—(A) The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that the program established by this subsection assists schools in rural, suburban, and urban areas.

''(B) No institution shall receive funds under this subsection for more than three years.

''(C) An institution receiving a grant under subtitle A of title VI of the National Mathematics and Science Partnerships Act may participate in the program created by this section.

''(6) REPORT.—Not later than April 1, 2005, the Director shall provide a report to Congress assessing the success of the program funded under this subsection and the need of schools for continued assistance, and, based on the experience with the program, recommending ways information technology assistance to schools could be made more broadly available.

''(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2004.''.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PROFICIENCY SCHOLARSHIPS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Proficiency in mathematics, science, and information technology is necessary to prepare all students in the United States for participation in the 21st century and to guarantee that the United States economy remains vibrant and competitive.

(2) In order to achieve such results, it is important that the Federal Government shows interest in economically disadvantaged students who have not been provided with opportunities that will improve their knowledge of mathematics, science, and technology.

(3) Many economically disadvantaged students in urban and rural America share a common need to receive a quality education, but often the schools of such students lack the needed resources to lift those students into the information age.

(4) The schools and businesses serving urban and rural communities are strategically positioned to form a unique partnership with students that will increase their mathematics, science, and technology proficiency and encourage and support their undergraduate study in those fields for the benefit of the Nation.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish a demonstration project to encourage businesses to offer scholarships to eligible students (to enable them to attend institutions of higher education) by providing grants to improve mathematics, science, or technology education in the schools attended by the eligible students.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—(1) The Director shall provide grants under this section to local educational agencies on a merit-reviewed, competitive basis.

(2) Funds awarded under this subsection may be used to—

(A) provide teacher professional development in mathematics, science, or technology;

(B) develop or implement mathematics, science, or technology curriculums, and to purchase related equipment; and

(C) to carry out other activities the Director determines would improve mathematics, science, or technology education.

(d) ELIGIBLE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—For purposes of this section, a local educational agency is eligible to receive a grant under this section if the agency—

(1) provides assurances that it has executed conditional agreements with representatives of the private sector to provide services and funds described in subsection (e); and

(2) agrees to enter into an agreement with the Director to comply with the requirements of this section.

(e) PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION.—The conditional agreements referred to in subsection (d)(1) shall describe participation by the private sector, including—

(1) the donation of computer hardware, software, and other technology tools;

(2) the establishment of internship and mentoring opportunities for students who participate in the mathematics, science, and information technology program; and

(3) the donation of higher education scholarship funds for eligible students to continue their study of mathematics, science, and information technology.

(f) APPLICATION.—(1) To apply for a grant under this section, each eligible local educational agency shall submit an application to the Director in accordance with guidelines established by the Director pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2)(A) The guidelines referred to in paragraph (1) shall require, at a minimum, that the application include—

(i) a description of proposed activities consistent with the uses of funds and program requirements under subsection (c);

(ii) a description of the higher education scholarship program, including criteria for selection, duration of scholarship, number of scholarships to be awarded each year, and funding levels for scholarships; and

(iii) evidence of private sector participation and financial support to establish an internship, mentoring, and scholarship program.

(B) The Director shall issue and publish such guidelines not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) PRIORITY.—The Director shall give special priority in awarding grants under this section to eligible local educational agencies that—

(1) demonstrate the greatest ability to obtain commitments from representatives of the private sector to provide services and funds described under subsection (e); and

(2) demonstrate the greatest economic need.

(h) ASSESSMENT.—The Director shall assess the effectiveness of activities carried out under this section.

(i) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Director—

(1) shall initiate an evaluative study of the effectiveness of the activities carried out under this section in improving student performance in mathematics, science, and information technology at the precollege level and in stimulating student interest in pursuing undergraduate studies in those fields; and

(2) shall report the findings of the study to Congress not later than 4 years after the award of the first scholarship.

Such report shall include the number of students graduating from an institution of higher education with a major in mathematics, science, or information technology and the number of students who find employment in such fields.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''conditional agreement'' means an arrangement between representatives of the private sector and local educational agencies to provide certain services and funds, such as, but not limited to, the donation of computer hardware and software, the establishment of internship and mentoring opportunities for students who participate in mathematics, science, and information technology programs, and the donation of scholarship funds for use at institutions of higher education by eligible students who have participated in the mathematics, science, and information technology programs.

(2) The term ''eligible student'' means a student enrolled in the 12th grade who—

(A) has participated in a mathematics, science, and an information technology program established pursuant to this section;

(B) has demonstrated a commitment to pursue a career in information technology, mathematics, science, or engineering; and

(C) has attained high academic standing and maintains a grade point average of not less than 2.7 on a 4.0 scale for the period from the beginning of the 10th grade through the time of application for a scholarship.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

(l) MAXIMUM GRANT AWARD.—An award made to an eligible local educational agency under this section may not exceed $300,000.

SEC. 702. ARTICULATION PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

(a) OUTREACH GRANTS.—In making awards for outreach grants authorized under section 3(c)(2) of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 1862i(c)(2)), the Director shall give priority to proposals that involve secondary schools with a majority of students from groups that are underrepresented in the science, mathematics, and engineering workforce. Awards in such cases shall not be subject to the requirement under section 3(f)(3) of such Act for a matching contribution.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

SEC. 703. ASSESSMENT OF IN-SERVICE TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Director shall review all programs sponsored by the National Science Foundation that support in-service teacher professional development for science teachers to determine—

(1) the level of resources and degree of emphasis placed on training teachers in the effective use of information technology in the classroom; and

(2) the allocation of resources between summer activities and follow-on reinforcement training and support to participating teachers during the school year.

(b) REPORT.—The Director shall submit to Congress, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report that—

(1) describes the results of the review and assessment conducted under subsection (a);

(2) summarizes the major categories of in-service teacher professional development activities supported at the time of the review, and the funding levels for such activities; and

(3) describes any proposed changes, including new funding allocations, to strengthen the in-service teacher professional development programs of the National Science Foundation that support activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 704. STUDY OF BROADBAND NETWORK ACCESS FOR SCHOOLS AND LIBRARIES.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall conduct a study of the issues described

in subsection (c), and not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, transmit to Congress a report including recommendations to address those issues. Such report shall be updated annually for 6 additional years.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the reports under subsection (a), the Director shall consult with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and such other Federal agencies and educational entities as the Director considers appropriate.

(c) ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED.—The reports shall—

(1) identify the current status of high-speed, large bandwidth capacity access to all public elementary and secondary schools and libraries in the United States;

(2) identify how the provision of high-speed, large bandwidth capacity access to the Internet to such schools and libraries can be effectively utilized within each school and library;

(3) consider the effect that specific or regional circumstances may have on the ability of such institutions to acquire high-speed, large bandwidth capacity access to achieve universal connectivity as an effective tool in the education process; and

(4) include options and recommendations to address the challenges and issues identified in the reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1858.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House today H.R. 1858, the National Mathematics and Science Partnerships Act. I want to thank the leadership for placing it on the suspension calendar. This bill belongs on the suspension calendar, which is reserved for noncontroversial items, because it is a result of a fair and deliberative process and it is designed to achieve goals we all share.

Let me talk first about the process. This bill brings together ideas that originated in the President's education plan, in the version of H.R. 1858 that was introduced by me, and in the largely complementary earlier bill, H.R. 1693, that was introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member.

In addition, we worked in a bipartisan fashion to include proposals by a wide variety of Members, including the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who chairs the Subcommittee on Research; the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), who is the ranking member on that subcommittee; and numerous other Members on both sides of the aisle. We did that by adjusting all the proposals to fit within the structure, the philosophy and expenditures already in the bill. Every time someone came up with a good idea, we did not just up the ante or go off in a different direction, we were disciplined; and we fit it all within the structure and the philosophy and expenditures in the bill. As a result, the bill was passed by voice vote at both subcommittee and full committee. Then we had further discussions with our friends on the Committee on Education and the Workforce and made additional changes in response to their concerns.

We added language, for example, to ensure coordination between the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education, coordination that should occur automatically but often does not. So I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for his cooperation. As a result of that cooperation, the Committee on Education and the Workforce discharged the bill with an exchange of letters to protect each of our jurisdictions. Then we had an additional set of discussions with the Republican Study Committee and made additional changes sought by that group to ensure that we did not end up with duplicate programs within the National Science Foundation. I want to thank Neil Bradley of the RSC staff for facilitating those discussions.

So the bill we are bringing to the floor reflects an open and fair process of consultation with anyone and everyone who has had an interest in this bill, and its broad support within this body reflects that.

Of course, none of that process would matter if we were not doing something of significance here, and we are. This bill will allow our Nation to make major forward strides in the critically important task of improving K–12 math and science education. We have all spent a lot of time pointing to the studies that show how poorly our students do compared with their international counterparts in math and science. In this bill, we are doing something about it. The basic premise of the bill is simple. We need to do more to bring the resources and expertise of academia and business to bear on improving K–12 education. It is a simple premise, as I say; but its simplicity has not so far led to its realization.

There remains a gulf between our world-class institutions of higher education and our troubled institutions of elementary and secondary education. There remains a gulf between our business community, which demands a better trained workforce, and our school systems, which educate that future workforce. There remains a gulf between our stated desire for more and better teachers, better curriculum and better educational reforms, and what we are actually investing to achieve those goals. This bill is an effort to bridge all of those gulfs.

The bill authorizes a number of programs at the National Science Foundation, an agency with a long and proud history of awarding funds on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis to the best proposals that originate around the country. It authorizes programs that will encourage our colleges and universities and businesses to help school systems train teachers, develop new teaching methods, find better ways to use educational technology, apply the latest research in cognitive sciences, and prepare and gain access to better teaching materials.

I want to call Members' attention to two of those programs in particular. The first is the President's math and science partnerships. President Bush deserves the gratitude of all Americans for focusing on education in general and on math and science education in particular. He made the wise decision to have the National Science Foundation run his marquee math and science initiative. We have funded this initiative at the level requested by the President, and we have structured it to ensure that colleges and universities work together with school districts without excessive interference or financial intrusion from the heavy hand of the State education bureaucracy.

The second program is one close to my heart, one that I have been working on for years, the Noyce scholarships, named for Robert Noyce, an inventor of the transistor and a founder of Intel. Under this program, top math and science majors will be encouraged to teach by awarding of scholarships with a service requirement and by providing them with extra training and support. The single most important step we can take to improve math and science education is to get bright, well-trained students with confidence in their material into the classroom. This program is designed to do just that.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for providing appropriations to get the program started. Congress first passed a version of this program over a decade ago, and it is long past time for the National Science Foundation to get started on it.

I should also point out that this bill has broad support from academic and business groups, and a bipartisan counterpart to it has recently been introduced in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, in closing let me just say that this is a good bill that reflects the contributions of many Members, a bill that will make a real difference to the students and teachers in our elementary and secondary schools and, through them, a big difference to all of us. In passing this bill, we will be heeding the sound admonition of H.G. Wells: ''Civilization becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.''

I urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise, of course, in support of this act. It is a very important piece of legislation that will strengthen science and mathematics education in the Nation's schools. It includes a lot of provisions designed to bring more support to K–12 science and math teachers, more support to their students and, of course, to the entire schools.

□ 1500

The overall goal is to help our children become more proficient in science and math, to get them more interested in it, and I am confident that the programs authorized by this bill will do exactly that.

Earlier this year, I chaired a forum in Sherman, Texas, which is in my district. It focused on the issue of the skills needed for high technology workforce. The forum highlighted the importance of providing high quality science and math education in elementary and secondary schools in order to prepare the students for the technological challenges of the new economy. The program initiatives authorized by H.R. 1858 are consistent with the recommendations I received during this conference. It was a 3-day conference in Northeast Texas, well attended.

I congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the Committee on Science, for placing science education high on the committee's agenda this year, and for taking the necessary steps to move this legislation forward for consideration by the House today. We worked together, and I think that is the reason we are here today. We had very few disagreements. The disagreements we had, we worked them out, worked them out through our committee staffs, who worked very hard.

H.R. 1858 is the result of a very bipartisan thrust and it incorporates several programs and activities from a comprehensive education bill, H.R. 1693, which I introduced earlier this year. It also includes specific provisions Democratic Members of the Committee on Science have separately developed to improve K–12 science and math education.

I would particularly like to highlight the programs incorporated from H.R. 1693 that explore ways to effectively use educational technology in the classroom.

The approach is to identify promising techniques and approaches, then test them in a variety of classroom settings, and then document results in terms of student performance. This knowledge will enable schools to select the technology-based material and approaches that actually work and are worth the substantial investment needed to implement them.

The educational technology activities authorized by this bill respond to the recommendations of both the Web-Based Education Commission in its December 2000 report to the President and the Congress, and the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee in its February 2001 report, ''Using Information Technology to Transform the Way We Learn.''

Also, H.R. 1858 incorporates programs from H.R. 1693 to encourage and support women and minorities in pursuing careers in science and in engineering and to get them interested in it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the collegial process through which this bipartisan legislation has been developed. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the Subcommittee on Research chairman, and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), for their efforts to develop this bill.

Finally, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), the chairman of the Committee on Science, for his willingness to work cooperatively with the Democratic Members to develop this legislation. We have had a lot of meetings, we have met here on the floor, and we have discussed it at times when he was generous with his time. As chairman, he has many things to do, but he has given us the time we asked for. We have a good chairman, and I am thankful for him.

I am proud we were able to work on this legislation with minimal debate over the fundamental objections and objectives. As a result, we produced a bill that is a win-win for teachers, it is a win-win for students, and the industries that rely on math, science and technological expertise, it is a win-win for them.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this measure to my colleagues and ask for their support for its passage by the House.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research. He has had such an integral part to play in the development of this very significant legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and certainly the gentleman from Texas, the ranking member on our subcommittee. It is a goal in the Committee on Science to work together, and I think that kind of an effort is good, because it moves us ahead to get some of this legislation passed and to the president.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1858. It is a bill that was favorably reported out of the Committee on Science Subcommittee on Research last month and a couple weeks later passed out of the full committee.

In opening that markup, I noted that the bill addresses an issue that is at the heart of our national security and our national prosperity. The math and science education we provide our kids is so important. We are in the midst of a technological revolution that has driven our economy, improved our productivity and helped us live longer and healthier lives. But it is a revolution fueled, in large part, by our investment and our past investment in research and development. But this research and development is, in turn, dependent on how we inspire our kids to take up math and science education and the quality of education and teachers. We furnish that inspiration by giving them a quality education in math and science. This bill takes important steps to manage that investment.

I am also pleased, as I mentioned, that the bill before us today represents the work and input from many members, from the Democrats and Republicans of the Subcommittee on Research and the full Committee on Science. Certainly the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), in moving this bill ahead, I thank him for his willingness to include provisions important to me and other members of the subcommittee in this particular bill, particularly for his inclusion of language establishing the Centers on Research on Learning and Education and Education Research Teacher Fellowships that originally appeared in my education research legislation, H.R. 2050.

These provisions address the need to bridge the gap between the basic research on how our children learn and actual classroom practice, a gap we have explored in several hearings before this subcommittee. I would like to tell my colleagues that witnesses at those hearings testified that the fire that started in these kids to make them sometimes not afraid of math and science, but, more importantly, to make them pursue that math and science education, is so important. You can have great teachers, but if the kids are not interested in math and science and do not take it up, it does not happen.

Here is an interesting result of the questions that I asked our witnesses. I said if education is more the lighting of a fire than filling of a container, when is that fire lit for math and science? Two of the witnesses said probably between kindergarten and the third grade. If those kids do not get a little bit of that fire, that lighting up of interest between kindergarten and third grade, then they are probably not going to pursue math and science.

But it is important, the work that this committee has done. I would also mention the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) has been a catalist for legislation helping assure quality teachers that will ultimately make a big difference whether those kids have a good math and science education.

You know, as First Lady Laura Bush said last week at a speech at the start of a 2-day summit of leading education researchers, ''The topic of our children rises above partisan politics and turf battle. Teachers, especially pre-kindergarten and early education teachers,

need to have the latest information on the science of learning in order to teach effectively.''

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer my support to this bill today, and once again thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BOEHLERT) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), as well as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), for all of their efforts.

My suggestion today is that with the technology that is evolving, every student in every class regardless of the career they pursue, needs to take a little more math and science. A basic in math and sciences will be instrumental in their ability to communicate, to produce and in their ability to achieve success in the developing new world of technology.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who is an integral part of this legislation and a Member who pursued it and has worked well with the opposition and me as the ranking member.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1858, the National Mathematics and Science Partnerships Act. I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for their very successful effort to bring this bill together in a true bipartisan manner. That is what makes serving on the Committee on Science such a joy. I thank you both very much.

This bill is a clear blueprint to further science, math, and technology education in our country. As a member of both the House Committee on Education and Workforce and Committee on Science, I am very aware of the challenges that our students and schools face in educating for a highly technical workforce. We know that having a well-educated workforce in the math and science fields is a major priority of employers across this Nation, especially in the high-tech arena.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the United States will not have a technically competent workforce until females, the majority of our students, study science, math, and engineering or technology in the same numbers as their male counterparts. That is why I am glad that we were able to work together on this committee to ensure that this bill addresses the important issue of girls and young women and technology.

The science enrichment programs for girls included in this bill, which is based on a bill I authored, Go Girl, H.R. 1536, will authorize NSF to fund programs in elementary and secondary schools that encourage the ongoing interests of girls in science, math, engineering, and technology. The bill, H.R. 1858, will provide a way for girls to gain both the practical advice and the vision they need to pursue undergraduate and graduate studies or careers in these technical fields.

It will help create a bold new workforce of energized young women, meaning that employers, public and private, will be able to hire the workers they need right here in America, because the 50 percent of our population that now is turning away from careers in science, math, engineering, and technology will actually seek and receive the education they need to fill those jobs, jobs that pay a very good salary, by the way.

This important provision is one of the reasons I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who is an educator and a lawmaker and a consummate professional in both pursuits.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 1858.

Mr. Speaker, I obviously want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the Committee on Science for his commitment, for his leadership, and for introducing this legislation and for bringing it to the floor so expeditiously. Also I want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL). I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who chairs the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Science, and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member. This is a collaborative effort, and this is a committee where people on both sides of the aisle work together to help our country, and in this case to help our young people who are going to be our future leaders.

Many challenges face us in our Nation's educational effort, particularly in science and math. Despite the dedication and hard work of many committed individuals, our children continue to perform poorly on standardized tests. Lackluster performances on the most recent TIMSS, TIMSS-Repeated and NAEP tests, those are the Third International Math and Science Study, Third International Math and Science Study Repeated, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress, these reports are a case in point.

While there is a broad range of scores throughout the Nation, even our strongest districts lag behind international averages. For example, while I was very proud to learn that my district, Montgomery County, Maryland, soundly beat the national average in both math and science, we still lagged behind the Eastern and European powerhouses. What is worse, data comparing the fourth, eighth, and twelfth grades suggest that our students grow further behind the longer they are in school. This situation is unacceptable.

□ 1515

We need to recruit better teachers and provide additional training to the ones that we have. Teachers, like most professionals, need opportunities for development. Education is not a static discipline, and our efforts and approaches need to be upgraded to take into account our changing times.

We also need additional research on how to take advantage of the technology revolution in the classroom. This bill provides grants for the development of current teachers, scholarships for math and science majors who go into teaching, and research dollars for innovative methods. These incentives are desperately needed.

In addition, we need to provide opportunities for traditionally under-represented groups such as women, minorities, and persons with disabilities so that they can excel in math and science-related fields. The Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us that careers in science, engineering and technology are still booming and, over the next few years, we will need to fill over 5 million new jobs in high-tech specialty occupations. To meet this demand, we will need participation from all sectors of our work force.

The Commission that was established by my legislation on the advancement of women minorities in science, engineering and technology found that these groups greatly askew technical occupations. They are severely under-represented in scientific disciplines, and while they represent the fastest growing segment of the work force, they are not going into technical careers at an appreciable rate. If we are going to meet the future demand for a highly skilled work force, we must find ways to tap into these groups.

In particular, these outreach efforts should include a consortium of community colleges in their university-industry partnerships. Community colleges do not traditionally do well in competition with 4-year institutions for establishing pilot programs and research efforts. However, nearly 45 percent of all U.S. undergraduates and a majority of women minorities and persons with disabilities attend these institutions and they must be included in our efforts if we are to reach out to those under-represented groups. Provisions for such a community college consortium, which I introduced as an amendment to H.R. 1858 and which was supported by the Committee on Science, are included in the bill's report language. Our children deserve the best in education, and this legislation offers a common sense approach to improve science and math education. It deserves our support.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman

from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research, who is responsible for a lot of this bill, but she especially pushed the section of the bill that promotes the Partnership for Math and Science for Economically Disadvantaged Schools.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my support for the National Mathematics and Science Partnership Act. This is significant legislation designed to improve mathematics and science education in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation.

I congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the Committee on Science, for his efforts to develop the bill and for his cooperative approach in working with Members on both sides of the aisle all during the process. I also want to acknowledge the hard work of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), my ranking member and colleague, who introduced comprehensive science education earlier this year. Many provisions of his bill, Science Education for the 21st Century Act, H.R. 1693, are incorporated in the bill before us today.

Over the past two Congresses, the Committee on Science has conducted an extensive series of hearings that have examined all aspects of K–12 science and math education. I believe that H.R. 1858, as reported from the Committee on Science, is guided and well-supported by the testimony that we have received. It is now time to move it forward toward final passage.

The Democratic members of the Committee on Science have separately developed several legislative proposals on science and math education this year. In addition, they have worked with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), our ranking member, in developing H.R. 1693. I am pleased that many of the programs and activities set out in these bills are now part of H.R. 1858.

I want to commend the bipartisan process through which the legislation has been developed. I believe we all approached this matter with an appreciation of the importance of finding creative and effective ways to address the serious deficiencies that now exist in K–12 science and math education. I believe we may all take pride in the legislation that has emerged from this collegial process.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1858 comprises a range of proposals from Members on both sides of the aisle on ways to improve teacher training, to attract more talented students to careers in science and math, to encourage more students to go into education, and to develop more effective educational materials and teaching practices to improve student learning. It also authorizes new research programs to improve the scientific base for teaching techniques and education materials, as well as to determine the effectiveness of new educational approaches of improving student performance.

I am particularly pleased that the bill incorporates the Math and Science Proficiency Partnership Act, H.R. 1660, which I introduced this year. This is similar to bills that I have introduced in the past two Congresses.

My legislation is a targeted measure. It seeks to bring schools with large populations of economically disadvantaged students together in partnership with businesses to improve math and science education and to recruit and support students in undergraduate education and science and technology fields.

The components of the partnerships will include support from the National Science Foundation to the schools for teacher training, education materials, and equipment. Industry will provide support for college scholarships for promising students, job site mentoring and internship programs, and donations of computer software and hardware. The overall effect of the partnerships will be to encourage and support promising students from under-represented groups in pursuing careers in science and engineering.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for his willingness to work cooperatively with the Democratic Members in developing H.R. 1858, and I would ask favorable consideration. I also want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, for his contributions, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. Speaker, I support strongly the passage of this bill.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ehlers), a distinguished scientist, distinguished educator and a distinguished lawmaker.

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

I will be brief, because I have a similar bill coming up shortly, and I will amplify my comments at that time.

This is an excellent bill. I strongly urge the House to pass this bill and to work diligently with the Senate to make certain that we get these programs passed into law.

One of the most important aspects of this bill is that it establishes a competitive merit-based grant program of partnerships between universities and school districts, and they are encouraged to include businesses as well, to improve K–12 math and science education. This is the centerpiece of the bill; it is something that the President recommended early on when he took office, and I am very pleased to see this take place.

In addition to that aspect, the bill will enable K–12 math and science teachers to participate in math, science, or engineering research at universities or government or industry labs. That can be a life-changing experience for a high school teacher, or even an elementary school teacher, to spend time working in a well-known lab with a well-known scientist and doing science at the edge of the envelope.

Third, this bill establishes a competitive merit-based grant program to set up four university research centers on teaching and learning. This again is ground-breaking work and something that is similar to a recommendation of the Glenn Commission last year. We have to develop better research in teaching science and mathematics as well as other subjects. Reid Lyon at the National Institutes of Health has done ground-breaking research in this, but there is much more to be done and we must involve the universities as well. This provision will go far in that direction.

Finally, this bill establishes a program to award scholarships to top math and science majors in their junior and senior years of college with a requirement that they must teach 2 years for each year they receive a scholarship. This is a stroke of genius, because we badly need new, good science and math teachers, and this is one method which will provide some of the world's best.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill, and I encourage the House to adopt it. It is an excellent bill.

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

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

Just let me close by acknowledging how this all came about. Well-intentioned people, Republicans and Democrats alike, guided by that dedicated cadre of staff people who worked tirelessly behind the scenes to make it all possible; they crossed committee jurisdictions with the administration and the Congress, even consulting with our friends and colleagues in the other body. Sharon Hayes and Jim Wilson deserve special commendation for their endless hours of very hard and very productive work. To the parents and the students and teachers and business people in America I say, we are here to help.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1858, the National Mathematics and Science Partnerships Act and H.R. 100, the National Science Education Act.

As a scientist and former teacher, I know that success in this information age depends not just on how well we educate our children, but on how well we educate them in math and science specifically.

Yet, one of the most difficult challenges we face today is getting well-trained and qualified science and math teachers in every classroom.

We need to recruit better teachers and provide additional training to the ones we have. Teachers, like most professionals, need opportunities for continuous development. Education is not static. Our needs and the requirements of our teachers are constantly changing

as we gain a better understanding of how our children learn and as we gain new technologies. Just think of how computers have changed the way we teach and learn.

Our methodologies must change as well.

I was fortunate enough to serve on the Glenn Commission, which sought ways to improve the teaching of math and science. One of the major recommendations that came out of our report, Before It's Too Late, was to provide for an ongoing system of professional development of our teachers. I am pleased to see that these bills will provide grants to improve the professional development of our current teachers.

Just as the Glenn Commission recommended, H.R. 1858 also addresses ways to recruit new and talented teachers into the field by providing scholarships for math and science majors who go into teaching, funds to provide master teachers, and other initiatives to improve the quality of our math and science instructors.

I am also pleased to see that H.R. 1858 provides opportunities for traditionally underrepresented groups to excel in math and science related fields. According to a report by the Congressional Commission on the advancement of Women and Minorities in Science, Engineering, and Technology Development, women, minorities, and persons with disabilities still eschew technical occupations. They are severely underrepresented in scientific disciplines and while they represent the fastest growing segment of the workforce, they are not going into technical careers at an appreciable rate. If we are to meet the future demand for a highly skilled workforce, we must find ways to tap into these groups.

This bill would also address this important issue. It contains programs and language specifically geared towards the recruitment and retention of qualified individuals from these underrepresented groups.

Yet we need to do more. If we are going to improve the recruitment and retention of our teachers, it is important we hear from the people this affects most—our teachers.

I am concerned that this bill does not do enough to include the participation of teachers. Rather than giving sole authority to the Director of NSF, to ensure teachers' voices are heard, it is important that the director work in collaboration with teachers.

I hope as this bill continues to move through Congress, we can incorporate language that will ensure our teachers' voices are heard.

Nevertheless, I support the goals of this bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1858-legislation to improve America's standing in mathematics, science and technology education and instruction.

A solid academic foundation in math and science education is crucial for success in the 21st Century. This bill includes a major initiative to enhance science education through the National Science Foundation. H.R. 1858 authorizes $200 million for the National Science Foundation (NSF) to establish partnerships between institutions of learning and local or state school systems to improve instruction and learning of elementary and secondary school science.

As the former Superintendent of Schools in my home state of North Carolina, I have worked for many years to improve science and math education in our schools. This bill also includes the measure that I proposed for the better preparation of K–12 teachers in science. We need better math and science instruction in our K–12 classrooms. This bill will help ensure that improving math and science education remains an important national priority. Quality instruction is the key to helping students learn in these critical fields. This action will make a real difference for our children and will put America on the road towards a higher standing in the world in math and science.

There is growing recognition that the success of nearly any effort to improve the academic performance of America's students depends critically on their teachers' mastery of subject matter and their ability to teach it. The way to lift student achievement is to ensure that we have a qualified teacher in every classroom. Therefore, if America is to improve its public schools, initiatives to improve science instruction and learning must become the first priority of education reform. I am pleased this bill takes several steps in that direction.

I urge adoption of this bill, and I hope the President will sign it into law as soon as it reaches his desk.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1858, the National Mathematics and Science Partnerships Act.

I would like to thank Science Committee Chairman BOEHLERT for working with me and my colleagues on the committee to craft this important bipartisan legislation.

I want to express particular support for Title IV in this bill. Title IV sets up the Robert Noyce Scholarship program, which would provide scholarships and programming designed to recruit and train mathematics and science teachers. I introduced a similar bill earlier this year, provisions of which have been incorporated into Title IV.

My bill, the Science Teachers Scholarships for Scientists and Engineers Act, provided for scholarships to students or professionals who have a degree in science or engineering to enable them to take the courses they need to become certified as science or math teachers.

From a series of Science Committee hearings last year about the state of science and math education, and from talking to constituents, students, and educators at home, it has become clear to me that we need to improve science and math education in this country.

In particular, I've come to understand that poor student performance in science and math has much to do with the fact that teachers often have little or no training in the disciplines they are teaching. While the importance of teacher expertise in determining student achievement is widely acknowledged, it is also the case that significant numbers of K–12 students are being taught science and math by unqualified teachers.

So I'm pleased that this bill would begin to address the shortage of qualified science and math teachers by providing an incentive for individuals with the content knowledge to try teaching as a career.

Mr. Speaker, to keep economic growth strong in the long-term, we need continued innovation. But innovation doesn't happen by itself—it requires a steady flow of scientists and engineers. That's why this legislation is so important. H.R. 1858 will help ensure we are prepared for the demands and challenges of the economy of this new century.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1858, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SCIENCE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 100) to establish and expand programs relating to science, mathematics, engineering, and technology education, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 100

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Science Education Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) As concluded in the report of the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, ''Unlocking Our Future Toward a New National Science Policy'', the United States must maintain and improve its preeminent position in science and technology in order to advance human understanding of the universe and all it contains, and to improve the lives, health, and freedoms of all people.

(2) It is estimated that more than half of the economic growth of the United States today results directly from research and development in science and technology. The most fundamental research is responsible for investigating our perceived universe, to extend our observations to the outer limits of what our minds and methods can achieve, and to seek answers to questions that have never been asked before. Applied research continues the process by applying the answers from basic science to the problems faced by individuals, organizations, and governments in the everyday activities that make our lives more livable. The scientific-technological sector of our economy, which has driven our recent economic boom and led the United States to the longest period of prosperity in history, is fueled by the work and discoveries of the scientific community.

(3) The effectiveness of the United States in maintaining this economic growth will be largely determined by the intellectual capital of the United States. Education is critical to developing this resource.

(4) The education program of the United States needs to provide for 3 different kinds of intellectual capital. First, it needs scientists, mathematicians, and engineers to continue the research and development that are central to the economic growth of the United States. Second, it needs technologically proficient workers who are comfortable and capable dealing with the demands of a science-based, high-technology workplace. Last, it needs scientifically literate voters and consumers to make intelligent decisions about public policy.

(5) Student performance on the recent Third International Mathematics and Science Study highlights the shortcomings of current K–12 science and mathematics education in the United States, particularly when compared to other countries. We must expect more from our Nation's educators and students if we are to build on the accomplishments of previous generations. New methods of teaching science, mathematics, engineering, and technology are required, as well as better curricula and improved training of teachers.

(6) Science is more than a collection of facts, theories, and results. It is a process of inquiry built upon observations and data that leads to a way of knowing and explaining in logically derived concepts and theories. Mathematics is more than procedures to be memorized. It is a field that requires reasoning, understanding, and making connections in order to solve problems. Engineering is more than just designing and building. It is the process of making compromises to optimize design and assessing risks so that designs and products best solve a given problem. Technology is more than using computer applications, the Internet, and programming. Technology is the innovation, change, or modification of the natural environment, based on scientific, mathematical, and engineering principles.

(7) Students should learn science primarily by doing science. Science education ought to reflect the scientific process and be object-oriented, experiment-centered, and concept-based. Students should learn mathematics with understanding that numeric systems have intrinsic properties that can represent objects and systems in real life, and can be applied in solving problems. Engineering education should reflect the realities of real world design, and should involve hands-on projects and require students to make trade-offs based upon evidence. Students should learn technology as both a tool to solve other problems and as a process by which people adapt the natural world to suit their own purposes. Computers represent a particularly useful form of technology, enabling students and teachers to acquire data, model systems, visualize phenomena, communicate and organize information, and collaborate with others in powerful new ways. A background in the basics of information technology is essential for success in the modern workplace and the modern world.

(8) Children are naturally curious and inquisitive. To successfully tap into these innate qualities, education in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology must begin at an early age and continue throughout the entire school experience.

(9) Teachers provide the essential connection between students and the content they are learning. Prospective teachers need to be identified and recruited by presenting to them a career that is respected by their peers, is financially and intellectually rewarding, contains sufficient opportunities for advancement, and has continuing access to professional development.

(10) Teachers need to have incentives to remain in the classroom and improve their practice, and training of teachers is essential if the results are to be good. Teachers need to be knowledgeable of their content area, of their curriculum, of up-to-date research in teaching and learning, and of techniques that can be used to connect that information to their students in their classroom.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATION OF PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall review the education programs of the National Science Foundation that are in operation as of the date of enactment of this Act to determine whether any of such programs duplicate the programs authorized in this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—(1) As programs authorized in this Act are implemented, the Director shall terminate any existing duplicative program or merge the duplicative program into a program authorized in this Act.

(2) The Director shall not establish any new program that duplicates a program that has been implemented pursuant to this Act.

(c) REPORT.—(1) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall review the education programs of the National Science Foundation to ensure compliance with the provisions of this section.

(2) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall complete a report on the review carried out under this subsection and shall submit the report to the Committee on Science, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(3) Beginning one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall, as part of the annual budget submission to Congress, submit an updated version of the report required by paragraph (2).

SEC. 4. MASTER TEACHER GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) The term ''sponsoring school'' means an elementary or secondary school that employs a teacher who is participating in a program funded in accordance with this section.

(2) The term ''nonclassroom time'' means time during regular school hours that is not utilized by a master teacher for instructing elementary or secondary school children in the classroom.

(3) The term ''master teacher'' means a mathematics or science teacher who works to improve the instruction of mathematics or science in kindergarten through 9th grade through—

(A) participating in the development or revision of science, mathematics, engineering, or technology curricula;

(B) serving as a mentor to mathematics or science teachers at the sponsoring school or other schools;

(C) coordinating and assisting teachers in the use of hands-on inquiry materials, equipment, and supplies, and when appropriate, supervising acquisition and repair of such materials;

(D) providing in-classroom teaching assistance to mathematics or science teachers; and

(E) providing professional development, including for the purposes of training other master teachers, to mathematics and science teachers.

(4) The term ''mathematics or science teacher'' means a teacher of mathematics, science, engineering, or technology in an elementary or secondary school.

(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—(1) The Director of the National Science Foundation shall establish a program to award competitive, merit-reviewed grants to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) to train master teachers and assist elementary and secondary schools to design and implement master teacher programs.

(2) Institutions of higher education receiving grants under this section shall offer programs to train master teachers. As part of such programs, a grantee shall—

(A) recruit and select teachers to receive training;

(B) ensure that training covers both content and pedagogy;

(C) ensure that participating teachers have mentors; and

(D) assist participating teachers with the development and implementation of master teacher programs at their sponsoring schools.

(3) Grants awarded under this section may be used to—

(A) develop and implement professional development programs to train elementary or secondary school teachers to become master teachers and to train existing master teachers;

(B) provide stipends and reimbursement for travel to allow teachers to participate in professional development programs in the summer and throughout the year;

(C) provide guidance to sponsoring schools to enable them to develop and implement a plan for the use of master teachers;

(D) support participating teachers during the summer in research programs conducted at institutions of higher education, private entities, or government facilities;

(E) provide educational materials and equipment to master teachers;

(F) provide computer equipment and network connectivity necessary to enable master teachers to collaborate with other master teachers, to access educational materials available online, and to communicate with scientists or other mentors at remote locations; and

(G) fund any other activities the Director determines will accomplish the goals of this section.

(c) SELECTION PROCESS.—(1) An institution of higher education seeking funding under this section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

(A) a description of which classroom subjects and grade levels the training will address;

(B) a description of the activities to be carried out, including—

(i) how such activities will be aligned with State and local standards and with other activities that promote student achievement in mathematics and science; and

(ii) how such activities will be based on a review of relevant research and why such activities are expected to strengthen the quality of mathematics and science instruction;

(C) a description of how the applicant will ensure the active participation of its mathematics, science, or engineering departments in the development and implementation of the program;

(D) an explanation of how the program will ensure that teachers are given instruction in both content and pedagogy;

(E) a description of how the applicant will recruit teachers to participate in the program and the criteria that will be used to select the participants;

(F) a description of the type and amount of any financial assistance that will be provided to teachers to enable them to participate; and

(G) a description of how the applicant will work with schools to ensure the success of the participating teachers.

(2) In evaluating the applications submitted under this subsection, the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(A) the ability of the applicant to effectively carry out the proposed program;

(B) the experience the applicant has in developing and implementing high-quality professional development programs for mathematics or science teachers; and

(C) the extent to which the applicant is committed to making the program a central organizational focus.

(3) In evaluating the applications submitted under this subsection, the Director shall give priority to those applications that demonstrate the greatest participation of

mathematics, science, or engineering departments.

(d) TEACHER ELIGIBILITY.—(1) To be eligible to participate in a program funded under this section, a mathematics or science teacher shall submit to the Director, at such time and in such manner as the Director may require, an assurance executed by the sponsoring school, that, after completing the program funded by this section, the participating teacher will be provided sufficient non-classroom time to serve as a master teacher. A copy of this assurance must be submitted to the institution of higher education as part of the teacher's application to participate in the master teacher program.

(2) No funds authorized by this section may be used to train any teacher who has not complied with paragraph (1).

(e) ACCOUNTABILITY AND DISSEMINATION.—(1) The Director shall evaluate the activities carried out under this section. At a minimum such evaluations shall use a common set of benchmarks and assessment tools to identify best practices and materials developed and demonstrated with funds provided under this section.

(2) The results of the evaluations required under this subsection shall be made available to the public, including through the National Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Education Digital Library, and shall be provided to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

(3) Materials developed under the program established under this section that are demonstrated to be effective shall be made available through the National Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Education Digital Library.–

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this section $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

SEC. 5. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON REQUIRED COURSE OF STUDY FOR CAREERS IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall, jointly with the Secretary of Education, compile and disseminate information (including through outreach, school counselor education, and visiting speakers) regarding—

(1) typical standard prerequisites for middle school and high school students who seek to enter a course of study at an institution of higher education in science, mathematics, engineering, or technology education for purposes of teaching in an elementary or secondary school; and

(2) the licensing requirements in each State for science, mathematics, engineering, or technology elementary or secondary school teachers.

(b) LOCAL CONTROL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to direct, review, or control the instructional content, curriculum, or related activities of a State or local educational agency or a school.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

SEC. 6. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT STUDY EVALUATION.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall enter into an agreement with the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering under which the Academies shall review existing studies on the effectiveness of technology in the classroom on learning and student performance, using various measures of learning and teaching outcome including standardized tests of student achievement, and explore the feasibility of one or more methodological frameworks to be used in evaluations of technologies that have different purposes and are used by schools and school systems with diverse educational goals. The study evaluation shall include, to the extent available, information on the type of technology used in each classroom, the reason that such technology works, and the teacher training that is conducted in conjunction with the technology.

(b) DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION.—The study evaluation required by subsection (a) shall be completed not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEFINITION OF TECHNOLOGY.—In this section, the term ''technology'' has the meaning given that term in section 3113(11) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6813(11)).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the purpose of conducting the study evaluation required by subsection (a), $600,000.

SEC. 7. SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS EDUCATION CONFERENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall convene the first of an annual 3- to 5-day conference for kindergarten through 12th grade science, mathematics, engineering, and technology education stakeholders, including—

(1) representatives from Federal, State, and local governments, private industries, private businesses, and professional organizations;

(2) educators;

(3) science, mathematics, engineering, and technology educational resource providers;

(4) students; and

(5) any other stakeholders the Director determines would provide useful participation in the conference.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the conference convened under subsection (a) shall be to—

(1) identify and gather information on existing science, mathematics, engineering, and technology education programs and resource providers, including information on distribution, partners, cost assessment, and derivation;

(2) determine the extent of any existing coordination between providers of curricular activities, initiatives, and units; and

(3) identify the common goals and differences among the participants at the conference.

(c) REPORT AND PUBLICATION.—At the conclusion of the conference the Director shall—

(1) transmit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the outcome and conclusions of the conference, including an inventory of curricular activities, initiatives, and units, the content of the conference, and strategies developed that will support partnerships and leverage resources; and

(2) ensure that a similar report is published and distributed as widely as possible to stakeholders in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology education.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this section—

(1) $300,000 for fiscal year 2002; and

(2) $200,000 for each of fiscal years 2003 and 2004.

SEC. 8. DISTANCE LEARNING GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall establish a program to award competitive, merit-based grants to institutions of higher education to provide distance learning opportunities in mathematics or science to elementary or secondary school students.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this section shall be used by institutions of higher education to establish programs under which elementary or secondary school students can participate in research activities in mathematics or science occurring at the grantees' institution via the Internet.

(c) SELECTION PROCESS.—(1) An institution of higher education seeking funding under this section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

(A) a description of the research opportunities that will be offered;

(B) a description of how the applicant will publicize these research opportunities to schools and teachers;

(C) a description of how the applicant will involve teachers of participating students in the program;

(D) a description of how students will be selected to participate;

(E) a description of how the institution of higher education will ensure that the research is enhancing the participants' education and will make it more likely that the participants will continue their studies in mathematics or science; and

(F) a description of how the funds will be spent.

(2) In evaluating the applications submitted under this subsection, the Director shall consider—

(A) the ability of the applicant to effectively carry out the proposed program;

(B) the extent to which the proposed program will enhance the participants' education and encourage them to continue the study of mathematics or science; and

(C) the extent to which the proposed program will provide opportunities that would not otherwise be available to students.

(3) The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that the program established under this section serves students in a wide range of geographic areas and in rural, suburban, and urban schools.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

SEC. 9. COORDINATION.

In carrying out the activities authorized by this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall consult and coordinate with the Secretary of Education to ensure close cooperation with programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–10).

SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term ''elementary school'' has the meaning given that term by section 14101(14) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801(14)).

(2) The term ''secondary school'' has the meaning given that term by section 14101(26) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801(26)).

(3) The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given that term by section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on H.R. 100, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, and all of the members of the Committee on Science for their bipartisan support of H.R. 100, the National Science Education Act. I am pleased that the bill passed unanimously in committee; I am also pleased that the bill is under consideration today.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) in his earlier comments mentioned the importance of good math and science education for national security and prosperity. Let me underscore those comments of the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research. First, as to the importance to the economy: during the past decade we had some stunning economic growth and, although many people have taken credit for it, Alan Greenspan correctly pointed out that the real credit goes to those scientists and engineers who developed all of the different ideas and inventions which came to fruition in the past decade. The majority of the growth of our economy in the past 10 years came from developments in science and technology, not from political action.

We must recognize the continued importance of science and technology to our economy and the future. We must also recognize, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) pointed out, the importance to national security. In the war in the Balkans in which our Air Force and our other fighting arms dealt with the Serbian actions in Kosovo, we managed to win the battle without losing a single American soldier, sailor or airman because of developments in science and technology.

□ 1530

Laser-guided bomb technology did not just drop into our laps. It was developed through a lot of hard work by scientists and engineers; and if we want to maintain our strength as a Nation in national security, we must continue with good science and math education so that we will have scientists and engineers for the future strength and security of America.

There are three main reasons why it is very important for us to have good science and math education, particularly in K through 12. It serves three main purposes.

First we need it to prepare future scientists and engineers for further study in college and graduate school. We do well in that right now, better than any other nation; but there is still room for improvement. We are simply not producing enough good scientists and engineers.

Furthermore, good K through 12 math and science education provides all future workers the basic technical skills they will need for the 21st century workforce, where nearly every job will have a technical component. Gone are the days when one can ignore math and science in high school and still get a good job. In the future, the good jobs will require people to know the basic ideas of math and science.

The third main purpose of K–12 science education is to provide scientific and technical understanding so that citizens may make informed decisions as both consumers and voters.

Mr. Speaker, there is a problem in our Nation. The Third International Mathematics and Science Study pointed out that, compared to other developed nations, we are dead last in high school physics, we are close to the bottom in high school mathematics, and we are second from the bottom out of all developed nations in math and science education overall in our high schools.

In addition to that, the National Science Policy Study, which I developed several years ago now and which led to the emphasis on this subject, pointed out the vital need to strengthen our Nation's science and mathematics education.

The Committee on Science held numerous hearings which served to further examine these problems and develop solutions. We have held many hearings during the past 3 years. These hearings have reinforced the earlier findings and have helped us to develop solutions that will bring needed improvements to our K through 12 math and science classes.

A key to all of this, as we soon found out, and as one could intuitively deduce, is that we must have a knowledgeable and well-prepared teacher in every classroom. While there are many factors that impact student achievement, there is no substitute for a knowledgeable and well-prepared teacher.

Research has shown that an inquiry-based, hands-on science curriculum, which is also concept based, is a vital component of high-quality science education. However, elementary and middle school teachers often lack the time, expertise, and school resources to implement such curricula.

This bill authorizes a grant program for institutions of higher education to train master teachers to have strong backgrounds in math and science so they can provide professional development, in-classroom assistance, and oversight of hands-on science materials to K–9 science, math, and engineering technology teachers. This is the type of support our teachers deserve and should be receiving.

During my 30 years of working in higher education and also working in elementary and secondary classrooms on math-science education, I found that the single greatest determinant of success for a math or science program in a school was having a well-trained go-to person in that school, where the teachers could go for help if equipment broke or if they did not understand a concept. They could go there and immediately get help.

That is what this program will create, master teachers who will thus serve, and it provides for the training of those master teachers.

This bill also creates a program for higher education institutions to provide distance learning opportunities for elementary and secondary students. Distance learning invites exciting possibilities for student learning, particularly for student scientific research. Our Nation's teachers and students will be one step closer to receiving this training experience when this bill passes.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT); the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; the leadership of the House, and of course the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL). They have all worked together to produce a good bill, and I am pleased to bring this bill to the floor of the House today.

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

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation is the result of several years of hard work and perseverance on the part of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). It enjoys strong support from both the business and the educational communities; and the Committee on Science approved this bill, as was mentioned, unanimously.

I want to thank our good friends on the Committee on Education and the WorkForce, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), for their advice and cooperation. We have worked together in an unparalleled spirit of close cooperation throughout this process, and they have made significant contributions to the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, study after study has confirmed that certified, well-trained teachers who majored or minored in their subject matter are one of the central factors affecting student achievement. As a matter of fact, I maintain

that the most important ingredient in a child's education, other than the family, is the teacher, not so much a new school or bricks and mortar or fancy textbooks or all that. They are all important, but the most important ingredient outside the home is the teacher, and this bill recognizes that.

I think it is the result of a lot of hard work on the part of a lot of well-intentioned people who have put their heads together, put their talents together, and have come up with something worthy of our support.

Mr. Speaker, let me salute once again the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for his unparalleled leadership in this effort.

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

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

(Mr. HALL of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 100, the National Science Education Act. It is a bill reported by the Committee on Science; and as we have spoken of the previous bill, it is a bipartisan bill. It is complementary to H.R. 1858, the Committee on Science's comprehensive science education legislation.

The principal provision of the bill addresses the important issue of training and supporting the activities of highly qualified science and math teachers, so-called ''master teachers.'' The words ''master teachers'' will be heard several times during this hearing; several times, I am sure, as it goes to conference; and several times when it is presented to the President for his signature.

The master teacher provision is consistent with the approach taken by the master teacher language in H.R. 1693, an education bill I introduced earlier this year.

Over the past 3 years, the Committee on Science has held a series of hearings on how to improve K through 12 science and math education. A strong message that has emerged from this series of hearings is that there is no silver bullet that will improve student learning in these subjects.

But what is also clear is the critical importance of having teachers who have achieved mastery of their subject matter and who have acquired the teaching skills to effectively implement a hands-on standards-based curriculum.

Master teachers are individuals who have acquired these skills and who are available in schools as mentors and research resources for other science and math teachers. By training a new generation of master teachers, a multiplying effect occurs that will lead to improved science and math education in entire schools, not just in a single classroom.

Like other provisions in H.R. 100, these provisions are consistent with education legislation that was approved in a bipartisan manner by the Committee on Science last year. I want to lay special emphasis on this, and this may be the day of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), I do not know; but I want to lay special emphasis on his contribution.

I want to congratulate these people, all the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), including Professor EHLERS, Dr. EHLERS and Chairman EHLERS, for his willingness to work on this bill and his willingness to work with the minority to perfect it.

He did not just work this year; he was selected by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) last year to carry out the thrust of the ingredients of H.R. 100. The gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) endorsed that recommendation, and we are here today I think to see the fruits of his labor.

I congratulate the gentleman. I congratulate the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), of course, and others who have had a lot to do with it. I ask my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I particularly thank him for this piece of legislation, H.R. 100, and for his commitment to science and math education. His leadership and dedication on that issue have been an inspiration to those of us on the Committee on Science and for all of his colleagues in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this bill coming before us in this timely fashion. I appreciate the ranking member of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and indeed, the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), for the leadership and the kind of climate that they have introduced and that they have expanded on that bipartisan committee.

Mr. Speaker, we know we have a problem with math and science education in this country. Our students perform poorly compared with our international counterparts, and the gap appears to be widening. Most recently, the Glenn Commission, named for former Senator John Glenn, highlighted some of the reasons for our difficulties in its report, ''Before It Is Too late.''

I served on that commission, and we noted that much of the problem lies with inadequate preparation of teachers, not with their dedication, and certainly not with their commitment.

To put it simply, when it comes to teaching math and science, we ask teachers the impossible: to teach a subject they were not trained to teach, and to do it without any assistance.

Over half of high school students take physical science from an out-of-field teacher. Over 20 percent of high school math and science teachers lack even a minor in their main teaching field. Too many students take math and science classes from instructors with no formal training in these difficult and important subjects. Small wonder they have difficulties with this material.

It would be nice to change this situation. It would be nice if science and math majors were in the classroom teaching science and math. In fact, it is imperative. We have a number of proposals to increase the recruitment of qualified instructors; but we need to do something, and we need to do it now. We cannot wait for the next generation of teachers to graduate; and even with our best efforts, we will not be able to graduate enough teachers with technical backgrounds to meet our short-term needs.

Our best alternative is to provide some assistance to the ones that we have. H.R. 100 provides that help. It provides grants for the training of master teachers in math and science who, along with their instructional duties, are commissioned to serve as a reference for embattled teachers. They are experts to whom the less experienced math and science instructors can turn for curriculum advice, for technical assistance, and for other needs. They are a vital link to the scientific community for teachers with little formal experience.

It would be best if every teacher had some formal training in the subject he or she taught. Ideally, a math and science teacher would have completed extensive coursework in the specific disciplines they teach. But unfortunately, all too often that is just not the case.

Out-of-subject teachers are doing a difficult, if not impossible, job. Their hard work and dedication are commendable, but good intentions are not enough. They need support. They need some help. It is about time they got it. Give our teachers someone to turn to. Pass H.R. 100. It will pay off 100 percent.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Research, who ushered these bills through subcommittee, through committee, the Committee on Rules, and to the floor.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 100. I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), and the ranking member for bringing this legislation forward. It works in concert with the bill we just passed and brings attention to the very important link, and that is to make sure that very well-qualified teachers are available. Students need this type of expertise in a classroom.

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

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

□ 1545

I certainly appreciate all the expressions of support for this bill. As my colleagues may know, this bill and the previous one are a product of a number of years of work.

But let me reemphasize a few points. For those who think that we are already doing a sufficiently good job on K–12 math and science, I encourage a visit to graduate schools in this Nation. In virtually every graduate school in science and engineering, we find that over half of the students are from other nations. Our students cannot compete against students from other nations in applying for admission to graduate school.

If more evidence is needed, just look at the actions of this Congress itself. This year we have approved 200,000 H–1B visas. Why? Because we do not have enough scientists, engineers, technicians, and mathematicians in this country to do the work that we need done to invent, develop, and produce the products that we are making in this country.

I could give other reasons why we have problems here. Let us face it, some of the problems are cultural. That is why the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) introduced her bill trying to encourage young girls to go into science, technology, and engineering because there is a culture in this country that women cannot do math or women cannot do science. It is utter nonsense. We are throwing away approximately 40 percent of our potential scientific, engineering, and mathematics workforce with that cultural attitude, that women are not good at science or math or that minorities do not care for science or math. That is nonsense, because in other countries they do; and they become scientists, engineers, doctors, and mathematicians. Women and minorities in this country can do the same.

We have to work hard to change that culture, and this bill will move us in that direction.

Science is fun if it is understood. Science is exciting when taught properly. And we have to make certain that the students of America enjoy that experience and realize that science is fun.

But the cultural issue is still an important one. As a physicist I have often had the experience when I met someone, before I came to the Congress, and they would ask what I do. I would say I am a physicist, and quite often I would get the response, ''Oh, I could never understand all those numbers and symbols; I just could not get math or science.'' For a number of years, I accepted that statement. But then I began to think that was strange. What if I had asked them the question first, what do you do, and they said, ''Well, I am an English teacher,'' and I said, ''Oh, I cannot understand all those letters and words, and so I gave up reading.'' That is socially unacceptable. But by the same standard, it should also be socially unacceptable to publicly profess ignorance of science and math.

Everyone is capable of learning some science and math. Everyone should learn it. I think it is extremely important in today's society that people not only understand the writings of Shakespeare and read them, but they should also understand the third law of dynamics; not as a physicist does, I do not expect that, but they should certainly understand what the three laws of thermodynamics mean and why we have an energy crisis today because we have, as a public, failed to understand the implications of the three laws of thermodynamics. Concepts such as this are important, and people should be aware of them and understand the implications of them.

These are all purposes of this bill and also of the bill of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT). I am hopeful that these bills will pass into law and that together they will go far to improve the competence of the scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and the lay people of this country so that we will no longer have a shortage of people to work in the technical, scientific industries, that we will train good teachers, and that we will have schools and students that we can be very proud of.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 100, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR RETENTION OF TRAVEL PROMOTIONAL ITEMS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2456) to provide that Federal employees may retain for personal use promotional items received as a result of travel taken in the course of employment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2456

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RETENTION OF TRAVEL PROMOTIONAL ITEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5702 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(2) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), by striking ''This section does'' and inserting ''Subsections (a) and (b) do''; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) Promotional items (including frequent flyer miles, upgrades, and access to carrier clubs or facilities) an employee receives as a result of using travel or transportation services procured by the United States or accepted pursuant to section 1353 of title 31 may be retained by the employee for personal use if such promotional items are obtained under the same terms as those offered to the general public and at no additional cost to the Government.''.

(b) REPEAL OF SUPERCEDED LAW.—Section 6008 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355; 5 U.S.C. 5702 note) is repealed.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to promotional items received before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2456, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, lately we have been hearing many reports about the human capital crisis affecting our civil service. Many of our best Federal employees are leaving for the private sector, with better pay and better benefits that are available to them. In addition, many talented individuals are choosing jobs in the private sector over public sector work for the same reasons.

While it is difficult for the Federal Government to match salaries with the private sector, it can at least demonstrate to current and prospective Federal employees that it values their service and is willing to reward them with certain benefits; and for this reason I hope the House will pass today H.R. 2456.

This important legislation that I am proud to cosponsor allows Federal civilian employees to keep frequent flyer miles and other promotional benefits that they receive while traveling on official government business. Unlike private sector employees, current law prohibits Federal employees from keeping

these benefits for personal use. In order for Federal employees to keep these frequent flyer benefits, the bill requires that they be obtained under the same terms as provided to the general public and must be at no additional cost to the government.

Many employees' work travel can interfere with their personal lives. This legislation is a great way to thank them for their service. In a recent GAO report that looked into the efficacy of allowing Federal employees to keep their frequent flyer miles, the GAO, that is the General Accounting Office, concluded that ''changing the frequent flyer policy, and changing it retroactively, so that employees can take advantage of the unused miles, would boost Federal employees' morale and strengthen the Federal Government's ability to compete with the private sector. We, therefore, believe Congress should consider allowing Federal employees to keep and make personal use of the frequent flyer miles.''

I could not agree more. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for her leadership on this issue. I think it is very important that we level the playing field between the way Federal Government employees are treated and employees in the private sector are treated with regard to frequent flyer miles and other such benefits.

As we all know, we are having a more difficult time than ever attracting quality individuals into the Federal workforce, and we know that there are many very hard working Federal employees who deserve to be treated in the public sector the same as they would be treated if they were in the private sector. So this bill today is, I think, a significant step toward improving the morale of our government employees and allowing them to know that the Federal Government, as an employer, will treat them in a similar manner to those employees in the private sector.

I know that the gentlewoman from Maryland has taken a very strong interest in this bill. She has many Federal employees within her district, and I know that she has studied this issue very carefully. It is very true, I think, that the use of these frequent flyer miles by our Federal agencies is sporadic at best. Many times they go unused. It seems to be certainly an appropriate benefit of employment to allow our Federal employees, many of whom get up early in the morning to make a flight to take care of Federal business, sometimes getting home late at night after a workday in some far off place. Those who make those sacrifices, who are away from their families, it seems to me it is entirely appropriate they receive some benefit for those extra hours that many of them spend on an airplane beyond the usual 8 hours and 40 hours that they work in a day or a week.

So I again commend the gentlewoman from Maryland for her leadership on this issue and certainly urge all the Members of the House to join in supporting H.R. 2456.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his steadfast and committed work in the Committee on Government Reform, and thank him for the statement he made in support of this bill, which I think will be very helpful.

Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned, very often when Federal employees are traveling, they are sacrificing the valuable time that they would spend with their family. By allowing them at least to use these frequent flyer miles when they are on government service, they could perhaps take their family, cumulatively with these miles, on a trip.

As I had mentioned earlier, the legislation has the support of the General Accounting Office, it has the support of the administration. I hope that we can put this legislation on President Bush's desk this year and show our Federal employees that we value their service.

I want to thank the Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), for bringing this legislation to the floor, and all of the cosponsors.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2456 would allow Federal employees to keep frequent flyer miles they earn from official travel. This bill was approved unanimously by the Government Reform Committee last week. It will help Federal agencies compete with the private sector for hard-to-retain employees.

In 1994, we passed a law that said that Federal employees can't keep frequent flyer miles. The idea was to save money. We wanted Federal agencies to use these miles for official business. Unfortunately, it didn't work. Frequent flyer miles are going to waste at agencies across the government.

The problem is that, according to the airlines, frequent flyer miles can only be awarded to individuals. The airlines won't set up separate business accounts and personal accounts. So in most cases, the frequent flyer miles are being wasted. They're not being used by Federal agencies, and in most cases, they're not being used by Federal workers. This situation isn't benefiting anyone.

In the private sector, businesses let their employees keep frequent flyer miles. It's good employee relations. Business travel can be draining. Employees often have to travel on their own time. Letting employees keep their frequent flyer miles compensates them for lost time they could be spending with their families. It also helps companies hold on to their good employees. That's the approach the Federal government ought to take.

In a review done for the Committee, the General Accounting Office expressed their strong support for this legislation. According to the GAO, passage of this bill would boost employee morale and help the government attract and retain top-quality employees. The Bush Administration has also fully endorsed this legislation.

I would like to thank Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA, an original cosponsor of the bill, for her hard work on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 27, 2001.

Hon. DAN BURTON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 2456, a bill to provide that federal employees may retain for personal use promotional items received as a result of travel taken in the course of employment.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Grabowicz, who can be reached at 226–2860.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For DAN L. CRIPPEN, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

H.R. 2456—A bill to provide that federal employees may retain for personal use promotional items received as a result of travel taken in the course of employment; As ordered reported by the House Committee on Government Reform on July 25, 2001.

H.R. 2456 would allow most civilian federal employees to use frequent flyer miles and other travel benefits that they earn through official travel for their own personal travel. Current law permits most federal employees to utilize such frequent travel programs only for official business. Because airlines award such benefits to the individual traveler rather than to the government however, the benefits of frequent travel programs are rarely applied to official trips and have little effect on federal travel costs, according to a recent report by the General Accounting Office. Thus, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 2456 would have no significant impact on the federal budget.

H.R. 2456 would not affect direct spending or receipts, so pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz, who can be reached at 226–2860. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests for time, I urge adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2456.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTION RECOVERY MONTH

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 190) supporting the goals and ideals of National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 190

Whereas 26,000,000 people in the United States are addicted to drugs or alcohol;

Whereas 85 percent of all crime in the United States is related to drug or alcohol addiction;

Whereas the taxpayers of the United States paid more than $150,000,000,000 in drug-related criminal and medical costs in 1997, which is more than they spent in that year on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space exploration, and foreign aid combined;

Whereas each dollar invested in drug and alcohol treatment yields 7 dollars in savings from decreased health care costs, criminal justice costs, and work-related costs caused by absenteeism, injuries, and poor performance;

Whereas treatment for addiction is as effective as treatments for other chronic medical conditions, such as diabetes and high blood pressure;

Whereas adolescents who receive treatment for addiction report using less marijuana and alcohol and being involved in less criminal activity;

Whereas addiction treatment for adolescents also improves the school performance and psychological health of the adolescents;

Whereas a number of organizations and individuals dedicated to fighting addiction and promoting treatment and recovery will recognize September 2001 as National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month;

Whereas the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration sponsors the celebration of National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month to encourage citizen action to help expand and improve the availability of effective addiction treatment;

Whereas National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month celebrates the tremendous achievements of individuals who have undergone successful addiction treatment and recognizes those in the field of addiction treatment who have dedicated their lives to helping people recover from addiction; and

Whereas the 2001 national campaign for National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month embraces the theme of ''We Recover Together: Family, Friends and Community'' and seeks to increase awareness about alcohol and drug addiction and promote treatment and recovery for the millions of Americans who need it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress supports the goals and ideas of National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.Con.Res. 190, the concurrent resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the House consider House Concurrent Resolution 190. It is important legislation introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD). The resolution expresses congressional support for the goals and ideals of National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month.

Mr. Speaker, over 26 million people in the United States are addicted to drugs or alcohol, and over 85 percent of all crimes are related to these two substances.

□ 1600

In fact, the preamble to the resolution notes that in 1997 American taxpayers spent more than $150 billion in drug-related criminal and medical costs. This is more than taxpayers spent that year on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space exploration and foreign aid combined.

National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month celebrates the tremendous achievements of individuals who have undergone successful addiction treatment. It also recognizes the tireless advocates who have dedicated their lives to helping people recover from addiction.

Treatment for addiction, which the resolution notes is as effective for treatment of other chronic medical conditions, such as diabetes and high blood pressure, deserve the support of all Americans.

Every dollar invested in drug and alcohol treatment yields $7 in savings as a result of decreased health care costs, criminal justice costs, work-related costs caused by absenteeism, injuries, and poor performance. Treatment for adolescents improves their school performance and psychological health.

A number of organizations and individuals involved in fighting addiction will recognize September as National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's Center for Substance Abuse has recognized the importance of this activity. It sponsors this celebration to encourage citizen action to help expand and improve the availability of effective treatment for addiction.

The theme of this year's national campaign for National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month is, and I quote, ''We recover together: Family, friends and community.''

Its objectives are to increase awareness and to promote treatment and recovery for the millions of Americans who need it. These are worthy goals, Mr. Speaker. I urge all Members to support the resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 190, which expresses the support of the goals and ideas of National Alcohol and Drug Recovery Month.

This resolution is one that is very close to the heart of its sponsor, Mr. RAMSTAD, who I have heard speak on this floor before regarding his personal experiences and his deep conviction that drug treatment is critical to our society.

September is, of course, National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month. It is an opportunity for us to share the powerful message that substance abuse treatment is effective and it reclaims lives. Providing effective treatment to those who need it is critical to breaking the cycle of drug addiction, violence, and despair and to helping addicted individuals to become productive members of our society.

September is the opportunity for all of us to recognize the tremendous strides taken by individuals who have undergone successful treatment and to salute those in the field who have dedicated their lives to helping people in need.

Substance abuse problems costs American businesses and industries millions of dollars every year. They have profound negative effects in the workplace. A study by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration found that nearly 73 percent of all illegal drug users in the United States are employed, 6.7 million full time workers, 1.6 million part time workers.

Lost productivity, high employee turnover, low employee morale, mistakes and accidents, and increased workers' compensation insurance and health insurance premiums are all the results of untreated substance abuse problems in the workplace.

Recovery Month also highlights the benefits to be gained from corporate and small business workplace substance abuse referral programs.

H. Con. Res. 190 makes us aware that recovery from substance abuse is possible and that supporting treatment for addicted individuals increases productivity, improves morale, business success, and the quality of life for the addicted individual and their families.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me and for bringing this resolution to the floor so expediently and for her strong support of this resolution. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his support of this resolution as well as his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago tomorrow, July 31, 1981, I woke up from my last

alcoholic blackout in a jail cell in Sioux Falls, South Dakota under arrest for disorderly conduct, resisting arrest and failure to vacate the premises. Today, on the eve of my twentieth anniversary as a grateful recovering alcoholic, I am alive and sober only because I had access to chemical dependency treatment.

My treatment experience at St. Mary's Hospital in Minneapolis, Minnesota started me on the road to recovery and gave me the tools to live a sober, healthy life these past 20 years.

But, Mr. Speaker, 26 million other Americans are not so fortunate. That is right. There are 26 million Americans, 26 million alcoholics and addicts in our country, and fewer than 5 percent of them are able to access treatment for their disease of addiction.

This disease, Mr. Speaker, is afflicting people of all ages. Among young people, teenagers, ages 12 to 17, an estimated 1.1 million young people are dependent on illicit drugs. Another 1 million teenagers are addicted to alcohol in this country. Last year alone, 3½ million drug addicts were denied access to treatment, according to the Office of National Drug Control Policy. That does not account for the staggering number of alcoholics who are unable to access treatment in the United States.

Alcoholism and other drug addictions are an epidemic in America that are not being adequately treated, an epidemic, Mr. Speaker, that killed 150,000 American people last year alone, and cost the American people $246 billion. That is according to the Family Research Council, which we all respect for the accuracy of their studies.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1956, the American Medical Association first declared that addiction is a disease. AMA declared alcoholism and drug addiction are a fatal disease if not treated. That means we alcoholics and addicts will ultimately die, either directly or indirectly, as a result of our dependency if our disease is not treated and recovery maintained.

The good news is that treatment works. According to all of the studies, treatment for alcoholism and other chemical addiction has the same recovery rate as for the disease of diabetes, the disease of hypertension, and the disease of adult asthma. In fact, treatment for addiction has a higher success rate than treatment for kidney disease and many forms of cancer.

All of us in Congress have heard former drug czar Barry McCaffrey tell us, ''Chemical dependency treatment is more effective than cancer treatment, and it is a lot cheaper.'' It is well-documented, as the two previous speakers have mentioned, every dollar we spend for treatment saves $7 in health care costs, criminal justice costs, lost productivity from job absenteeism, injuries and below par work performance.

All of the empirical data also shows that health care costs alone are 100 percent higher for untreated addicts and alcoholics than for people like me who have been fortunate enough to go through treatment for chemical dependency. Chemical dependency treatment works and it is cost effective. Treatment not only saved my life, but it has saved millions of lives in the United States over the last several decades, restoring people to sanity and enabling them to lead healthy, productive lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution commemorating National Alcohol and Drug Addicting Recovery Month. For years a number of organizations and people dedicated to addiction treatment and recovery have recognized September as National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month. I particularly want to recognize the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, which sponsors this celebration of National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month each year.

There are many other important organizations, like the Alliance Project, the Johnson Institute, Hazelden Foundation and Recovery Works in my home State of Minnesota which do so much to encourage citizen action to help expand and improve the availability of effective addiction treatment.

This September, special attention will focus on the relationships impacted by addiction and recovery. The theme, as was mentioned, will be ''We recover together: Family, friends and community.'' As any recovering person will tell you addiction is extremely destructive to family members. That is why they call it the family disease, and the support of our family and friends is invaluable as we travel the road to recovery.

Addiction is also destructive to communities. Eighty-two percent of the people locked up in American jails and prisons today are there because of drugs and/or alcohol. Increasing access to treatment for use, Mr. Speaker, is extremely critical. Despite the benefits of treatment, a significant gap exists between the number of adolescents who need chemical dependency treatment and those who actually receive such treatment.

According to a study done in Minnesota, a State that has led the Nation in treatment and prevention of addiction, only one-fourth, one out of four young people hooked on drugs and/or alcohol who need treatment actually receive it.

Celebrating Recovery Month also gives us an opportunity to recognize the tremendous strides taken by those who have undergone treatment, as well as the great accomplishments by professionals in the treatment field who dedicate their lives to helping others. By celebrating recovery, we celebrate the lives of millions of people and their families and friends in recovery today.

We also, Mr. Speaker, give hope to those still suffering from the ravages of chemical addiction. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution, H. Con. Res. 190.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Minnesota for sponsoring this resolution; and in particular, I know I am joined by every Member of this House in thanking him for standing on the floor and sharing with us his own personal experiences with this issue. I know it will be an inspiration to many who are struggling with this problem, and I join with my colleagues in thanking the gentleman to share his story and sponsor this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) for his moving and inspiring statement, especially about his personal experiences. I also commend the gentleman for his 20th anniversary of freedom from chemical dependency, and thank him for introducing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service; the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the full committee; and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for expediting consideration of this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month to encourage citizen action to help expand and improve the availability of effective treatment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 190. By Mr. RAMSTAD a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this worthy legislation.

Regrettably Mr. Speaker, our society is in dire need of additional emphasis on alcohol and drug abuse education, and especially with regard to treatment. Alcohol is the third leading cause of preventable death in the nation, killing nearly 100,000 Americans each year. It has been estimated that approximately 14 million Americans suffer from alcohol related problems, including more than 8 million who are full alcoholics.

Drug abuse is a widespread problem affecting more than 9 million individuals. Recent years have shown disturbing trends in the use of heroin, various club drugs, and methamphetamine, especially among our younger populations. Moreover, the drugs available on the streets today are cheaper, purer and easier to acquire than at any previous point in our nation's history.

All told, it is estimated that 85% of all crime committed in our nation is somehow related to either drug or alcohol addiction. Furthermore,

in 1997, U.S. taxpayers spent more than $150 billion in drug-related criminal and health care costs.

More troubling than the detrimental health effects for the individual alcoholic or addict, is the long term impact on the families, and especially the children, of alcoholics and drug abusers. Far too many children grow up in homes where one or both parents consume far too much alcohol, or use illicit drugs. These children are more likely to suffer abuse or neglect from their parents than their counterparts in homes were neither parent has a substance abuse problem. More troubling is the fact that these children have a higher risk of becoming alcoholics or addicts themselves when they reach adulthood.

We have made enormous progress in improving drug and alcohol awareness. Thanks to the tireless efforts of groups like the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Council of Orange County, and of Mothers Against Drunk Driving, alcohol-related traffic fatalities have decreased considerably from thirty years ago.

Yet, we still have far to go. Far too many people do not view alcohol as a drug, and an alarming number of Americans do not realize that various alcoholic beverages contain different amounts of alcohol. A survey conducted in 1996 found that only 39% of Americans understood that a 12 ounce can of beer, a 5 ounce glass of wine, and a mixed drink with 1.5 ounces of distilled spirits contain the same amount of alcohol. This figure needs to be improved if we are to have any measurable level of success in raising alcohol awareness.

Moreover we also have far to go on the drug front as well. Recent years have seen a proliferation of efforts to create back doors to legalization. This phenomenon is best illustrated by the medical marijuana argument. However, on the whole, anti-drug efforts are seeing signs of finally working after eight years of neglect under the prior administration. A return to a balanced approach that attacks both the supply and demand side of the problem simultaneously has made a difference.

Drug treatment is an important component of demand reduction that has proven itself to be workable, but it requires enormous commitment on the part of both doctor and patient. This is especially true for those addicted to opiate narcotics and alcohol.

In closing Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 190 is a good bill, with a laudable purpose. For that reason, I strongly support its passage, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 190.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1615

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE ACCESS ACT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2001

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1499) to amend the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 to permit individuals who graduated from a secondary school prior to 1998 and individuals who enroll in an institution of higher education more than 3 years after graduating from a secondary school to participate in the tuition assistance programs under such Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1499

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''District of Columbia College Access Act Technical Corrections Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. REVISIONS TO ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR TUITION ASSISTANCE UNDER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE ACCESS ACT.

(a) PERMITTING CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS TO PARTICIPATE IN TUITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) INDIVIDUALS GRADUATING FROM SECONDARY SCHOOL PRIOR TO 1998.—Section 3(c)(2)(B) of the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–98; 113 Stat. 1325) is amended by striking ''on or after January 1, 1998''.

(2) INDIVIDUALS ENROLLING MORE THAN 3 YEARS AFTER GRADUATING FROM SECONDARY SCHOOL.—Section 3(c)(2) of such Act (Public Law 106–98; 113 Stat. 1325) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(b) PROHIBITING PARTICIPATION OF FOREIGN NATIONALS.—Section 3(c)(2) of such Act (Public Law 106–98; 113 Stat. 1325), as amended by subsection (a)(2), is amended by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) meets the citizenship and immigration status requirements described in section 484(a)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(a)(5));''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) introduced H.R. 1499 on April 4, 2001. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and I were original cosponsors of the legislation. I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her diligent work and commitment to the students of the District of Columbia both during the 1999 passage of the District of Columbia College Access Act and in the introduction of the bill before us. H.R. 1499 makes amendments to the District of Columbia's tuition assistance grant program that was authorized by the passage of the District of Columbia College Access Act.

The legislation under consideration would permit District of Columbia residents who graduated from secondary school prior to 1998, and also those who enroll in an institution of higher education more than 3 years after graduating from a secondary school, to participate in the tuition assistance program. The original act limited participation to those students who graduated from secondary school after January 1, 1998. This amendment would allow current college juniors and seniors to be eligible to receive the benefits of the College Access Act. Because the original 1999 act was passed with enough funding for the current juniors and seniors to participate in the program, there is sufficient money for this group of students to benefit from the provision.

The legislation removes the 3-year deadline for college admission after graduation from high school to be eligible for the program. This restriction prevented individuals who needed to work before entering a college program, or who had other plans, from participating. The amendment follows the policy that the U.S. Department of Education places on its scholarship program.

Finally, H.R. 1499 closes the loophole that permitted foreign nationals who live in the District of Columbia to receive grants through this program. The legislation requires that individuals meet the citizenship and immigration status requirement of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1499 is an extremely important bill for the students of the District of Columbia and the citizens of our Nation's capital. As a matter of fairness, these students should have the same educational opportunities as students in our 50 States. Colleges and universities will commence their educational year in a month. I urge swift passage of this bill so that the other body can also act on H.R. 1499 expeditiously, enabling more District citizens to receive a high-quality, affordable college education.

In its 2-year existence, the District of Columbia tuition access program has helped 1,800 people pay for their higher education. We look forward to many more taking advantage of this wonderful opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the people who will participate in this program to obtain higher education will become wage earners, taxpayers, productive members of our

national community; and there may be some who will be interested in public service or in running for Congress.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, for her perseverance in correcting the College Access Act. I also want to recognize the former chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), for his support, guidance and commitment in bringing this bill to the floor.

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

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

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I thank our Chair, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), for her work on this bill and for striving successfully to get it to the floor so quickly. I appreciate the work she has done and the work of her staff.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1499, the College Access Technical Corrections Act of 2001, a bill that would close a gap by allowing all D.C. residents who qualify to receive the valuable benefits of the College Access Act passed by the Congress in 1999. I want to thank the Chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), and the past Chair of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), who are original cosponsors of this bill and particularly the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), who was the sponsor of the original College Access Act and worked diligently in both Houses for its passage.

H.R. 1499 was passed unanimously in both the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia and the full Committee on Government Reform prior to coming to the floor today. It has the enthusiastic support of Mayor Williams and the council of the District of Columbia as well as, of course, of D.C. residents. Indeed, I want to thank the Congress for its strong support of the District of Columbia College Access Act in 1999. Residents have enthusiastically moved to take advantage of this opportunity.

The act is now responsible for nearly 2,000 D.C. students who are attending public colleges and universities nationwide at in-state rates or receiving a $2,500 stipend to private colleges and universities in the District and the region. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this act to the District, which has only an open-admissions university and no State university system. A college degree is critical in the District of Columbia today, because this is a white collar and technology city and region with few factories or other opportunities for jobs that provide good wages.

The College Access Act has provided opportunities for D.C. residents to afford a public college education both here in the region and around the country. For the first time since the city was established 200 years ago this year, District residents have choices for a public college education routinely available to Americans in the 50 States.

H.R. 1499 would improve the College Access Act by removing two restrictions that have prevented some D.C. residents from qualifying for the in-state tuition and other benefits of the act. The first restriction is a requirement that only students who graduated from high school after January 1, 1998, qualify. The second restriction is language that provides that students who graduated from high school more than 3 years ago do not qualify. These two provisions were originally placed in the act because with no prior experience with this approach, Congress was not certain that the annual appropriation would be sufficient. Today, the District has demonstrated that the funds allocated are indeed sufficient to accommodate the current college seniors and some juniors as well as older students who are adversely affected by these restrictions. H.R. 1499 also closes a loophole that allows foreign nationals who live in the District to receive the benefits of the act, a result not intended by the sponsors of the original legislation.

We need to pass this bill now and get it to the Senate, because this year's college graduating class is among the residents who are affected. The D.C. tuition assistance grant office, which administers the college access program, is prepared to deliver funds to these seniors and also to the juniors who previously did not qualify. In addition, older students who did not qualify are eager to take advantage of the program in time for the next college year in September.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill that would go far toward affording to the residents of the Nation's capital opportunities that are equal to those provided throughout the United States.

Again, I would like to thank our Chair, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), and also the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), chairman of the full Committee on Government Reform, who enabled this legislation to go before the full committee without hesitation and quickly to arrive on the floor today and the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), who has been supportive throughout, for their work on the bill and for bringing this bill to the floor so quickly.

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

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

Again, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and particularly to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for the leadership that she has provided both in the previous bill and in this bill, which is, I think, an improvement, and corrections act to the D.C. College Access Act. I also reiterate my appreciation to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for getting us started on the D.C. access bill.

This seems to be an education afternoon, because we had the enactment of the National Mathematics and Science Partnerships Act, we had the enactment of the National Science Education Act, and now this District of Columbia College Access Act improvements. I think it says that for us in Congress we recognize the fact that more expensive than education is ignorance, and we have no room for ignorance in our country.

I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1499, the District of Columbia College Access Act Technical Corrections Act of 2001.

Two years ago, I introduced the D.C. College Access Act of 1999 along with my colleague, Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. The Act allows recent high school graduates in D.C. to pay in-state tuition at public colleges in Maryland and Virginia. It also provides tuition assistance grants for students attending private colleges in the District, Maryland, or Virginia. Since D.C. is not a state, the thousands of high school seniors who graduated from city schools each year had to pay out-of-state tuition rates when attending any public college or university other than the University of the District of Columbia. College-bound students in each of the 50 states have a vast network of state-supported institutions to attend. The D.C. College Access Act of 1999 has leveled the playing field for eligible D.C. residents. It gives D.C. graduates more choices, and provides an incentive for more families to remain in the nation's capital.

Due to funding constraints, eligibility under the Act was limited. It was always our intention that all District of Columbia residents holding a secondary school diploma or the equivalent would eventually have access to this program. That is why I support H.R. 1499. The bill expands the application of the D.C. College Access Act of 1999 by opening the eligibility requirements to those individuals who graduated from secondary school prior to 1998 and also to individuals who enroll in an institution of higher education more than three years after graduating from a secondary school.

This bill ensures that a greater number of D.C. residents are eligible to receive tuition assistance thereby broadening their educational opportunities at the undergraduate level. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1499.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1499.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) at 6 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order.

House Resolution 212, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 191, by the yeas and nays; and

House Concurrent Resolution 190, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT WORLD CONFERENCE AGAINST RACISM PRESENTS UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS GLOBAL DISCRIMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 212, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 212, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 3, answered ''present'' 3, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Conyers
McKinney
Paul

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Barr
Carson (IN)
Johnson, E.B.

NOT VOTING—19

Baca
Baker
Cubin
DeGette
Goode
Hansen
Hefley
Jefferson
Kleczka
Lipinski
Mollohan
Rivers
Schaffer
Snyder
Spence
Stark
Stenholm
Udall (CO)
Waters

□ 1825

Mr. SOUDER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Ms. KILPATRICK changed her vote from ''present'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

SENSE OF HOUSE THAT U.N. SHOULD TRANSFER UNCENSORED VIDEOTAPE TO ISRAELI GOVERNMENT REGARDING HEZBOLLAH ABDUCTION OF THREE ISRAELI DEFENSE SOLDIERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 191.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House

suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 191, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 4, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Conyers
Dingell
Paul
Rahall

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Barr

NOT VOTING—17

Baca
Cubin
DeGette
Goode
Greenwood
Hansen
Hefley
Jefferson
Lipinski
Rohrabacher
Schaffer
Snyder
Spence
Stark
Stenholm
Udall (CO)
Waters

□ 1834

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTION RECOVERY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 190.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 190, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald

Miller (FL)	Rehberg	Stenholm
Miller, Gary	Reyes	Strickland
Miller, George	Reynolds	Stump
Mink	Riley	Stupak
Mollohan	Rivers	Sununu
Moore	Rodriguez	Sweeney
Moran (KS)	Roemer	Tancredo
Moran (VA)	Rogers (KY)	Tanner
Morella	Rogers (MI)	Tauscher
Murtha	Rohrabacher	Tauzin
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (MS)
Nadler	Ross	Taylor (NC)
Napolitano	Rothman	Terry
Neal	Roukema	Thomas
Nethercutt	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Ney	Royce	Thompson (MS)
Northup	Rush	Thornberry
Norwood	Ryan (WI)	Thune
Nussle	Ryun (KS)	Thurman
Oberstar	Sabo	Tiahrt
Obey	Sanchez	Tiberi
Olver	Sanders	Tierney
Ortiz	Sandlin	Toomey
Osborne	Sawyer	Towns
Ose	Saxton	Traficant
Otter	Scarborough	Turner
Owens	Schakowsky	Udall (NM)
Oxley	Schiff	Upton
Pallone	Schrock	Velazquez
Pascrell	Scott	Visclosky
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Vitter
Paul	Serrano	Walden
Payne	Sessions	Walsh
Pelosi	Shadegg	Wamp
Pence	Shaw	Waters
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Watkins (OK)
Peterson (PA)	Sherman	Watson (CA)
Petri	Sherwood	Watt (NC)
Phelps	Shimkus	Watts (OK)
Pickering	Shows	Waxman
Pitts	Shuster	Weiner
Platts	Simmons	Weldon (FL)
Pombo	Simpson	Weldon (PA)
Pomeroy	Skeen	Weller
Portman	Skelton	Wexler
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Whitfield
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Wicker
Putnam	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Quinn	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Radanovich	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Rahall	Solis	Wu
Ramstad	Souder	Wynn
Rangel	Spratt	Young (AK)
Regula	Stearns	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Baca	Goode	Schaffer
Berkley	Hansen	Snyder
Cox	Hefley	Spence
DeGette	Jefferson	Stark
Fattah	Lipinski	Udall (CO)

□ 1844

So, (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced a above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1845

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2647, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–171) on the resolution (H. Res. 213) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2505, HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–172) on the resolution (H. Res. 214) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2505) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to House Resolution 210 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2620.

□ 1846

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2620) 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, 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHIMKUS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Friday, July 27, 2001, amendment No. 46 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment from page 33 line 5 through page 37 line 9.

Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency shelter grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; the supportive housing program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; the section 8 moderate rehabilitation single room occupancy program as authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; and the shelter plus care program as authorized under subtitle F of title IV of such Act, $1,027,745,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That not less than 35 percent of these funds shall be used for permanent housing, and all funding for services must be matched by 25 percent in funding by each grantee: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further*, That no less than $14,200,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading is transferred to the Working Capital Fund to be used for technical assistance for management information systems and to develop an automated, client-level Annual Performance Report System: *Provided further*, That $500,000 shall be made available to the Interagency Council on the Homeless for administrative needs.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOUSING FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For assistance for the purchase, construction, acquisition, or development of additional public and subsidized housing units for low income families not otherwise provided for, $1,024,151,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That $783,286,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under such section 202(c)(2), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a one-year term, and for supportive services associated with the housing, of which amount $49,890,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects, and of which amount $49,890,000 shall be for grants under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q–2) for conversion of eligible projects under such section to assisted living or related use: *Provided further*, That of the amount under this heading, $240,865,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under such section 811(d)(2), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a one-year term, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811 of such Act, and for tenant-based rental assistance contracts entered into pursuant to section 811 of such Act: *Provided further*, That no less than $1,000,000, to be divided evenly between the appropriations for the section 202 and section 811 programs, shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided further*, That, in addition to amounts made available for renewal of tenant-based rental assistance contracts pursuant to the second proviso of this paragraph, the Secretary may designate up to 25 percent of the amounts earmarked under this paragraph for section 811 of such Act for tenant-based assistance, as authorized under that section, including such authority as may be waived under the next proviso, which assistance is five years in duration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive any provision of such section 202 and such section 811 (including the provisions governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance and tenant-based assistance) that the Secretary determines is

not necessary to achieve the objectives of these programs, or that otherwise impedes the ability to develop, operate, or administer projects assisted under these programs, and may make provision for alternative conditions or terms where appropriate.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

From the Rental Housing Assistance Fund, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 2001, and any collections made during fiscal year 2002, shall be transferred to the Flexible Subsidy Fund, as authorized by section 236(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), $13,566,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2002 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2002 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $0 and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2002 appropriation.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 2002, commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of $160,000,000,000.

During fiscal year 2002, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed $250,000,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan program, $330,888,000, of which not to exceed $326,866,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''; and not to exceed $4,022,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Office of Inspector General''. In addition, for administrative contract expenses, $145,000,000, of which not less than $96,500,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–3 and 1735c), including the cost of loan guarantee modifications as that term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, of up to $21,000,000,000: *Provided further*, That any amounts made available in any prior appropriations Act for the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) of guaranteed loans that are obligations of the funds established under section 238 or 519 of the National Housing Act that have not been obligated or that are deobligated shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the making of such guarantees and shall remain available until expended, notwithstanding the expiration of any period of availability otherwise applicable to such amounts.

Gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed $50,000,000, of which not to exceed $30,000,000 shall be for bridge financing in connection with the sale of multifamily real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act; and of which not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single-family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, $211,455,000, of which $193,134,000, shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''; and of which $18,321,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Office of Inspector General''. In addition, for administrative contract expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, $139,000,000, of which no less than $33,500,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION (GNMA)

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed $200,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed mortgage-backed securities program, $9,383,000 to be derived from the GNMA guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account, of which not to exceed $9,383,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z–1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, $46,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That $1,500,000 shall be for necessary expenses of the Millennial Housing Commission, as authorized by section 206 of Public Law 106–74: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $7,500,000 shall be for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) Initiative.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, $45,899,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which $19,449,000 shall be to carry out activities pursuant to such section 561: *Provided*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by sections 1011 and 1053 of the Residential Lead-Based Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, $109,758,000 to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which $10,000,000 shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related environmental childhood diseases and hazards.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $7,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $1,086,800,000, of which $520,000,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, $9,383,000 shall be provided from funds of the Government National Mortgage Association, $1,000,000 shall be provided from the ''Community development fund'' account, $150,000 shall be provided by transfer from the ''Title VI Indian federal guarantees program'' account, and $200,000 shall be provided by transfer from the ''Indian housing loan guarantee fund program'' account: *Provided*, That no less than $85,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of Information Technology Systems: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall fill 7 out of 10 vacancies at the GS–14 and GS–15 levels until the total number of GS–14 and GS–15 positions in the Department has been reduced from the number of GS–14 and GS–15 positions on the date of enactment of Public Law 106–377 by two and one-half percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit a staffing plan for the Department by November 1, 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 42 offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

Page 47, line 10, after the first dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 5, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 10 minutes in support of his amendment.

Does the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) claim the time in opposition?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I am not in opposition. I do not know that there is going to be opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), and then the gentleman from Maryland will have the right to claim the time.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN). I offer this amendment in full support and adulation for the chairman and ranking members of the subcommittee, recognizing their ongoing cooperation in this effort. And I offer this in complete support of the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), without whose efforts last year would not allow us to be here today.

Mr. Chairman, the number is 102, and the number in 1999 was 112. That was the number of U.S. citizens, most of them volunteers, who were killed in the line of duty in protecting our towns. If we lost that many soldiers, it would be a national scandal. If we lost that many teachers, it would be a national disgrace. Yet every year, on average, America loses over 100 men and women who are simply protecting their towns.

Last year, for the first time, with the leadership of the good chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), we appropriated $100 million on the competitive grant program to help our Nation's 32,000 fire and EMS departments leverage their money to help them better train and better equip themselves.

The response was overwhelming. Thirty thousand applications came in within 1 month. Twenty thousand individual fire and EMS departments in every district in America applied. And now it is time for us to increase that funding.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, without whose efforts this would not have happened.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for his determined dedication to this issue of providing support for those men and women who serve on the front line in guaranteeing the safety and security of our communities, along with police officers. Without our firefighters, I am not sure where we would be going as a Nation or as a community.

I would say the gentleman was very kind in his remarks directed to this chairman, but I must tell my colleagues that he, in fact, is the most dedicated, most persistent, most determined Member of this House to see that this type of assistance is made available for those brave men and women who do support the security of our Nation in fighting the fires, protecting our properties, and protecting our lives.

Again, I would say thanks to him for the determination and the strong effort that he has made in this respect.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in no way in opposition to this account being funded at the amount designated in the amendment, $150 million, however, there is a better place to do that; and we will certainly, at that time, look as favorably as we can upon the request.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) will control the balance of the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of the Weldon amendment.

The Weldon amendment is carrying out what I think is a very worthwhile and important objective. It would increase the $100 million provided in the bill for the fire grant program by $50 million.

Before I speak on the substance, I want to thank the chairman and ranking members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations, I understand the constraints they are under. I also understand their support of this program.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), as well as so many others who have been supportive, and I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), for rising to speak on behalf of this amendment. All of them have been tireless in their support of this program.

The response, Mr. Chairman, from the fire services to the Fire Act, which authorized $300 million and to which we appropriated $100 million last year, has been nothing short of astonishing and has exceeded everyone's expectations. In this first year of the program, the U.S. fire administration received over 30,000 requests from local departments, totaling more than $3 billion.

To put this in perspective, there are 32,000 departments in this country. Our first responders respond to fire, flood, hurricane, and other crises. In the first year, the departments were limited to applying for only 6 of the authorized 14 categories. That gives us, I think, Mr. Chairman, a sense of the need that is out there that fire departments throughout this country have.

The $100 million in this bill is insufficient. The chairman and the ranking member know that. Hopefully, in conference, we will be able to get that figure up to the figure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania seeks and, indeed, if there are additional funds, they would be warranted as well.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), a cosponsor of this amendment and one who has been a real leader in this effort.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), which I was pleased to cosponsor. I also thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG); the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for their support.

The Weldon amendment allocates an additional $50 million in funding for the Firefighters Assistance Grant Program, which is one of our Nation's most vitally important programs. In fiscal year 2001, approximately two out of three fire departments in our Nation applied for funds, totaling nearly $3 billion in requests. Regrettably, the majority of those requests could not be granted because funding for the program was not sufficient to meet the overwhelming demands of our Nation's fire departments.

As the popularity of this program increases, it falls upon all of us in the Congress to meet the demand with adequate funding. We must make sure our Nation's firefighters have the resources to perform their dedicated work in our communities, saving lives and property.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to show their support for our Nation's firefighters by voting in support of the Weldon firefighter amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been such a hard fighter on behalf of this program for the firefighters and first responders of our Nation.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the Weldon amendment to increase funding

for the Firefighters Assistance Grant Program.

There are a million firefighters in America, one million, and 32,000 fire departments. The number of applications for the first year is just overwhelming. This is a replica of the COPS program, which proved to be so successful. And I want to congratulate folks from both sides of the aisle. The amount of applications is an indication, Mr. Chairman, of how serious the need is in our Nation's fire departments.

I totally support this amendment. We are all going to be hearing from the fire departments in our own districts, because there is only so much money to go around for so many applications.

□ 1900

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who is a senior member of the Committee on Science and who has been an advocate for the fire service.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee that oversees the Federal Fire Administration, I would like to suggest that it is about time we really started helping communities across America by helping firemen.

Today in the United States there are over 1 million fire fighters and 77 percent are volunteers. If we had to pay all of these volunteers, we would be spending billions of dollars more in property tax coming out of taxpayers' pockets.

Last year I worked with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and others to get $100 million into this program. This amendment is going to increase that by $50 million to $150 million.

I think it is important to mention that in 1999 there were 45,000 fire fighters injured and 112 fire fighters killed in duty-related incidents. These men and women are American heroes. They are truly our first responders. They are the ones that are at the scene when there is natural disasters. They are the ones at the scene when there is shootings in school, chemical spills, terrorism, looking for lost kids, or getting the kitten out of a tree.

We give billions of dollars to law enforcement in this country. It is time we gave a few dollars to help local communities and help the first responders of this Nation.

This amendment would increase the funding allocation to help local fire departments hire new firefighters, purchase new safety equipment, and provide improved training.

These men and women are American heroes. They are truly first responders. They are part of national security.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be an easy choice to make. Either we fund more bureaucracy or fund more help for firefighters. The increased funding for the fire grants program could be used for new equipment to fight fires, new training so that our firefighters are brought up to speed on the latest firefighting techniques, advanced safety equipment that can help prevent firefighter injury or death. This type of support is especially critical for volunteer fire departments that often must supplement their sources of funding with bake sales and the like.

Despite the risks, the million men and women of the fire services continue to guard against fires, accidents, disasters, and terrorism. We in this body must continue to get them the support they need.

It may come as a surprise to many of the people viewing tonight, but the United States has one of the highest fire death rates in the industrialized world at 13.1 deaths per million population. In 1999, 3,570 Americans lost their lives and another 21,875 were injured as the result of fire—more Americans than were killed in all natural disasters combined. The National Safety Council ranks fires as the fifth leading cause of accidental deaths, behind only vehicle accidents, falls, poisonings, and drownings.

The total cost of fire to society is staggering—estimated over $100 billion per year. This includes the cost of adding fire protection to buildings, the cost of paid fire departments, the equivalent cost of volunteer fire departments ($20 billion annually), the cost of insurance overhead, the direct cost of fire-related losses, the medical cost of fire injuries, and other direct and indirect costs. Direct property losses due to fire was estimated at $10 billion in 1999.

The top three causes of fires in the U.S. are smoking (22 percent), incendiary and suspicious (or arson) (21 percent), and heating (11 percent). The leading cause of injuries is cooking (22 percent), followed by arson (13 percent), and children playing (11 percent).

On the front lines, protecting the public from fire, are the Nation's over one million firefighters, three-quarters of whom serve as volunteers. Every day, these men and women place their lives on the line to protect their neighbors. Every 17.3 seconds, a firefighter in this country responds to a fire.

In my State of Michigan volunteer firefighters are very important. Between 1995–2000, eleven Michigan firefighters—both volunteer and professional—lost their lives fighting fires.

Last year alone, four Michigan firefighters lost their lives—Ronald Haner of Portage, David Maisano of Mio, David Sutton of Fraser, and Gail VanAuken of Holland. Firefighter Sutton was killed by an arsonist who ignited combustibles on the first and second floors of a Fraser apartment building. Mr. Sutton had sought to save a resident of that apartment building, who was trapped on the second floor, and was also killed by that fire. This fire was one of six arson fires that occurred in the same general area over a two day period of last year.

For their bravery and sacrifice, we owe first responders and their families a debt of gratitude. Our Nation's founders were deeply committed to the idea that the individual had an obligation to serve the community and the country. Those who serve as first responders exemplify these ideals every day.

It is unfortunate that today many now consider duty and honor relics of a bygone age. While our society lavishes praise on athletes and rock stars, we tend to forget about those who stand ready at a moment's notice to risk their lives to keep our communities safe. It is only after disaster strikes that we appreciate fully the contributions they make.

They have kept faith with us, and we in this body must continue to keep faith with them by getting them the support they need. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, which has jurisdiction over the U.S. Fire Administration, I am pleased that last year we were able to pass legislation reauthorizing USFA. This legislation is helping get USFA back on the right track so that it can provide the training and research our firefighters need.

In addition, last year, many of us worked to get more help to firefighters. These efforts led to the passage of unprecedented legislation to benefit America's fire service, much of which was reflected in my Help Emergency Responders Operate—HERO—Act.

This type of support is particularly important to volunteer fire departments that often do not have adequate funding. Many volunteer departments have to supplement their local funding with bake sales and other activities just to keep themselves afloat.

The VA/HUD appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002 provides another $100 million for this purpose. Like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I was hoping that we can increase that amount to $150 million, and I am still hopeful that we can get some more funding as the bill moves through conference. Remember that each year fire results in $10 billion in property loss and more than 3,500 deaths in the U.S. I have also cosponsored legislation offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. LARSON, that would set up special tax-free retirement accounts, similar to IRA's, for volunteer firefighters.

Increasingly, we are asking firefighters to take on expanded responsibilities—to respond to terrorist attacks or to help stem environmental disasters, for example. It is important that as we ask them to take on more, we stay committed to insuring we support them as best we can.

I thank the gentleman for his efforts on behalf of firefighters and thank him for bringing this issue before the House tonight. I urge my colleagues to support this amendemnt.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and thank him for all he has done for the fire fighters of the State of Maryland and of the District of Columbia. I have witnessed firsthand what he has done to beef up the capability of fire stations, not just within these two jurisdictions, but across the country. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the head of the Fire Caucus.

The fact is that fire fighters today do so much more than fight fires. They respond to medical emergencies, crises, catastrophes. They are the first line of defense when we have emergencies that occur across the country. So I support the intent of this amendment very strongly.

I do have some reticence about the fact that it would be taken from salaries and expenses in HUD, as I know

the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) do. But I suspect that when we sit down with the Senate, that the fire fighters will be recipients of the kind of financial support and political support that they need and deserve.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI), one of our freshmen Members who was a leader of the fire service in Brookhaven in Long Island.

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

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Weldon amendment, which would increase the Fire Assistance Grant Program by $50 million.

Last Monday it was my honor to announce the awarding of a Federal grant to the Davis Park Fire Department in my district. This grant was one of only 108 that were awarded to the fire departments across this country under FEMA's Fire Assistance Grant Program.

The Davis Park Fire Department along with nearly 20,000 other fire companies applied for grants. That is almost two-thirds of all fire companies in America. In the coming months, more than $100 million in grants will be rewarded to fire companies for vehicles, fire prevention programs, equipment and training.

The Davis Park Fire Department will use its $30,000 in funds to train its fire fighters in the most recent fire fighting and rescue techniques. When I spoke with the department's chief, he expressed his excitement over how the grant would help to strengthen the safety of not just the citizens of Davis Park, but also the brave men and women who serve them.

By supporting the Weldon amendment we can guarantee that fire departments, like Davis Park, will be able to benefit from this vital program next year.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Weldon amendment which would increase the Fire Assistance Grant Program by $50 million.

Last Monday, it was my honor to announce the awarding of a Federal grant to the Davis Park Fire Department in my district. This grant was one of only 108 that were awarded to fire departments across this country under FEMA's Fire Assistance Grant Program.

The Davis Park Fire Department along with nearly 20,000 other fire companies applied for grants—that is almost two-thirds of all fire companies in America. In the coming months, more than $100 million in grants will be rewarded to fire companies for vehicles, fire prevention programs, equipment and training.

The Davis Park Fire Department will use its $30,000 in funds to train its firefighters in the most recent firefighting and rescue techniques. When I spoke with the department's chief he expressed his excitement over how the grant would help to strengthen the safety of not just the citizens of Davis Park but also the brave men and women who serve them.

By supporting the Weldon amendment we can guarantee that Fire Departments like the Davis Park will be able to benefit from this vital program next year. In doing so we can increase the safety of countless communities throughout our nation.

I call upon all of my colleagues to join me in providing our nations local fire departments with the opportunity to improve the quality of both services they offer and safety standards under which they serve.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), one of the co-chairs of the Fire Service Caucus who does an outstanding job on behalf of the fire fighters of America.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment.

In the new century the front line of America's defense is not the battlefields of Europe or the high seas around the globe or even the skies above us. The front line is the domestic battle against terrorism.

The first line of defense in that battle is the fire fighters, EMS, and public safety personnel of our country. They certainly deserve the amount that is suggested by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for making sure that $100 million is already in this bill.

I know we can all work together in the conference with the other body to try to increase that amount to $150 million by trying to find the appropriate place in the bill from which the money may be taken.

We are going to spend $300 billion on defending this country by the Armed Services this year. I support that. This is a small fraction and an important element of our fight or national defense. I enthusiastically support this amendment. I thank its authors.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), one of the champions of our national security and one of the champions of the fire service in America, who along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has been there, along with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have ever spoken on an amendment which I am not sure is going any place, but I will say this: I can remember when it was first introduced they were talking about $1 billion. Most people thought there would not be that kind of a need or application. But in my district this has been one of the most popular things we have done in this Congress.

We are having trouble getting volunteers. They are having trouble getting equipment. So this is the type of thing we will have to get involved in. I predict that in the end there will be a lot more money in this program. It is going to be just like defense. It is going to increase more and more. So I support the program and enthusiastically endorse what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) are trying to do.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) has 4 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the group of people we are talking about are our domestic defenders. People ask why we should fund the fire service, are we trying to federalize the Nation's fire service? The answer is absolutely no. But in today's climate we are asking these domestic defenders to deal more with weapons of mass destruction and terrorist incidents.

In fact, for every major disaster in America, floods, tornadoes, earthquakes, they are the first responder. It is not the FEMA bureaucrat, it is not the National Guard, it is not the Marine Corps CBIRF teams, it is the men and women of the American Fire Service.

We have responsibility to help them. We spend over $300 billion on our international defenders, and I support that and more. We spend $4 billion a year on our police officers, and I support that. Imagine asking our police officers to go out and have a chicken dinner or tag day to raise the funds to buy their police car or their crime incident vehicle.

Every day across this country our paid and volunteer fire EMS people are asked to do more with less. This is a small effort for us to assist them, to give them seed money, to help them use their very limited dollars to help leverage that money to buy the equipment they need.

Is this program a success? The first round of grants are now going out. Let me read just one. The smallest grant award to date was $757 to buy a smoke machine for training fire fighters in the Paisley Volunteer Fire Department in southeastern Oregon. That may save one life, and if we save one life out of those hundreds that are killed each year, it is well worth the funding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for working together on this effort. It would not have happened without the bipartisan support of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and all of the others

who have spoken, are the reason we are here today.

Mr. Chairman, to our fire and EMS leaders, we are only just beginning. I thank my colleagues and ask them to support this amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is going to take a short time, and this amendment is going to be I think withdrawn. It is going to be withdrawn because we understand that we ought not to take $50 million out of the salary and expense money of HUD. HUD needs that money.

Mr. Chairman, I rise really to say that this committee's 302(b) allocation is insufficient to meet the unbelievable demands that it confronts. I think the chairman and ranking member are going to say that in just a minute. But I empathize with that because this is a critical need. We have talked about the need being manifested in the grant applications that have been submitted: Over $3 billion with $100 million available. Those grant applications are not for some objective which somebody would make fun of.

We talk about fires, and that is what we think about our fire service and emergency response teams as doing; but we have also talked about natural disasters. There are also unnatural disasters; for instance, automobile accidents. The first people usually on the scene are the fire service and/or the EMS, emergency medical service. They are there. They need equipment and training. That means more lives saved.

Just as it has been said that we spend a lot of money on people that we send overseas to defend our security, that is why the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I and others on this floor refer to our fire service and EMS personnel as our domestic defenders; because, indeed, they are the persons, along with our police department, that we ask to defend us here at home to make sure that we not only have law and order, but that we have security at time of crisis, whether it is natural disaster or fire or accident or some other calamity.

Mr. Chairman, the fire service was one of the first on the scene when Timothy McVeigh set that awful explosion that killed 168 people. They were there in that building climbing those stairs bringing children out, bringing women and visitors from that building.

They take risks every day, and we lose on an average one every 3 days in America. It is important, and I think America believes it to be a priority, that we give to them the training, the equipment, so that they cannot only respond effectively to save our lives, but they can do so in the safest possible manner that we can give to them.

In conclusion, let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). I know that they care deeply about this program and I know the constraints on them. The good news is when we go to conference I hope we can get to this number.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership last year, and ask the gentleman if he can work with us in conference to help move toward this goal?

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

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this is as good an idea that has come along in a long time. It has broad support. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is as consistent as Old Faithful regarding fire fighters. The gentleman is their hero; and there are many others in this room who have made this happen.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and I have an allocation that would force us to go into HUD that would cut salaries and expenses. Nobody wants to do that. Give us a chance to work with the gentleman as we move towards conference, and I think we probably will have a positive result.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for their leadership on this issue.

This amendment is less about a desire in this body of getting resources to fire fighters than it is about the scarcity about the resources that we have to appropriate here.

As the chairman indicated, we need a larger allocation to do justice to this amendment. We need more money to do justice to this amendment. We hope as this process moves forward, it will be available. It will be very difficult in the context of the tax cut we had earlier in the year. We are going to work hard to honor both gentlemen's request here as it moves forward. I will support the chairman in that process.

□ 1915

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our colleagues for their comments. The gentleman from Maryland has an additional comment to make, and then I will make my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I think everybody here that has spoken says this is something we ought to do. Hopefully between now and when we adjourn, we will be able to get this accomplished, not just for the fire service of America but for the people of our Nation and safer communities.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank all of my colleagues for speaking. It is pretty evident that this is something we want to do. Working with the other body, hopefully we can get there.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Weldon-Pascrell-Andrews amendment which would increase the FY02 budget for the Fire Assistance Grant Program from $100 million to $150 million.

Mr. Chairman, there is such a great need for this program in this country that while it has been funded at $100 million for FY01, there has been $2.9 billion in requests from across the country for this vital program.

Mr. Chairman, new and advancing technologies are constantly requiring expensive purchase and upgrading of equipment to enable our firefighting units to provide the very best in services to our communities. My own district of the U.S. Virgin Islands, is one such community in need. They have put in a request for this assistance and support to ensure that they have the right equipment, vehicles and other tools necessary to meet the important need of keeping our community safe in times of fire disaster.

Mr. Chairman, our firefighters, across the country, put their lives on the line day after day—for us! Let us appreciate their service, and improve their safety as well, by passing the Weldon-Pascrell-Andrews amendment today.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $93,898,000, of which $22,343,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration and $10,000,000 shall be provided from the amount earmarked for Operation Safe Home in the appropriation for the ''Public housing operating fund'': *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within the Office of Inspector General.

CONSOLIDATED FEE FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the balances remaining available from fees and charges under section 7(j) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act, $6,700,000 is rescinded.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Federal Housing Enterprise Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, including not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, $23,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed such amount shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund: *Provided further*, That the general fund amount shall be

reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $0.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stuart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded, or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2002 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a nonfrivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. (a) Notwithstanding section 854(c)(1)(A) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)(1)(A)), from any amounts made available under this title for fiscal year 2002 that are allocated under such section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall allocate and make a grant, in the amount determined under subsection (b), for any State that—

(1) received an allocation in a prior fiscal year under clause (ii) of such section; and

(2) is not otherwise eligible for an allocation for fiscal year 2002 under such clause (ii) because the areas in the State outside of the metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) in fiscal year 2002 do not have the number of cases of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) required under such clause.

(b) The amount of the allocation and grant for any State described in subsection (a) shall be an amount based on the cumulative number of AIDS cases in the areas of that State that are outside of metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) of such section 854(c)(1)(A) in fiscal year 2002, in proportion to AIDS cases among cities and States that qualify under clauses (i) and (ii) of such section and States deemed eligible under subsection (a).

SEC. 204. Section 225(a) of the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, Public Law 106–74 (113 Stat. 1076), is amended by inserting ''and fiscal year 2002'' after ''fiscal year 2001''.

SEC. 205. Section 251 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''issue regulations'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''require that the mortgagee make available to the mortgagor, at the time of loan application, a written explanation of the features of an adjustable rate mortgage consistent with the disclosure requirements applicable to variable rate mortgages secured by a principal dwelling under the Truth in Lending Act.''; and

(2) by adding the following new subsection at the end:

''(d)(1) The Secretary may insure under this subsection a mortgage that meets the requirements of subsection (a), except that the effective rate of interest—

''(A) shall be fixed for a period of not less than the first 3 years of the mortgage term;

''(B) shall be adjusted by the mortgagee initially upon the expiration of such period and annually thereafter; and

''(C) in the case of the initial interest rate adjustment, is subject to the one percent limitation only if the interest rate remained fixed for five or fewer years.

''(2) The disclosure required under subsection (b) shall be required for a mortgage insured under this subsection.''.

SEC. 206. (a) Section 203(c) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and (k)'' and ''or (k)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting immediately after ''subsection (v),'' the following: ''and each mortgage that is insured under subsection (k) or section 234(c),''; and

(B) by striking ''and executed on or after October 1, 1994,''.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) apply only to mortgages that are executed on or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) be implemented in advance of any necessary conforming changes to regulations.

SEC. 207. (a) During fiscal year 2002, in the provision of rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in connection with a program to demonstrate the economy and effectiveness of providing such assistance for use in assisted living facilities that is carried out in the counties of the State of Michigan specified in subsection (b) of this section, notwithstanding paragraphs (3) and (18)(B)(iii) of such section 8(o), a family residing in an assisted living facility in any such county, on behalf of which a public housing agency provides assistance pursuant to section 8(o)(18) of such Act, may be required, at the time the family initially receives such assistance, to pay rent in an amount exceeding 40 percent of the monthly adjusted income of the family by such a percentage or amount as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines to be appropriate.

(b) The counties specified in this subsection are Oakland County, Macomb County, Wayne County, and Washtenaw County, in the State of Michigan.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

The text of the amendments en bloc is as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, consisting of amendment No. 31, amendment No. 33, amendment No. 34, and amendment No. 35:

AMENDMENT NO. 31:

At the end of title II, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2____. For an additional amount for providing public housing agencies with tenant-based housing assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to provide amounts for incremental assistance under such section 8, and the amount otherwise provided by this title for ''PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND'' is hereby reduced by, $100,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 33:

In title III, at the end of the matter relating to ''NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION-SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY'' insert the following: ''Additionally, for the Space Grant program, to promote science, mathematics, and technology education for young people, undergraduate students, women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities in the State of Texas, for careers in aerospace science and technology, $8,900,000.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 34:

In title III, at the end of the matter relating to ''NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION-SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY'' insert the following: ''Additionally, for the Minority University Research and Education Program to emphasize partnership awards that leverage the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's investment by encouraging collaboration among the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Other Minority Universities, and other university researchers and educators, $58,000,000.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 35:

In title III, at the end of the matter relating to ''NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION-EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES'' insert the following: ''Additionally, for training young scientists and engineers, creating new knowledge, and developing cutting-edge tools that together will fuel economic prosperity and increase social well-being in the years ahead, $662,000,000.''.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for giving me the opportunity to engage in debate on these important issues on the floor of the House.

First let me say that I want to add my support for the Weldon amendment that was debated just previously and would hope to be one of those supporting the concept of public safety and the appreciation of our Federal fire service and all of our firefighters.

The issues I want to discuss this evening I believe warrant consideration; and I would hope, with good will, I would be able to have the point of order waived. But let me describe the reason for offering first of all amendment No. 31, which has to do with more funding for section 8. Realizing that there were funds that were not utilized under the section 8 program, my concern is that in various jurisdictions there are still long waiting lists for the section 8 certificates. It seems to me that with that in mind, we need to either revise the program or work with

the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make sure that this program actually utilizes all the dollars and gets to all the regional areas where there is a definitive need.

In my community, the waiting list has been extensive. I believe it is extremely important to assure that there is affordable housing to disperse to the hardworking poor in areas throughout the community for them to have a better quality of life.

My other amendments, 33, 34 and 35, deal with an important issue. I am on the Committee on Science and am well aware of the opportunity for dealing with these issues in the Committee on Science. I would say that we have done a very good job of that, but I have found that there is a great importance and great need for engaging our Historically Black Colleges and our Hispanic Serving Institutions in the important work that NASA does. The NASA space grant program is a program authorized by Congress in 1987 designed to increase the understanding, assessment, development and use of aeronautics and space resources. My interest is ensuring that this program has the dollars to be able to collaborate with those colleges.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to this section of the bill H.R. 2620, VA–HUD–Independent Agencies appropriations for FY 2002.

I am requesting an increase in NASA Space Grant Progam. The NASA Space Grant program is a program, authorized by Congress in 1987, designed to increase the understanding, assessment, development, and use of aeronautics and space resources. All 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia have Space Grant Consortium programs in which more than 700 affiliates participate. These consortia form a network of colleges and universities, industry, state/local governments, and nonprofit organizations with interests in aerospace research, training, and education. This amendment is for an increase of $8.9 million to the existing FY 2002 budget request. This increase would bring the existing budget from $19.1 million to $28 million.

I ask that my colleagues support me in this amendment.

In addition, I am particularly interested in the minority university research and education program that emphasizes the partnership awards with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's investment in collaboration with Historically Black Colleges and other minority universities. Even today we find that there is a dearth of trained minorities in the sciences. We have always talked about the importance of math and science in our elementary and secondary schools. It is equally important to establish criteria and curricula in our colleges to be able to network, if you will, with the kind of disciplines and employment needs that we have in the particular industry. These research grants that I would have asked for more money for would have provided that increased opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to this section of the bill H.R. 2620, VA–HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations for FY 2002.

I am requesting an increase in the NASA Minority University Research and Education Program (MUREP). MUREP is a program that focuses primarily on expanding and advancing NASA's scientific and technological base through collaborative efforts with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Other Minority Universities (OMUs), including Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCU).

NASA's outreach to Minority Institutions (MI) in FY 2002 will build upon the prior years' investments in MI research and academia infrastructure by expanding NASA's research base; contributing to the science, engineering and technology pipeline; and promoting educational excellence in all MUREP. These contributions include the education of a more diverse resource proof of scientific and technical personnel who will be well prepared to confront the technological challenges to benefit NASA and the Nation.

The strategic goals of this program are to (1) Foster research and development activities at MI's which contribute substantially to NASA's mission; (2) to create systemic and sustainable change at MI's through partnerships and programs that enhance research and education outcomes in NASA-related fields; (3) to prepare faculty and students at MI's to successfully participate in the conventional, competitive research and education process; and (4) To increase the number of students served by MI's to enter college and successfully pursue and complete degrees in NASA-related fields.

This amendment is for an increase of $58 million to the existing FY 2002 budget request. This increase would bring the budget up from $82.1 million to $140.1 million.

I ask my colleagues support me in this amendment.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, might I say in amendment 35, that amendment has to do with the National Science Foundation education and human resources which goes, again, to the point of training young scientists and engineers, creating new knowledge and developing cutting-edge technology that would fuel the economic prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to this section of the bill H.R. 2620, VA–HUD–Independent Agencies appropriations for FY 2002.

I am requesting an increase in the National Science Foundation (NSF). NSF supports the nation's future and trains young scientists and engineers, creates new knowledge, and develop cutting-edge tools that together will fuel economic prosperity and increase social well-being in the years ahead. NSF will provide leadership in the President's Math and Science Partnership, and sustained investments in NSF's core programming will contribute to progress across science and engineering. The productivity of the U.S. scientific and engineering community—the fruits of which can be seen in the information technology, communications, and biotechnology industries—depends critically on NSF support of fundamental research.

This amendment proposes a 15 percent increase in NSF's budget over FY 2001, rather than the administration's proposed 1 percent. This amendment is for an increase of $662 million. This increase would bring the FY 2002 budget up to $5.1 billion.

I ask that my colleagues support me in this amendment.

The more people we have in this Nation from all walks of life understanding science, understanding technology, being able to create the new leverage for energy technology, space technology, health technology, I believe this Nation is better off. My amendments have that intent, and certainly I would hope that the chairman would see the interest that I have in science and particularly the interest that I have in, if nothing else, revising or looking at the section 8 program so that those individuals, as I move to housing, those individuals that want to get into section 8, that is a voucher to allow you to live in rental property, dispersed around the community, not necessarily in one area, enhancing your quality of life would do so.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to present this argument on the floor of the House, and I thank the ranking member as well.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman continues to reserve a point of order.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman has time reserved. I think we best allow her to close before I insist on my point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me simply say that what I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, is to have the opportunity to withdraw these amendments. I would like to be able to have the gentleman from New York speak and yield to me to ask a question.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Is the gentlewoman prepared to withdraw the amendments?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am interested in withdrawing the amendments, yes. What my general question is, as the gentleman knows, one of my amendments deals with section 8 housing which I know this committee has worked very hard on. The other amendments have to do with technology and Historically Black Colleges and minority colleges and the importance of those institutions having access to technical training. My simple question would be is that this subcommittee on appropriations, VA, HUD and other agencies, has in its mind and in its focus that these issues will remain important issues as we move toward finalizing this bill and that these issues are important in the committee and will not be forgotten, if you will.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentlewoman for continuing to yield. I think in this bill, we have really made an effort to make sure that Historically Black Colleges, Hispanic Serving Institutions and other minority programs are part of the focus of the National Science Foundation. I think there has been some criticism, and it is somewhat due, that the larger, better established research institutions around the country, the colleges, have benefited substantially. Certainly the country has benefited from that research, also.

But there has been a tradition on this subcommittee, beginning with Chairman Lou Stokes, to make sure that some of these resources are provided, that we encourage those institutions that I mentioned to expand their research capacity. I know the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has been a strong and consistent voice for these, also. We will always do that, and we would always welcome the gentlewoman's input as to whether or not we are meeting the goals that we have set.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired. The remaining time is controlled by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I believe we can all work together for these important issues. Training of our young people; providing funding for these colleges is very important; housing is very important. With that as I had asked, I hoped that we would waive the point of order, but I think it is more important for us to find common ground.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment to appropriate an additional $662 million for the National Science Foundation's education and human resources account, to be used for training young scientists and engineers.

There is a pressing need for this level of funding, particularly as it relates to minority scientists and engineers. Recent reports have cited the ''brain drain'' as our current pool of scientists and engineers prepare to retire. Furthermore, it is clear that America's youth are not being prepared to pursue the rigorous disciplines associated with the hard sciences. American students perform comparably to other children in foreign countries in math and science until they reach the fourth grade level. However, there is a serious drop-off in their achievement and competitiveness in later years.

For minority students the case is even worse. Funding the NSF with increased resources will prepare communities and our nation to respond to the intellectual and real world challenges that await the engineers and scientists of the future. I urge my House colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw these four amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 36 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 54, after line 6, insert the following new section:

SEC. 208. The amounts otherwise provided by this title are revised by increasing the aggregate amount made available for ''PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND'', increasing the amount specified under such item for incremental vouchers under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, reducing the amount specified under such item for rescission from unobligated balances remaining from funds previously appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, increasing the amount made available for ''COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND'', and increasing the amount specified under such item for the community development block grant program, by $100,000,000, $100,000,000, $324,000,000, $224,000,000, and $224,000,000, respectively.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me explain the purpose of this amendment, which is to add dollars, $100 million, to increase the community block grant programs. This goes to a continuing issue that we are confronted with in Houston, Texas, based upon the devastation of Tropical Storm Allison.

First of all, let me rise in support of the $1.3 billion that the committee has put in for additional funds for FEMA. Let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for protecting those dollars. We are in desperate need around the country. There are 31 disaster sites around the country. We do not know how many more may come about, because we are in hurricane season. I thank them particularly for the recovery that Houston is going through.

What we are beginning to face is a shortage of housing because many people are facing the determination or the assessment of the condition of their homes as to whether or not they can be built or rebuilt or not. We are in what we call the ''buyout program'' that FEMA has which requires a complicated process of percentages of whether or not your house has been damaged or not damaged and whether or not you can have the opportunity to rebuild your house. In many instances, there is a need for down payment dollars or dollars to initiate the program. The programs are being designed at this point by Harris County government, and the city of Houston is assessing their status as to whether or not they will be participating in the buyout program. I simply wanted to have enough dollars for flexibility in this community development block grant program that if the city were to engage in participating in these programs, it would have the dollars to do so, any cities, to do so.

My amendment provides for funding so that the many disaster areas that may have lost housing and have to participate in a buyout program would have the resources through the flexibility of the community development and buyout program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that provides $50 million in funding for the Housing and Urban Development's Community Block Grant program from the HUD Section 8 Housing Certificate Fund.

As many of you know, last month Tropical Storm Allison ravaged our nation from Texas to the Northeast. This storm has been particularly hard on the residents of Harris County and the city of Houston. Although words cannot even begin to describe adequately the destruction of Houston and its surrounding areas, I will attempt to describe for you some of the havoc that the storm has wreaked.

The more than three feet of rain that fell on the Houston area beginning June 6 has caused at least 23 deaths in the Houston area and as many as fifty deaths in six states. Over 10,000 people have been left at least temporarily homeless during the flooding, many with no immediate hope of returning to their homes. More than 56,000 residents in 30 counties have registered for federal disaster assistance. The damage estimates in Harris County, Texas alone are $4.88 billion and may yet increase.

Some of the most hard hit areas include the University of Houston, Texas Southern University, and the Kashmere Gardens neighborhood, a Houston enclave that is predominantly low income and possesses the fewest resources needed to bounce back from this once in a lifetime event.

The devastation of single family, mobile homes and multi family homes is almost unbelievable. It is estimated that in the city of Houston, 1,067 were destroyed, 5,098 need major repairs and 24,182 need minor repairs, for a total of 30,347 homes affected. In Harris County, it is estimated that 2,429 homes were destroyed, 4,545 need major repairs and 6,826 need minor repairs, for a total of 13,800.

Of the multi-family housing units in the city, 56 units were utterly destroyed, 150 need major repair and 672 need minor repairs. All totaled, over 3,500 homes were destroyed and nearly 10,000 need major repairs.

FEMA is bringing in trailers as temporary housing for some of those who are now homeless. A new staging site for travel trailers has been secured, and FEMA has received 441 travel trailers. There are currently 138 travel trailers occupied. I met with FEMA several weeks ago to request this relief for the multitudes of Houstonians that have been left

temporarily homeless. These temporary housing trailers, which will be an integral part of FEMA's temporary housing program, are being located at either the severely damaged homes of flood victims or at commercial mobile home parks in and around Houston. The city of Houston will ease permit provisions for these trailers.

The city and county are working diligently with FEMA and SBA to provide grants and loans for home buyout and repair. However, these funds fall short of what the county and city need to help its residents.

For example, through its buyout program, called the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, FEMA provides only government entities 75 percent of the buyout expense. Harris County and Houston must pay the rest, as the state of Texas has declined to lend financial assistance toward this effort. Further, the total eligible buyout funds are only 15 percent of FEMA's estimated total disaster costs.

Moreover, after closing costs and moving expenses, the local governments' buyout share may end up closer to half of all expenses for buyouts. Estimates are that the repair and buyout of homes may cost $200 million or more. The local governments and low and moderate-income residents will scarcely have the resources to meet their expenses.

FEMA does also provide a limited source of funds to individuals and families to be used not only for essential home repair, but also to purchase destroyed clothing and other needed personal property, as well as to meet necessary medical, dental, transportation, and even funeral expenses. However, the average grant is only five to six thousand dollars, hardly enough in many cases to achieve the recovery that is needed. Therefore, I seek additional HUD Community Development Block Grant funds to be used to help supplement our local governments meet their obligations to their residents in need.

CDBG provides eligible metropolitan cities and urban counties with annual direct grants that they can use to revitalize neighborhoods, expand affordable housing and economic opportunities, and/or improve community facilities and services, principally to benefit low- and moderate-income persons.

Since 1974 CDBG has been the backbone of improvement efforts in many communities, providing a flexible source of annual grant funds for local governments nationwide-funds that they, with the participation of local citizens, can devote to the activities that best serve their own particular development priorities, provided that these projects either (1) benefit low- and moderate-income persons; (2) prevent or eliminate slums or blight; or (3) meet other urgent community development needs. The CDBG Entitlement Communities Program provides this Federal assistance to almost 1000 of the largest localities in the country.

As one of the Nation's largest Federal grant programs, the impact of CDBG-funded projects can be seen in the housing stock, the business environment, the streets and the public facilities of these entitlement communities. The rehabilitation of affordable housing has traditionally been the largest single use of CDBG funds.

Recipients of CDBG entitlement funds include local governments with 50,000 or more residents, other local government designated as central cities of metropolitan areas, and urban counties with populations of at least 200,000 (excluding the population of entitled cities). Local governments may carry out all activities themselves or award some or all of the funds to private or public nonprofit organizations as well as for-profit entities.

Low and moderate-income persons, generally defined as members of a family earning no more than 80 percent of the area median income, benefit most directly and most often from CDBG-funded activities. Grantees must use at least 70 percent of CDBG funds for activities that principally benefit low- and moderate-income persons. This includes activities where either the majority of direct beneficiaries such as housing rehabilitation low- or moderate-income persons.

Grantees may use CDBG funds for activities that include acquiring real property (primarily land, buildings, and other permanent improvements to the property) for public purposes. This type of activity might include, for example, buying abandoned houses for rehabilitation or an old industrial site in a distressed neighborhood for redevelopment. CDBG also helps communities demolish property and clear sites to prepare the land for other uses.

These funds can also be used for reconstructing or rehabilitating housing and other property from homeless shelters to single-family homes and from playgrounds to shopping centers, CDBG enables communities to improve properties that have become less usable, whether due to age, neglect, natural disaster, or changing needs.

The committee has recommended a rescission of $886 million for the Section 8 Housing Certificate Fund, stating that it is one of several programs that has built up a substantial balance of unspent funds. It is attempting to take these funds out of HUD until the programs spend the funds it has on hand. Well, I say, let HUD keep these funds and put them to a desperately needed use. This amendment will merely put those funds to a direly needed use.

Hence, I will be requesting in conference that this CDBG money be earmarked for the desperate needs of the homes devastated by Tropical Storm Allison, particularly in Houston and Harris County.

The people of Houston have made extraordinary efforts and acts of heroism during this disaster, as we recognized when we passed H. Res. 166 by a vote of 411–0. Houston contributes significantly to our national economy, as energy capital of the nation and a renowned center for medical care, and scientific and academic research. FEMA and SBA's efforts have been praiseworthy, contributing significant financial assistance and other much needed support. But to return to our potential, Houston needs to know that Congress continues to support its recovery. Although I look forward to this Chamber supporting Representative DELAY's request for $1.3 billion in emergency contingency funding for FEMA, even if we approve these funds, their release would still be up to the administration.

The flood has devastated us emotionally, physically and financially. To return to our potential, we still need help. Houston needs to know that Congress continues to recognize. Now, it is our turn to continue to make sure that we do our share to help them.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Just briefly, the subcommittee has done its level best to provide additional section 8 housing vouchers. In fact, we have 34,000 new section 8 vouchers in the bill. As we have discussed earlier, this is a very tight allocation. There are really very few other places to go within the bill to move money from one account to another.

Since this increase certainly is well intended but there is no offset provided, I would obviously continue to reserve my point of order.

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

□ 1930

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, this is such an important issue for us, I totally agree and believe that the committee has been as fair as it can possibly be. I would argue that there is such an emergency and such a need for assistance in this housing program and giving flexibility in additional dollars, I would argue and ask that the point of order be waived and the amendment be allowed to go forward.

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

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed suballocation of Budget Totals for fiscal year 2002 on July 26, 2001, House Report 107–165. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee allocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the Act.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my simple point on this amendment is that I think it is important that the idea of being able to assist flood victims is only at this time. I appreciate the fact that we have received additional dollars in FEMA. The housing represents an enormous crisis. Simply, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the point of order be considered waived in light of the emergency nature of the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair is authoritatively guided under section 312 of the Budget Act by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget that an amendment providing any net increase in new discretionary budget authority would cause a breach of the pertinent allocation of such authority.

The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas would increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill. As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The point of order is sustained, the amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, $30,466,000, to remain available until expended.

For the partial cost of construction of a new interpretive and visitor center at the American Cemetery in Normandy, France, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Commission shall ensure that the placement, scope and character of this new center protect the solemnity of the site and the sensitivity of interested parties including families of servicemen interred at the cemetery, the host country and Allied forces who participated in the invasion and ensuing battle: *Provided further*, That not more than $1,000,000 shall be for non-construction related costs including initial consultations with interested parties and the conceptual study and design of the new center.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, including hire of passenger vehicles, uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, $8,000,000, $5,500,000 of which to remain available until September 30, 2002 and $2,500,000 of which to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions: *Provided further*, That, hereafter, there shall be an Inspector General at the Board who shall have the duties, responsibilities, and authorities specified in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended: *Provided further*, That an individual appointed to the position of Inspector General of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) shall, by virtue of such appointment, also hold the position of Inspector General of the Board: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General of the Board shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of FEMA in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Board, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Board.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

To carry out the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for ES–3, $80,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which $500,000 shall be for technical assistance and training programs designed to benefit Native American communities, and up to $8,948,000 may be used for administrative expenses, including administration of the New Markets Tax Credit, up to $6,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to $1,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $15,000,000.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, $54,200,000.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

OPERATING EXPENSES

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 106–377, the Corporation for National and Community Service shall use such amounts of such funds as may be necessary to carry out the orderly termination of the programs, activities, and initiatives under the National Community Service Act of 1990 (Public Law 103–82) and the Corporation: *Provided*, that such sums shall be utilized to resolve all responsibilities and obligations in connection with said Corporation.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 30 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

In title III, under the heading ''NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES''—

(1) strike ''orderly termination of the''; and

(2) strike the proviso at the end.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it seems this evening that I am speaking a lot about the impact of Tropical Storm Allison in the Houston area and throughout Texas, but also as it has impacted Louisiana, the Southeastern Coast and many other States. We see now in the State of West Virginia that there has been extensive flooding over the last couple of days.

The reason why I rise is to present this amendment to ensure that there will be no language in this legislation that would suggest that the Corporation of National Service would be dismantled.

First of all, I believe that all of us are aware of the Corporation of National Service, the AmeriCorps volunteers. They are in our communities every single day. As I went about Houston during the initial days of the flood, and we were opening Red Cross centers and what we call DRCs, the recovery centers organized by FEMA, the complimentary volunteers that were there were the AmeriCorps young people and National Service Corporation individuals who were there every single day helping the flood victims.

As I noted to you, we have got about $4.88 billion in damage, and growing. Over 20,000 homes that have been damaged. But I have seen AmeriCorps working in many other capacities, in classrooms, daycare centers, cleaning up parks, working side-by-side with the respected citizens of the respective areas they are in.

This amendment is a very simple one and asks that we not consider this agency to be one dismantled and to be able to provide the support for the agency that I would hope all of us would desire to do.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) seek time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am not in opposition to the amendment. I do seek to control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) will control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, this AmeriCorps, similar to how the program has been handled in the last several years, the House has come into this bill without funding for AmeriCorps. It has been resolved in conference each time with funding being provided. I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that that is the way that this issue will be resolved again this year.

The President has spoken in support of AmeriCorps. There are many advocates for the program within the House and in the Senate. The language that the gentlewoman deals with in the bill would strike language that deals with

the elimination or the phasing-out of the AmeriCorps program. I do not think that that is necessary within the bill because of recent history, the fact that AmeriCorps is ultimately funded in conference.

So, assuming that that will happen, there is no need for that language. I think it is a positive amendment, it has no deleterious effect on the bill, and, for that reason, Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Corporation for National Service changes lives. It gets people of all ages to volunteer, and, as they volunteer, to improve the lives of others. While they are doing that, they improve their own lives. At the same time, the corporation volunteer program fills unmet local community needs.

In my district, the sixth district of California, AmeriCorps volunteers are reading tutors in Larkspur; students from Sonoma State University volunteer for a Vista program in Rohnert Park; AmeriCorps sponsors a multicultural alliance and teacher fellowship program in Ross, California; and seniors in Sonoma County donate their time and wisdom through the local Retired and Senior Volunteer Program, RSVP.

We have been lucky to get assistance also from California Statewide AmeriCorps programs. Last summer, AmeriCorps volunteers from Los Angeles came to my district and spent a week clearing the property around the historic Carrillo Adobe. They have done so much. They contribute so much.

Forty other volunteers assisted at the Redwood Empire Food Bank. But the Corporation for National Service and AmeriCorps aren't important only for the good they do in our communities, or for the experiences of the individual volunteers. At a time when too many Americans are defined by their differences, the Corporation for National Service, and AmeriCorps, give thousands of volunteers, and the communities where they serve, an opportunity to meet across the barriers of education, race, and income, to work together for a common good. The corporation for National Service is one of this Nation's best investments in a future of good citizens, and we should be supporting it, not trying to eliminate it.

Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear the chairman agree with the sponsor of this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and her leadership in working with the program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to rise and compliment the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for this amendment. It brings to the attention of the body the fact that in this bill this account, the Corporation for National and Community Service, was not funded. It also gives us an opportunity to express our support for it. The chairman, I know, is very supportive of this program and has in the past taken the lead in making sure it was restored in conference.

The simple fact is, and I want to assure the gentlewoman for the chairman, that there was an outlay problem in this bill. The Senate has more outlays than we do, $300 million. We have fewer outlays than the Senate, so this program was not funded, because it was known that it would be supported in conference.

I would like to say that the chairman, as I stated earlier, has taken the lead in restoring this in the past; and I have all the confidence in the world that he will in the future. He is extremely supportive of community service.

The corporation funds some wonderful programs; AmeriCorps, Points of Light, it funds at $10 million; Youth Life foundation, it funds at $1.5 million; America's Promise, it funds at $7.5 million; Communities in Schools, $5 million; and Boys and Girls Clubs at $2.5 million.

These are very worthwhile programs targeted to our youth principally, and they certainly merit our support and the funding. However, more funding certainly could be used in these areas. This program is an excellent program for focusing in on our youth and funding worthwhile programs that are working to ensure that we support organizations that get them off on the right foot.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I will close by simply saying this is like the domestic Peace Corps. I thank the chairman and ranking member. I think all Americans support this volunteer effort, helping our young people to be part of the volunteer spirit, similar to the Peace Corps. I believe these are very vital programs. I hope my colleagues will support us, and I thank the chairman for accepting the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to this section of the bill H.R. 2620, VA–HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations for FY 2002.

It has been the habit of this House to appropriate little or no funds for the Community of National Service and this appropriations legislation before the House today has the same deficit. This situation is disingenuous because those of us who remember the history of the appropriations process understand that funding for the Community of National Service will be funded by several hundred million dollars.

I am appreciative for the work done by this office of the Executive Branch and know that many communities throughout the United States have benefited from its existence. I am particularly grateful for the assistance provided by AmeriCorps Volunteers, who were directed to the Houston area by the Corporation of National and Community Service. The Corporation's three major service initiatives are AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve America and the National Senior Service Corps.

Over 200 AmeriCorps members from four regional campuses responded to a call-up from the American Red Cross to assist victims of Tropical Storm Allison in Texas and Louisiana. The members are serving as first-line Family Assistance Representatives, helping families to receive immediate aid and to identify each family's long term needs. The corps members are also operating emergency assistance shelters, working in soup kitchens, and delivering meals to people affected by the flooding. Additionally, Spanish speaking members are helping translate emergency assistance forms for people who don't speak English. The members are working in ten emergency assistance shelters in the Houston, TX vicinity and three shelters around Baton Rouge, LA.

Overall, the storm caused upwards of $4.88 billion in damage to Houston and surrounding Harris Country. Over 20,000 homes were damaged by the flooding as the storm dumped over 36 inches of rain in some areas with some houses reporting over seven feet of water in them.

It is unfortunate that the Appropriations Committee zeroed out the account for the Community Development Fund, when the Administration requested $411 million in funding for FY 2002. My amendment would restore the program and allow them to continue their work on the behalf of communities throughout the United States.

AmeriCorps, the domestic Peace Corps engages more than 40,000 Americans in intensive, results-driven service each year. We're teaching children to read, making neighborhoods safer, building affordable homes, and responding to natural disasters through more than 1000 projects. Most AmeriCorps members are selected by and serve with projects like Habitat for Humanity, the American Red Cross, and Boys and Girls Clubs, and many more local and national Organizations. Others serve in AmeriCorps*VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) and AmeriCorps*NCCC (the National Civilian Community Corps). After their term of service, AmeriCorps members receive education awards to help finance college or pay back student loans.

AmeriCorps is a win-win program that I hope the Rule for this legislation will allow it to continue in its work to help make America a better place to live. Homelessness in America continues to be a problem that seems to lack a broad commitment to see and end to this blight on the American Dream. Attempting to attribute homelessness to any one cause is difficult and misleading. More often than not, it is a combination of factors that culminates in homelessness. Sometimes these factors are not observable or identifiable even to those who experience them first hand (Wright, Rubin and Devine, 1998). For example, lack of affordable housing is a factor repeatedly cited as contributing to homelessness (Hertzberg. 1992; Johnson, 1994; Metraux and Culhane, 1999; National Coalition for the Homeless, 1999–F). However, lack of affordable housing is often representative of a collectivity of other

problems. Other key factors include the inability to earn a living wage, poverty, welfare reform, unemployment and/or domestic violence that can combine to form a situation in which even the most basic housing is not affordable.

The support that AmeriCorps volunteers provided to Houston area residences must be supported by funds from the federal government in allowing families to have homes to live in after the damaged causes by Tropical Storm Allison. I have an amendment that increases funds for HUD's Community Development Block Grant Program to be used as matching funds for home repair and buyout for Harris County and the City of Houston citizens who have been displaced by Tropical Storm Allison.

In time of great difficulty the Corporation of National Service has been there to assist citizens of our nation to put their lives back into order. It is time that this House stop using the Corporation of National Service as a budget gimmick to hide the fact that the VA–HUD appropriations legislation that will pass is in fact in violation of the budget agreement reached by the House earlier this year.

This is the reason why we must revisit many fiscal issues as they relate to our nation's surplus and its obligations. I ask that my colleagues support me in removing language from this bill, which gives the false impression that this office will be discontinued.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, we are prepared to accept the gentlewoman's amendment. We believe it is constructive.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $5,000,000, which shall be available for obligation through September 30, 2003.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 7251–7298, $13,221,000, of which $895,000 shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102–229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $22,537,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, $70,228,000.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended; section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended; and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, $78,235,000, to be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund Trust Fund pursuant to section 517(a) of SARA (26 U.S.C. 9507): *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited health care providers: *Provided further*, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for ATSDR to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2002, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $680,410,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2003.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; and not to exceed $6,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $2,014,799,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2003.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mrs. CAPPS:

In title III, in the item relating to ''ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT'', after the last dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,200,000)''.

In title III, in the item relating to ''ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND'', after the last dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $7,200,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase by $7.2 million Federal efforts to clean up leaking underground storage tanks. The amendment pays for this increase by cutting the same amount from the EPA's Environmental Programs and Management Account. It is my intention that this funding would come from the Regional Management Programs, which has been increased by nearly $20 million under the bill.

I am offering this amendment with the hope that we can increase our attention to the problem that MTBE contamination is causing to drinking water across this country. While I cannot, under the rules of the House, specify that this funding be used for MTBE cleanup, it is my hope the House will send a clear message that we want to do something about this huge problem.

MTBE is a fuel additive designed to reduce the production of smog by increasing the burning efficiency of gasoline. Unfortunately, due to its unique properties, MTBE has become one of the leading water contamination problems in the United States. MTBE makes water smell and taste like turpentine, even at very low levels, and has resulted in the closing of important drinking water supplies all across the country.

For example, in my district, the coastal town of Cambria, California, is facing a real calamity. MTBE contamination has shut down two municipal drinking water wells the Community Services District has used as back-up sources during dry seasons and droughts.

□ 1945

The district has spent more than $1 million to research the problem.

Cambria is also considering the addition of a desalinization plant to ensure an adequate supply of drinking water, and that will cost millions more.

In fact, there are 38 MTBE contaminated sites in San Luis Obispo County and another 86 in Santa Barbara County, both in my district. However, Mr. Chairman, MTBE contaminated drinking water is a huge problem not just in my district, but across the country. Santa Monica, California has lost about 80 percent of its drinking supply and spends a quarter of a million dollars per year buying replacement supplies.

The South Tahoe Public Utility District has shut down 13 of its 34 drinking water wells due to MTBE contamination. Twenty-one of Wisconsin's 71 counties have detected MTBE in groundwater in potable wells. In Iowa, it has been detected in 23 percent of urban alluvial wells. In Maryland, over 149 domestic public water systems are contaminated by MTBE, and the list goes on and on.

Owners and operators of underground tanks are responsible for cleanup, and that is where the responsibility should lie. But the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust fund provides additional cleanup resources, especially when no responsible party can be found or when the responsible party is no longer viable.

It may also be used to enforce corrective actions and recover costs spent from the fund for cleanup activities. Funded by one-tenth of a cent tax per gallon of gasoline, this LUST fund is a backstop to ensure prompt and appropriate cleanup of leaking tanks. This tax is bringing in close to $190 million this year. Mr. Chairman, at the end of fiscal year 2002, the administration expects the balance in the LUST fund to be nearly $2 billion. The interest on this balance is bringing the trust fund another $87 million, yet the bill before us appropriates only $72 million to support communities in their efforts to clean up leaking tanks. That is $96,000 less than we appropriated last year, and that is about $15 million less than the interest we expect to earn on the trust fund balance this year.

Mr. Chairman, I think we can do better than that. The American people pay taxes on gasoline and other fuels, in part to ensure that these underground tanks are not polluting their drinking water, so we should use those funds for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, last week the Energy and Commerce Committee unanimously adopted my amendment to authorize up to $200 million out of the LUST fund for MTBE inspections and cleanup. We took this action because MTBE contamination is presenting a real problem to thousands of communities across this country. My amendment today is only a small step toward addressing those cleanup needs when we should be taking a giant leap. So I would urge my colleagues to support this common sense amendment.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise actually in support of the gentlewoman's amendment and am prepared to accept it for our bill.

This is a good idea. It is a little tough on the Environmental Protection Agency because it will have to find these funds out of existing appropriated funds but, at the same time, it shows that the Congress considers this issue a very high priority. I know members of the subcommittee, including the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), has spoken long and strong in favor of doing a better, more aggressive job on leaking underground storage tanks, and especially with this issue of MTBE, which pollutes our drinking water. This amendment would also provide funds to orphaned sites where the owner cannot be located or otherwise cannot be identified.

Mr. Chairman, this is a serious problem. Communities all over the country worry about this issue and suffer from this issue, and we need to do a vigilant job in protecting our groundwater supplies which, once they are polluted, can be next to impossible to abate the problem.

So I support the gentlewoman's amendment and am prepared to accept it.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say how much I appreciate the support of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. PALLONE:

In the item relating to ''ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT'', after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

In the item relating to ''ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS'', after the 1st and 7th dollar amounts, insert the following: ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say, first of all, that this is a bipartisan amendment. It is sponsored by myself and the gentlemen from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and (Mr. SMITH), my two colleagues on the Republican side.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, Congress unanimously passed the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act; it is also known as the Beaches Act. The Beaches Act established consistent water quality standards for beach water and provides grants to help States develop and implement water quality testing and notification programs to warn the public about unsafe conditions at our Nation's beaches.

The reason we needed the Beaches Act and why it is so important is because beach waters are often contaminated by pathogens, which are disease-causing bacteria and viruses found in human and animal wastes from polluted runoffs, storm drains, sewer overflows and malfunctioning septic systems. These pathogens can cause ear, nose and throat infections, dysentery, hepatitis. The risks of infections are higher for children, the elderly, and those with weak immune systems.

Just as an example, Mr. Chairman, during 1999, there were more than 6,000 beach closings and advisories posted at U.S. beaches. Since 1988, more than 36,000 beach closures and health advisories have been issued across the Nation, but only 11 States regularly monitor most or all of their beaches and notify the public. One of the reasons why this amendment is sponsored by three Members from New Jersey is because we had New Jersey as an example of the type of monitoring, and we used this as an example in trying to get this bill passed last year.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It increases EPA's budget by $3 million for grants to States for beach water quality testing and notification. Last year, Congress unanimously passed the Beaches Act, and the Beaches Act authorizes $30 million in EPA grants. However, even though it authorizes $30 million, I think the President recommended only $2 million. The committee was generous in increasing it to $7 million. But we really think that a lot more money is needed and, if we are able to increase this by $3 million to $10 million, it would really make a big difference.

Mr. Chairman, if I could just say a few more things. In some ways, I see it almost as an unfunded mandate, that now we are asking States to do all of these things, but we are not providing them with enough money, and that is why I think this amendment is very important. I should also mention that there are 23 national and regional organizations, environmental groups representing millions of Americans who support this.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey and his colleagues from New Jersey who have led this fight to provide additional funds. This is a brand new program. It was authorized just last year, called the Beach Act. It is very popular legislation, it is important legislation, and it is clear that the subcommittee considered it a priority. It was authorized at a $2 million level. We added $5 million to raise funding to $7 million, and this amendment would add another $3 million, bringing a brand new program a fivefold increase in its first year. That is a pretty good test of the popularity and the importance of the program.

The funds, however, will have to come out of the Environmental Protection Agency's State Travel Assistance Grants. Those are very competitive funds. There is strong support and demand on those funds by Members for projects within their districts. So this will put somewhat of a hardship not only on EPA, but also on some of the Members' projects. But this is, we think, an acceptable amendment and we are prepared to support it.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his support and the statement that he made. I understand the limitations under which the subcommittee is living and the problem with the offset, but I do appreciate the fact that he, first of all, was willing to increase the amount from what the President recommended and now also go along with this amendment.

So with that, I thank the chairman and the ranking member, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, just a note of clarification; I misspoke. The funding comes out of the Environmental Programs and Management Fund, which is EPA's fund and goes into the State Travel Assistance Grant. The gentleman understood clearly that I was in sport of his amendment. I am in support of it. We accept it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong support for the Pallone-Saxton-Smith Amendment, which seeks an additional $3 million to the EPA budget for enhancing beach water monitoring programs. These programs are authorized under the BEACH Act (Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000), signed last year as Public Law 106–284.

Beach water monitoring programs are critical to the health of the millions of people who swim in our oceans. Since 1988, more than 36,000 beaches have been closed due to contaminated water. During 1999 alone, more than 6,000 beaches were closed because beach waters were found contaminated with pathogens, or disease-causing bacteria and viruses.

Pathogens are found in human and animal waste from polluted runoff, storm drains, sewer overflows and malfunctioning septic systems. When swimmers are unknowingly exposed to these pathogens, they can become sick from a whole host of diseases—gastroenteritis, dysentery, and hepatitis among others. Children, who frequent our beaches, are among the highest at risk because their immune systems are not as fully developed.

If we do not take action to keep our shores safe and clean, the dream of a family vacation can become a nightmare of disease and illness. Many of these pathogens are invisible and undetectable to the naked eye. Without testing, there is no way of knowing if beach waters are too contaminated for swimming, surfing, and other recreational activities.

Yet, until last year, no national standards were in place to monitor beaches for pathogen contamination to ensure the water is safe. As a result, Congress unanimously passed the BEACH Act (P.L. 106–284) to establish consistent water quality standards for our beaches. The bill also provides grants to help states develop and implement water quality testing and notification programs about unsafe conditions at our beaches.

The fact of the matter is that our beaches are national assets that deserve national protection. Just like our national parks, our beaches are not enjoyed solely by those who live near them. In fact, just the opposite is true: our beaches are visited by tens of millions of people from all over the country. Foreign tourists come from all parts of the globe to visit our coasts and beaches, including the Jersey Shore.

Our nation's beaches contribute heavily to our national economy—four times as many people visit our nation's beaches each year than visit all of our National Parks combined. And yet Congress provides copious funding for national parks—as it should. It is estimated that 75% of Americans will spend some portion of their vacation at the beach this year. Beaches are the most popular destination for foreign visitors to our country as well. The amount of money spent by beach-going tourists creates an extensive economic benefit—a portion of which goes back to the Federal government in the form of income and payroll taxes.

Clean and safe beaches are not just good public health policy, clean beaches are also good for the economy. In my State of New Jersey, in 1999, tourism brought $27.7 billion to the state—out of the 167 million trips made to New Jersey in 1999, 101 million were to the Shore area.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all members of Congress to support the Pallone-Saxton-Smith Amendment which adds an additional $3 million to the EPA budget for beach water monitoring programs, for a total of $10 million to states and localities to monitor pathogen contamination. Because, a trip to the beach should not result in a trip to the hospital.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $34,019,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, $25,318,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; $1,270,000,000 (of which $100,000,000 shall not become available until September 1, 2002) to remain available until expended, consisting of $635,000,000, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended by Public Law 101–508, and $635,000,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $11,867,000 shall be transferred to the ''Office of Inspector General'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2003, and $36,891,000 shall be transferred to the ''Science and technology'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2003.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BARCIA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. BARCIA:

Page 62, line 21, after the first dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $140,000,000)''.

Page 64, line 5, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $140,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA).

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

The amendment that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and I are offering today is a simple one. It would provide funding for an authorized grant program that has the potential to benefit communities in every district across this country. These communities are currently struggling with the pervasive and devastating problem of sewer overflows from both combined and sanitary sewer systems. Sewer overflow control programs are often the largest public works projects that communities will face.

The amendment itself is a mere down payment on the funding that this body authorized in the Wet Weather Water Quality Act for fiscal year 2002, just last December. However, I am hopeful that in conference, more money will be found to fully fund the act at the level of $750 million or, alternatively, at least at the President's budget request of $450 million.

This amendment, which has bipartisan support, is about protecting the health of our citizens from untreated sewage, helping communities provide safe and clean drinking water to tens of millions of Americans, and protecting the environment. The families, residents and businesses who are subjected to sewer overflows nationwide deserve nothing less.

Fundamentally, this amendment is about our collective commitment to ensuring the availability of safe, clean, potable water to communities throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all of the Members who share that commitment, like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), my colleague and good friend who has worked tirelessly on this issue. I appreciate his continued leadership. I would also like to especially thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and all of the Members who have expressed support for fully funding the grant program. I also want to especially recognize and thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking member, in continuing to work with us to find opportunities like this to fund the CSO, SSO grant program.

Mr. Chairman, every community, from Seattle, Washington, to Wheeling, West Virginia, to Syracuse, New York, to Indianapolis, Indiana, stands to benefit from this program. I have heard from many communities, and this is just a small representation of the communities who have written to me expressing their strong desire to have this program fully funded.

President Bush also acknowledged the real problem facing communities in his budget stating, ''To address Federal mandates to control the biggest remaining municipal waste water problem, funds should be used for the newly authorized sewer overflow control grants.''

□ 2000

I spoke with a constituent just last week, Craig Tetreau from Marlette, Michigan. They have a $3 million problem. Around here, $3 million may not sound like a lot of money. However, 763 families live in the city of Marlette, and they have an annual budget of $2 million for all city services. If they do not make the upgrades, the State has threatened to construct the necessary upgrade at a cost of $11,000 per household.

Similarly the village of Fairgrove, with 233 families, has $1.5 million in upgrading costs.

In Saginaw, Michigan, sewer rates jumped from $10.40 a month in 1989 to over $39 a month in 1999. Another 50 percent rate increase is anticipated. Recently, sewer rates were 2.64 percent of the median household income alone. This is an enormous burden for which Saginaw, like so many other communities across the country, needs help in the form of Federal grant funding assistance that would be provided by this amendment.

I urge every Member to support this critically important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will clarify that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) was recognized for 10 minutes for this debate, and a Member in opposition will have 10 minutes for this debate.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA). We have worked very, very closely with him on a number of issues within this bill. I know he is deeply concerned about water quality in the Great Lakes and about the quality of drinking water in his own community. These are things that he has worked very hard on and cares deeply about.

But what he is asking us to do is to choose which way, almost equivalent to asking us which way would we like to die, would we rather be hung or burned to death. This is a tough choice.

The Superfund program is terribly important, and it is very, very strongly supported by Members. We all know the combined sewer overflow problem this Nation has is in the hundreds of billions of dollars. We cannot take from one and give to the other either way. We have funds set aside for Superfund. There is not enough money, but we have done the best we could.

There is money set aside for combined sewer overflows through the Clean Water grants and special grants, close to $1.5 billion. It is not enough. There is more need out there. We all understand that. But we cannot take from Superfund $150 million, or $140 million. If we did, it would dramatically reduce the pace of Superfund clean-ups across the country. Every aspect of the Superfund program, but particularly the cleanup or Response program, would be impacted, and none of the agency's Superfund goals would be met, so the program would suffer dramatically. Funding to State programs would be reduced; communities would wait longer for their sites to be addressed.

I know there are a number of Members who feel very strongly about Superfund issues. Superfund sites do a lot of damage to the land, air and water. We have to make these projects a priority. We would lose 50 to 100 ongoing cleanup projects which would be slowed or stopped. The EPA would be unable to start toxic waste clean-ups at dozens of Superfund sites. Construction and completion would fall by one-third. Up to 150 potential sites identified by States would not be evaluated for their potential risks to human health and the environment.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, the Superfund program is funded at $1.2 billion, which is barely enough. It is at the President's request, and barely enough to cover the responsibilities which Superfund is charged to cover. We are talking about toxic waste cleanup; we are talking about carcinogenic substances that are real hazards to people.

I know the gentleman from Michigan had a terrible time in finding offsets in this bill. If we try to do it, it is extremely difficult. Even though he has gone to this account, I know he strongly supports the Superfund program.

Having said that, the gentleman raises a very important issue here. The funding need for water infrastructure is one of the most pressing issues addressed in this bill. A needs survey conducted by the American Society of Civil Engineers estimates our wastewater needs to be approximately $12 billion annually to replace aging facilities and comply with existing and future Federal water regulations. The funding in this bill does not even begin to touch that need.

Controlling sewer overflows continues to be a priority mandate imposed on communities by the EPA regulatory and enforcement programs, and it will continue to be a financing issue that communities around the country will have to confront.

It is terribly difficult for communities to even begin to contemplate being able to marshall the resources to solve this problem. So I understand the issue that the gentleman is bringing before the Congress today. It is an important issue. I compliment him bringing it to our attention.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) has been at the forefront of fighting for funding for water projects and for wastewater overflow projects, and he is to be commended for that.

However, I am reluctantly going to oppose his amendment because of the offset that he proposes, and hope that in the future we will find additional funds to address the very excruciating need that he brings to our attention.

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

I want to voice my strong support for his amendment seeking to provide relief for local communities that today are shouldering up to 90 percent of the burden of revamping their wastewater treatment facilities.

The American Waterworks Association unveiled its new study that predicts required spending of more than $250 billion over the next 30 years to take care of this problem. In the last Congress, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) led the charge in the Congress with the Wet Weather Quality Act, together with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL). The language is included in the Labor-HHS bill over in the Senate that provided a landmark 2-year grant program to be administered by the EPA.

We are not alone. We had a little hearing in front of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment earlier this year, and Administrator Whitman was in front of us. We said they have to provide money for the State revolving loan fund and this grant money as well, because communities cannot take it across the country.

The President put in $450 million in his budget for this program. While I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), who certainly understands the program and the problems as well as anybody in this Congress, the fact is that while the subcommittee has funded the State revolving loan fund and is willing to give loans to communities, there is no grant program in place that would take care of this problem across the Nation.

I want to just bring up one example, not in my district, but it is in Worcester, Massachusetts. To build a single-family home, one has to pay a $16,000 tap-in fee. Who in this Congress, Mr. Chairman, could pay $16,000 to flush the toilet to build a single-family new house? But that is the problem facing not only the folks in Worcester, Massachusetts; but it is the problem facing all of America today if we do not do something.

I would say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, if we go back to the Contract with America in the very first bill the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) introduced, the unfunded mandate legislation, this Congress, this Federal Government, has mandated all of these initiatives upon the wastewater treatment plants of the small municipalities in this country, but has not sent the money.

It is time to send the money. It is time to pass the Barcia amendment. It is too bad that the rules indicate we have to make an offset on the basis of the Superfund allocation, but this money needs to be sent to the small communities of America.

I praise the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), and I urge an aye vote.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin where the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) left off. The Clean Water Act provides very specific mandates for municipalities.

I was a mayor, mayor of the third largest city in the State of New Jersey. There is no way that the Patersons of this country, smaller, larger, can respond to this multibillion dollar need within our communities. Our clean water is threatened, is threatened if we do not begin to address, and we have, this problem.

I am positive that the chairman and the ranking member are sensitive to these needs. But being sensitive to the needs, we need to take it to the next level. We need to be in every mayor's office, in every council chambers throughout America when these issues are coming up.

Crumbling systems exist throughout America. We need to respond. The cost is great. If we do not do it, the cost will be even greater.

One segment of the President's proposed budget I was particularly pleased with, which was where the President expressed his support for the newly authorized sewer overflow control grants. H.R. 828, which passed the Congress, authorized $750 million in fiscal years 2002 and 2003. We are trying to give cities and towns across America the resources they need to clean up their sewer systems and comply with the Clean Water Act.

I am hopeful that we can work with the committee to ensure that full funding is included in the final bill to address this issue, which is important in every district and in every State in this Nation. We must follow through on our commitment to local governments to assist in their wet-weather infrastructure challenges, and I support this critical down payment.

I recognize the hard work of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this amendment. Grant funding to help communities control sewer overflows was approved and authorized in the last Congress; but in this Congress, in this House, in this budget, no funds have been set aside at all. Congress must follow through and fund this important program.

Back home in my district, I can point to the city of Everett, Snohomish, Anacordis, three cities with some of the highest sewer rates in my district. Everett alone has invested in excess of $12 million since 1990 towards reducing and controlling CSOs; and despite the substantial financial commitment, nearly $20 million more is required for the city to reach full compliance with all local, State, and Federal mandates.

Federal funding will be crucial to the city's efforts to reach full compliance, so it is my hope that this Congress can step up to help our communities by providing this funding.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of their communities, to vote in favor of this amendment. I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) for his work on this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief in closing. I have discussed this with my ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). We both appreciate not only the sentiment but the leadership that has been provided on this issue. It is a real big issue for the country.

But to force us to choose between Superfund and CSOs is just too tough a choice to make. We would urge the gentleman, with all due respect, to withdraw the amendment; and he should continue to work with the authorizing committee and with the Committee on Appropriations to see if we can do a better job of meeting this commitment. It is a question of allocation and choices, and we just cannot justify the choice he is asking us to make. I would ask again that he would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I rise today in support of the Barcia/Latourette amendment to HR 2620. This amendment would increase the bills funding for EPA Water Improvement Grants—with the intention that these funds would be used for grants for combined sewer overflows.

Mr. Chairman, the condition of our Nation's wastewater collection and treatment facilities is alarming. In its 1999 clear water needs survey, the EPA estimated that nearly $200 billion will be needed over the next 20 years to address wastewater infrastructure problems in our communities.

In Lynchburg, Virginia, the cost of improving 174 miles of combined sewers that serve 11.4 square miles exceeds $275 million in 2000 dollars. This equates to $16,875 per ratepayer in a city whose average income is $27,500. These CSO improvements are by far the largest capital projects the city has ever undertaken.

Given this great need, I believe the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist communities that are trying to fix their problems and comply with Federal water quality mandates.

I strongly urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment which will increase funding for the Clean Water Revolving Loan Program and help cities in need of meeting Federal mandates.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $72,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $15,000,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, $3,433,899,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,200,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the ''Act''); $850,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, except that, notwithstanding section 1452(n) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, none of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, or in previous appropriations Acts, shall be reserved by the Administrator for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants; $75,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; $30,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages; $200,000,000 shall be for making grants for the construction of wastewater and water treatment facilities and groundwater protection infrastructure in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the report accompanying this Act; and $1,078,899,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multimedia or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104–134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities of which and subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, $25,000,000 shall be for making grants for enforcement and related activities (in addition to other grants funded under this heading), and $25,000,000 shall be for Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2002 and hereafter, State authority under section 302(a) of Public Law 104–182 shall remain in effect: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2002 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2002, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Act, the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants to Indian tribes pursuant to section 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2002, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Act, up to a total of 1½ percent of the funds appropriated for State Revolving Funds under Title VI of the Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of such Act: *Provided further*, That no funds provided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the language beginning with ''except that'' on page 64, line 12, through ''drinking water contaminants'' on line 17 violates clause 2 of rule XXI of the rules of the House prohibiting legislating on an appropriations bill.

The language I have cited says that notwithstanding the provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act, none of the money in the fiscal year 2002 VA–HUD appropriations bill or even previous appropriation acts may be reserved by the EPA administrator for health effect studies on drinking water contaminants.

The language clearly constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill, and as such, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I therefore insist on my point of order.

□ 2015

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone wish to speak on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds that this provision explicitly supersedes existing law. The provision therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the provision is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

For fiscal year 2002, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California at this point?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the original amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 37 Offered by Ms. PELOSI: Page 92, strike lines 3 through 9.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the form at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment offered by Ms. PELOSI: Page 67, line 22, strike ''$17,000,000'' and insert ''$20,000,000''.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Page 67, line 22, strike ''$17,000,000'' and insert ''$20,000,000''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from California Ms. PELOSI, and a Member opposed each will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman form California (Ms. PELOSI).

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would ensure that the Environmental Protection Agency's program for registering pesticides and reassessing pesticide tolerances are funded at the same level in fiscal year 2002 as in the current year. These programs are important to ensure that pesticides used in our crops, on our pets, and in our homes and businesses are thoroughly reviewed, and tolerances are set at safe levels.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with further discussion of the amendment, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), for his extraordinary leadership in taking what might have been a controversial amendment and having us come to some peace on this issue among all the various equities that must weigh in this.

I certainly wish to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his leadership and cooperation, and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the original author of the Food Quality Protection Act for their leadership. Certainly, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for his representing the balances between the environment and ag concerns, which are now in harmony, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for his participation and leadership.

And before I go on, I would like to say that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) took the time to do this while playing a very active leadership role as a named sponsor of the legislation that is very important to all of us, the Patients' Bill of Rights. So I particularly wanted to acknowledge his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, it is especially important that we protect the health of infants and children by ensuring that pesticide exposure levels safeguard their health. The Food Quality Protection Act was designed with special protections for children in mind. We support this funding to ensure that EPA has adequate resources to review chemicals and ensure that they meet new safety standards set by the FQPA, the Food Quality Protection Act.

This amendment would ensure that the EPA has an additional $3 million to ensure that pesticides are adequately assessed for safety. I have worked with Members on both sides of the aisle on this amendment and believe that any controversy has been resolved, as I mentioned earlier. It is my understanding that this amendment is acceptable to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. The gentlewoman's amendment will maintain current funding levels for EPA's pesticide reregistration and tolerance assessment programs and is acceptable to the committee.

Collection of $20 million in maintenance fees will ensure that reregistrations and tolerance reassessments are completed in a timely manner with appropriate scientific analysis, ensuring that our farmers have the tools they need, and that human health is protected.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman for his statement and for agreeing to this amendment.

I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman regarding EPA's program to register new, reduced-risk pesticides. It is my understanding that there are negotiations underway to provide an additional $6 million in funding for assessing reduced-risk pesticides and strengthening EPA's scientific analysis on exposure of farm workers and exposure in drinking water.

We would like to continue discussions on these issues with the intention of addressing them in conference on the fiscal year 2002 bill. We would also ask that the chairman consider providing his support for funding of these programs for 5 years, but we are addressing the fiscal year 2002 bill now.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I thank her for bringing this matter to our attention.

Reduced-risk pesticides can displace pesticides that present higher risks, and they help ensure that our farmers have a complete toolbox to control the pests that attack our crops. I look forward to working with the gentlewoman to consider additional funds for reduced-risk pesticides in the conference report.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the chairman for his support of this amendment and for agreeing to work together to ensure that EPA can proceed with these programs that are so important to our farmers and to the safety of our food supply.

I wonder if our distinguished ranking member wishes to weigh in on this subject. Does the gentleman have any objection to the colloquy?

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

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I have no objection and compliment the gentlewoman for her efforts in this area. She has been very effective, as is evidenced by the chairman's accepting her amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member. And I want to once again acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the author of the Food Quality Protection Act; the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), for his leadership; the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR); and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM); and others, who have worked to resolve some of the controversy in this.

It is our anticipation that if we have this full funding, the $20 million for this year, that the EPA will be able to meet its statutory requirement. We, of course, want the additional $6 million and look forward to working with the chairman and the ranking member to get that in conference with the support that I mentioned here in a bipartisan way, and hope that the EPA can, over the course of the next year, demonstrate that these were sufficient funds to meet their statutory requirements under the Food Quality Protection Act.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to rise in support of this amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Ms. PELOSI.

As many of my colleagues know, I am a relatively new grandmother. My grandson, Teddy, is eighteen months old—old enough to sit at the table with his parents and eat many of the things they eat.

But Teddy is, of course, much smaller than his parents and his vital systems are not fully developed. According to a report by the National Academy of Sciences, that means that Teddy, and all other children, are ''more susceptible to permanent damage'' from exposure to pesticides and other chemicals in foods.

That landmark National Science Report, ''pesticides in the diets of infants and children'' was the main reason that Congress passed the food quality protection act in 1996 with strong bipartisan support.

This was the first law to require that the standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency for pesticide traces in our foods take into account the special vulnerabilities of growing children.

Members from both sides of the aisle agreed that we wanted the food our children—and grandchildren—eat to be as safe as possible.

That's why I was shocked to learn that H.R. 2620 will make it impossible for the Environmental Protection Agency to develop these standards.

And it does this in a really sneaky way. Section 421 of this Bill prohibits the EPA from issuing the final rule to increase the user fee that the pesticide industry pays to help finance pesticide tolerance studies.

OMB has estimated that increasing the user fee would give EPA an additional $50 million dollars that the EPA needs, in order to find out what levels of pesticides children can safely tolerate.

Section 421 makes it impossible for EPA to collect that money.

The Pelosi Amendment strikes Section 421, giving EPA the authority it needs to begin collecting increased user fees from the pesticide industry.

I can't imagine that there is a parent or a grandparent, or anyone in this house who cares about the health of a young child, who doesn't want to make sure that the food that child eats is safe from dangerous levels of pesticides.

that's what the Pelosi Amendment does, it protects the foods our children eat, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, a Member opposed also may control 15 minutes. Is there such Member?

If not, the question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 136a–1 of title 7, United States Code is amended—

(1) in subsection (i)(5)(C)(i) by striking ''$14,000,000'' and inserting ''$17,000,000''; and, by striking ''each'' and inserting ''2002'' after ''fiscal year'';

(2) in subsection (i)(5)(H) by striking ''2001'' and inserting ''2002'';

(3) in subsection (i)(6) by striking ''2001'' and inserting ''2002''; and

(4) in subsection (k)(3)(A) by striking ''2001'' and inserting ''2002''; and, by striking ''1/7'' and inserting ''1/10''.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $5,267,000.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, $2,974,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 202 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the Council shall consist of one member, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, serving as chairman and exercising all powers, functions, and duties of the Council.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $33,660,000, to be derived from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DISASTER RELIEF

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), $1,369,399,000, and, notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 5203, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $2,900,000 may be transferred to ''Emergency management planning and assistance'' for the consolidated emergency management performance grant program; up to $15,000,000 may be obligated for flood map modernization activities following disaster declarations; and $21,577,000 may be used by the Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations.

In addition, for the purposes under this heading, $1,300,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, $405,000, as authorized by section 319 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $25,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $543,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire and purchase of motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency preparedness; transportation in connection with the continuity of Government programs to the same extent and in the same manner as permitted the Secretary of a Military Department under 10 U.S.C. 2632; and not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $227,900,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $10,303,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall also serve as the Inspector General of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as amended (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 404–405), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, $404,623,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mrs. CAPPS:

In title III, in the item relating to ''FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY—EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE'', strike the period at the end and insert the following:

: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $25,000,000 shall be available for purposes of predisaster hazard mitigation pursuant to section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, will earmark $25 million of FEMA's Emergency Management Planning and Assistance Account for the successful Project Impact.

Project Impact is a commonsense public-private partnership designed to help communities prepare for natural disasters by funding predisaster hazard mitigation. The goal is to help communities become disaster resistant. This funding allows communities to build partnerships with businesses, industry, public works, utilities, volunteer groups, and the local State and Federal Government. These partnerships assess their community's risks and vulnerabilities to natural disasters, identify priorities for mitigation, and begin implementing them. And the Federal funding works to leverage support from private sources, magnifying its effectiveness.

Mr. Chairman, over the last decade, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has spent $20 billion to assist communities to recover from disasters. This does not include the billions spent by other agencies, like HUD, the Small Business Administration, as well as State and local governments. And not all damage can be repaired. People lose their jobs; businesses close. In fact, 40 percent of small businesses are never able to recover or reopen. And, of course, most tragically, lives are lost. Project Impact recognizes that we can spend a fraction of the money we spend now to avoid some of those costs and save many of those lives. It seems imprudent not to take this step.

Project Impact is a classic example of the adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. For example, earlier this year we saw the effectiveness of Project Impact. In January, Washington State and the City of Seattle were struck by the worst earthquake to hit the Pacific Northwest in 52 years. But according to press accounts, injuries were only about 15 percent of what FEMA expected from a 6.8 magnitude, and costs were only about half of what the agency projected. This was in no small part because of Project Impact.

In 1977, Seattle was able to turn a $1 million grant from Project Impact into $7 million with private support, and they set about to make Seattle disaster resistant. They enforced building codes, strengthened existing buildings, and educated their citizens about prevention measures they could take. FEMA and Seattle took the initiative and their work ahead of time and made a terrible tragedy significantly less tragic.

No less an expert on the matter of disaster relief and mitigation than former FEMA Director James Lee Witt pointed this out. In a letter he sent to me in support of this amendment to fund Project Impact, Mr. Witt says, and I quote, ''Despite FEMA's quick response, the reality is that without prevention efforts, thousands of families

will continue to lose their homes and precious possessions, and hundreds of small businesses will be destroyed, resulting in the loss of thousands of jobs. Seattle has shown the United States that prevention works. Other communities deserve the opportunity to replicate Seattle's success.''

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply appreciative that the committee has increased the funding for Emergency Management Planning and Assistance by nearly $35 million. It is clear that this funding is needed. But it is also clear that we should be spending some of that money on Project Impact and its preventive measures. My home county of Santa Barbara received a Project Impact grant to model potential wildfires and to look at ways to mitigate their impact. These efforts have allowed the county to better develop emergency plans which will save lives if, or more likely when, that catastrophe strikes. Besides Seattle and Santa Barbara, nearly 250 communities have received Project Impact grants since the program was established in 1997.

□ 2030

Let us give the next 250 communities that same chance.

It simply does not make sense for us to keep pouring money into communities after the fact and not try to help them before a disaster. This is especially true in light of FEMA's $2.25 billion budget. All this amendment does is dedicate 1 percent of that funding to predisaster assistance. It does not increase the budget and it will save many lives.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York seek time in opposition?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's amendment would designate $25 million of the funds for FEMA emergency management planning and assistance to be used for predisaster mitigation activities.

For the past 4 years FEMA had had a program to raise the awareness within communities of the need to prepare for disasters. This program was called Project Impact and it made strides towards helping communities become better informed of how to prepare and respond to natural disasters.

While this budget does not continue Project Impact, in our hearings earlier this year the Director of FEMA expressed his desire to develop a full-fledged predisaster mitigation program building on the success that Project Impact has had in raising the level of awareness within all communities.

I know that if such a program were developed and implemented after careful thought and deliberation, it would save money and lives. The biggest concern I have with the amendment is that it offers no way to pay for the program. The amendment designates $25 million of the $404 million in this account for the predisaster program. What programs currently funded in this account would the gentlewoman have us decrease?

Would the gentlewoman suggest a reduction in the budget for the Firefighter Assistance Grants? They are funded in this bill at $100 million. We have had debate on the floor today that Members believe there is substantially more need and there is great demand. We had $3 billion in requests for those $100 million for fire fighters. Surely we cannot go there.

Should we reduce the allowance for salaries or grants to State and local emergency management officials? We are already asking FEMA to take a reduction in their salaries for fiscal year 2002. A further cut of this magnitude would make this agency very difficult, if not impossible, to manage.

Should we reduce the allowance for updating floodplain maps? There is currently a backlog in the number of maps which need to be updated, and it is estimated that it will cost over $700 million to address this backlog. This bill contains a modest start to addressing this backlog. I know the gentlewoman is aware that flooding causes more damage nationwide than any other type of natural disaster, so I do not think she would want us to stop this effort in order to fund a public awareness campaign.

This bill is full of difficult choices, Mr. Chairman. Sometimes programs have to be canceled to make room for other more worthy programs. The budget request made such a decision with regard to predisaster mitigation, but with the ultimate goal of developing a more robust and focused program with well-defined and prioritized objectives. I think we ought to wait for such a program to be proposed and carefully considered in the context of all of FEMA's programs. For this reason I oppose the amendment and ask my colleagues to oppose it also.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

The issues of FEMA and Project Impact come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on which I serve. Throughout the last administration I worked with FEMA and the White House to develop Project Impact. I think it has been a tremendous success.

Mitigation is the cornerstone of emergency management. Mitigation simply means efforts to lessen the impact of disasters on people and property. It keeps homes out of floodplains, designs bridges to withstand earthquakes, creates and enforces building codes to protect property from hurricanes, and many such creative initiatives all across the land.

It helps communities adapt their public facilities before disaster strikes in order to save lives, buildings and homes.

The gentlewoman has so well cited the case of Seattle, Washington. It has been a Project Impact city since 1997. Everyone participated in retrofitting homes, developing mapping projects for landslides and seismic vulnerability. Schools received funds to remove structural hazards and we saw what a success all of that was in the aftermath of the earthquake.

I understand that the issue of funding was not created by the chairman of the subcommittee. It is the Office of Management and Budget that chose to strike this funding from the budget in a move I just simply cannot understand.

I welcome the suggestion that the chairman made that the Director of FEMA would work with the Congress to develop a plan. He has never approached me with such a proposal. He has not come to my committee to my knowledge to propose such an initiative. I look forward to him doing so, but I want to see something more concrete than just a wish. Meanwhile, vote for the Capps amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, Project Impact really provides communities with the resources they need to combat natural disasters and make them less susceptible to future damages.

In my district, Stratford, Connecticut last year was hit by a devastating storm. It dumped 8 inches of rain in a 4-hour period. It resulted in over $5 million in damage.

East Haven, another town in my district, has a long history of flooding, constantly ravaged by hurricanes and tropical storms. Every time there is a rain storm families fear they are going to be displaced.

East Haven was awarded grant money to take a proactive approach to help keep flood insurance rates lower. The grant helps to pay for an early warning storm system. It helps to pay for storm shutters for residents' windows and other weather precautions.

We have all stood in the rain witnessing these disasters. We have all met the crying homeowners, but it is

not the loss of property that is important. It is the lost dreams. That is why we need to take steps to get people help in such unavoidable circumstances. Project Impact does just that. It is a common-sense program. It protects property and saves lives. It identifies ways to prevent future tragedies and reduce property damage.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Capps amendment.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for this amendment. I respect the gentleman from New York in talking about the difficult trade-offs that are being made and the prospects of having $400 million of other programs of mitigation.

The fact is we do not have to wait to develop a practical, effective program. For heaven's sakes, this is one of the show pieces of the last FEMA Director, James Lee Witt, who everyone acknowledges has done an outstanding job. In just 5 years, starting with seven pilot projects, this has grown around the country. I was stunned to address their national conference last fall. I interacted with 2,500 people from around the country, private partnerships, NASA, local government, private business, and we are going to throw this away to develop something new?

Mr. Chairman, this is what frustrates people about the Federal Government. When we have a winning program that everybody likes, that reaches down to the grass roots, that is voluntary in nature, that we do not have to guess whether or not it is effective, we would throw that away? I beg the gentleman to reconsider. We can find $25 million to keep this experience alive.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for the Capps amendment. The Peterson area became one of the first to participate in Project Impact, using a small amount of Federal funding provided by the program to leverage greater local funding, to retrofit schools, homes and small businesses. In the past 10 years FEMA has spent more than $20 billion to help communities repair and rebuild after natural disasters. Project Impact in contrast costs the Federal Government only $25 million. In this instance it likely saved several times that figure in the Seattle area by saving lives and preventing damage. We do not need the promise of a new program; we have a program. It is called Project Impact.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this House to pass the Capps amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing her amendment because it highlights the importance of this very good program: Project Impact. Unfortunately, the amendment comes in a context which makes it very difficult for us to consider. There are a lot of excellent programs funded in this emergency management and planning assistance account. There are preparedness activities, for example, and early warning systems; flood mapping, which is an extremely important program; other mitigation efforts; and grants to States.

This is simply a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul, of taking money from good projects to put them in another good project. I think the better time to consider this issue is in conference where the Senate has already funded this activity. I think then we will be in a much stronger position to consider the merits of Project Impact vis-a-vis the merits of these other programs.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the process, we simply do not have enough money to go around. Given that we are looking toward possible favorable consideration in conference, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment. Again, it is simply robbing Peter to pay Paul, taking money from very good programs to fund a very good program. We are not against Project Impact; it is simply the wrong point in the process to consider the amendment.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I come from a district which has had seven presidentially declared disasters. If there is anything that I have learned, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Everything we do in this country is to try to prevent injury and harm. One of the dumb things we do is keep going in after a disaster and allowing people to do the same old thing.

Mr. Chairman, this program gets people out of doing the same old thing that makes them involved in a disaster. I hope my colleagues march into conference very strongly supporting this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I would close by saying we had a budget that was $35 million less last year, and instituted this Project Impact at that time. It has proven to be cost effective. It is already proven. We do not need to decide how to do it. I urge my colleagues to consider if we do not implement this program in this budget at this time, we will lose valuable ground and all of the networking that is going on in so many communities like my own with plans already in place.

Mr. Chairman, these dollars have saved lives. We know that. They will continue to save lives. I urge support for this amendment and ask that Project Impact be continued.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Just in closing, I restate that there is support. The concept is a good one. What we would like to do is give the new Director of FEMA the opportunity to develop a program that can go through the authorizing committee and garner the full support of the membership, be well-thought out and, as we said earlier, more robust. There is merit to this concept, but do not make us make this choice between fire fighters or mapping or salaries and expenses for FEMA, which is already very, very tight.

Mr. Chairman, I would reluctantly urge all members to oppose the amendment.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues LOIS CAPPS and RICK LARSEN to earmark $25 million of the $404 million in FEMA's Emergency Management and Planning Assistance account to fund Project Impact.

As my colleagues are aware, Project Impact is a public-private partnership that funds emergency management preparation activities. It has been a relatively low cost way to save lives and prevent damage in the case of natural disasters and other emergencies. Created in 1997 by former FEMA Director James L. Witt, the program has helped 250 communities in all fifty states and the Insular Areas to prepare for and prevent disasters.

My home islands St. Croix has been a project impact site since 1998. As a direct result, the community has been extremely successful in both decreasing damages and injuries in the territory and reducing recovery costs to FEMA—in fact our efforts have been widely touted as a FEMA success story by the agency.

Mr. Chairman, the Capps/Larsen amendment and the Project Impact program deserves our support because it is a common sense approach to help our country deal with disasters. The increasing number and severity of natural disasters over the past decade demands that action be taken to reduce the threat of hurricanes, tornadoes, severe storms, flood and fires, which is where Project Impact comes in. It is unconscionable and very shortsighted in my opinion that this program was not included in this year's VA–HUD appropriations bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the Capps/Larsen amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Capps amendment to the VA–HUD Appropriations bill. This is a good amendment, and I applaud the gentlewoman from California, Ms. CAPPS, for offering it to a bill that clearly has missed the mark on its funding priorities.

The Capps amendment earmarks $25 million to the Emergency Management Planning and Assistance account to continue funding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Project Impact. This amendment restores

the amount of funding to Project Impact at the same level this body approved last year. For the more than 250 communities in all fifty states who participate in Project Impact, it is essential that the House approve this amendment. In the nearly four years that this program has been in existence, it has been a low cost way to save lives and prevent damage in the case of natural disasters and other emergencies.

For the State of Florida, Project Impact is needed and utilized. In fact, in my district, the City of Deerfield Beach has been a beneficiary of Project Impact since the Project's creation in 1997. In addition, Miami-Dade County, just two months ago, was recognized by Project Impact for the county's ongoing efforts in dealing with local emergencies. Tampa, Jacksonville, and Pensacola, as well as Brevard and Volusia Counties, all participate in Project Impact. Any cut in funding will be felt state-wide.

Fortunately, the hurricane season has been kind to Florida since Project Impact began to assist South Florida. Regardless, if we do not fund this program today, I fear what will occur next time a Hurricane Andrew sweeps across South Florida. While we may not see the effects of out budget cuts today, the effects of Hurricane Andrew, which destroyed South Florida nearly a decade ago, are still seen and felt by my constituents.

When Project Impact was founded in 1997, former FEMA Director James Lee Witt recognized the importance of preparing for a natural disaster. While giving a speech in Miami, he noted, ''We've got to change the way we deal with disasters. We have to break the damage-repair, damage-repair cycle. We need to have communities and businesses come together to reduce the cost and consequences of disasters.''

Mr. Chairman, we have got to change the way we deal with disasters. Too many communities today are inadequately prepared to deal with natural disasters. Contrary to what some may believe, failing to adequately fund Project Impact is not an effective tool in changing the way we deal with disasters. By not funding this needed program, we risk the lives of thousands throughout this great country. This is unacceptable, and for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to recognize the importance of Project Impact and support the Capps amendment.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Capps amendment, which would earmark $25 million for Project Impact, a FEMA program which helps communities establish pre-disaster hazard mitigation programs. Project Impact communities initiate mentoring relationships, private and public partnerships, public outreach, and disaster mitigation projects to reduce the damage from potentially devastating disasters.

South Florida is a wonderful place to live, but as you know, we are highly susceptible to hurricanes. The City of Deerfield Beach, Florida, has been diligently working to better prepare its residents for the next big hurricane by establishing a $42 million multi-purpose public service facility, or Mitigation of Operation Center (MOC). The MOC would serve as a shelter in the event of a natural disaster, and would house the City's Department of Public Works, Emergency Operations Center, Fire & Rescue Center, a Broward County Emergency Communications facility, and satellite facilities for the Broward County Sheriff's Office and Florida Atlantic University. The MOC would also include a water treatment facility.

FEMA designated the City of Deerfield Beach, Florida, as our country's first Project Impact Community. Since its designation as one of the seven pilot Project Impact communities in 1997, Deerfield Beach developed a strong Project Impact initiative with over 100 small and large partners, completed with risk assessment and mitigation strategy. In fact, on November 20, 2000, Deerfield Beach was again recognized by FEMA with a Model Community Award.

The residents of Deerfield Beach demonstrated the importance they place on hazard mitigation when they passed an $8 million bond issue in November, 1999, to build the MOC, one of the country's first. Another $22 million has been committed toward this project over the last few years to upgrade the City's water filtration facilities. Moreover, FEMA awarded Deerfield Beach with a Hazard Mitigation grant in the amount of $400,000.

An earmark of $25 million for Project Impact would greatly help the efforts of communities like Deerfield Beach to be pro-active toward emergency preparedness. I am proud of the city's leadership on this issue, and I am hopeful that this Congress will recognize the commitment of communities like Deerfield Beach by providing these important and necessary funds.

I urge you to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) will be postponed.

□ 2045

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND

The aggregate charges assessed during fiscal year 2002, as authorized by Public Law 106–377, shall not be less than 100 percent of the amounts anticipated by FEMA necessary for its radiological emergency preparedness program for the next fiscal year. The methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable; and shall reflect costs of providing such services, including administrative costs of collecting such fees. Fees received pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the Fund as offsetting collections and will become available for authorized purposes on October 1, 2002, and remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

To carry out an emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of Public Law 100–77, as amended, $140,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3½ percent of the total appropriation.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (''the Act''), the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended, not to exceed $28,798,000 for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations, and not to exceed $76,381,000 for flood mitigation, including up to $20,000,000 for expenses under section 1366 of the Act, which amount shall be available for transfer to the National Flood Mitigation Fund until September 30, 2003. In fiscal year 2002, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $536,750,000 for agents' commissions and taxes; and (3) $30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations.

In addition, up to $7,000,000 in fees collected but unexpended during fiscal years 2000 through 2001 shall be transferred to the Flood Map Modernization Fund and available for expenditure in fiscal year 2002.

Section 1309(a)(2) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)(2)), as amended, is further amended by striking ''2001'' and inserting ''2002''.

Section 1319 of the Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4026), is amended by striking ''after'' and all that follows and inserting ''after September 30, 2001.''.

Section 1336(a) of the Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4056(a)), is amended by striking ''ending'' and all that follows through the second comma thereafter and inserting ''ending September 30, 2001,''.

Section 1376(c) of the Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4127(c)), is amended by striking ''December 31, 2001'' and inserting ''December 31, 2002''.

NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND

Notwithstanding sections 1366(b)(3)(B)–(C) and 1366(f) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, $20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, for activities designed to reduce the risk of flood damage to structures pursuant to such Act, of which $20,000,000 shall be derived from the National Flood Insurance Fund. Of the amount provided, $2,500,000 is to be used for the purchase of flood-prone properties in the city of Austin, Minnesota, and any cost-share is waived.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER FUND

For necessary expenses of the Federal Consumer Information Center, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $7,276,000, to be deposited into the Federal Consumer Information Center Fund: *Provided*, That the appropriations, revenues, and collections deposited into the Fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Federal Consumer Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of $12,000,000. Appropriations, revenues, and collections accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2002 in excess of $12,000,000 shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the Federal Consumer Information Center (FCIC) may not undertake any action that affects its organization, administrative location, or in any way alters its current function or mission mandate without first submitting a proposal to the Committees on Appropriations for approval: *Provided further*, That such proposal shall include the justification for such action, a description of all planned organizational realignments, the anticipated staffing or personnel changes, an assessment of the effect on the current operations of FCIC, and estimates of the proposed changes on future funding needs

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of

human space flight research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, environmental compliance and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $20,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $7,047,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which amounts as determined by the Administrator for salaries and benefits; training, travel and awards; facility and related costs; information technology services; science, engineering, fabricating and testing services; and other administrative services may be transferred to the Science, Aeronautics and Technology account in accordance with section 312(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended by Public Law 106–377.

For an additional amount for ''Human space flight'', for the development of a crew return vehicle with capacity for no less than six persons, for use with the international space station, $275,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be obligated prior to August 1, 2002: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this paragraph shall be rescinded on July 15, 2002, unless the President requests at least $200,000,000 in the fiscal year 2003 budget request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for continuation of the crew return vehicle program.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science, aeronautics and technology research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization, and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, environmental compliance and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $20,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $7,605,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which amounts as determined by the Administrator for salaries and benefits; training, travel and awards; facility and related costs; information technology services; science, engineering, fabricating and testing services; and other administrative services may be transferred to the Human Space Flight account in accordance with section 312(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended by Public Law 106–377.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

In title III, under the heading ''NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION'', before the item relating to ''OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL'', insert the following:

REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS FOR INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION

The amounts otherwise provided in this title for the following accounts and activities are hereby reduced by the following amounts:

(1) ''Human Space Flight'', the aggregate amount specified in the first paragraph of such account, $1,531,300,000.

(2) ''Human Space Flight'', the amount specified in the second paragraph of such account for the development of a crew return vehicle, $275,000,000.

(3) ''Science, Aeronautics and Technology'', the aggregate amount, $343,600,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I have offered over the last several years that would eliminate all funding for the Space Station. I have done so over the last several years because this Space Station had an initial projected cost to the American taxpayers across this great country in 1984 of $8 billion.

Today, in 2001, the General Accounting Office has come out with a study that says the total cost of this Space Station, for launching, for engineering, for technology, for construction, is not going to be $8 billion, it is not going to be $80 billion, it is going to be over $100 billion, total cost to the American taxpayer.

That is a staggering sum of money. I would be the first one out there as a proponent for a Space Station if it was going to perform the great tasks that we envisioned, a stepping stone with a telescope, like Hubble, to help us understand the solar system, a telescope pointed to the Earth to help us with the environment, a stepping stone and a tether to other planets for exploration. Great scientific discoveries promised. It cannot do any of those things today. None of those things. But it has gone from $8 billion to over $100 billion.

I would say to my colleagues, if this was a welfare program, a public housing program, an education program, it would not be here today. It would have been canceled a long time ago, but it is not. It has got a lot of contractors out there building in some States, so it has been funded through the years.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues that even with the cost and the lack of science, that if we had a perfect budgetary situation and it was not starting to grow into other programs and hurting some other very good space programs, delaying and canceling them, I still might be for it. Or if we had not lost $40 billion in our projected surplus in the last month, I might be for it.

But this body needs to make tough decisions about what the priorities will be in spending, in cuts, in taxes; and we have got to make those decisions in the next few months. So I would hope this body will belly up and make some of these difficult decisions and not go around saying we can afford to fund every single program, especially this one, who in the last few months, NASA officials just announced that they had a $4 billion overrun, just announced for the next few years. $4 billion for the next few years.

This is the bill, ladies and gentlemen. We line item in this bill how much we will spend on housing, how much we will spend on aeronautics, how much we will spend on national science. We do not then say, you can go over by $4 billion, go do anything you want. The line items are there for a purpose. We have the job, our oversight, our responsibility, is to try to make sure these programs are run well.

The proponents on the other side of this I have the utmost respect for and served on the Committee on Science for several years with them, Members from Texas and Alabama and Virginia and Florida. I respect what they are doing, I respect the science that we are trying to achieve, and I like many of those Members personally that will be the proponents for this Space Station. But, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly hope that we can get the cost overruns under control so that this does not cannibalize the rest of very worthwhile NASA science programs and projects.

I will not offer this amendment for a vote. I have an amendment that will simply fence the total amount we spend on this project in the future that Senator MCCAIN has passed in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment and wait for future debate on the next amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $23,700,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Human space flight'', or ''Science, aeronautics and technology'' by this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations for construction of facilities as authorized by law, such amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended. This provision does not apply to the amounts appropriated for institutional minor revitalization

and construction of facilities, and institutional facility planning and design.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Human space flight'', or ''Science, aeronautics and technology'' by this appropriations Act, the amounts appropriated for construction of facilities shall remain available until September 30, 2004.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Office of Inspector General'', amounts made available by this Act for personnel and related costs and travel expenses of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall remain available until September 30, 2002 and may be used to enter into contracts for training, investigations, costs associated with personnel relocation, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year. Funds for announced prizes otherwise authorized shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the prize is claimed or the offer is withdrawn.

No funds in this or any other Appropriations Act may be used to finalize an agreement prior to December 1, 2002 between NASA and a nongovernment organization to conduct research utilization and commercialization management activities of the International Space Station.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 2002, gross obligations of the Central Liquidity Facility for the principal amount of new direct loans to member credit unions, as authorized by 12 U.S.C. 1795 et seq., shall not exceed $1,500,000,000: *Provided*, That administrative expenses of the Central Liquidity Facility shall not exceed $309,000: *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 shall be transferred to the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880–1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; authorized travel; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; $3,642,340,000, of which not to exceed $306,230,000 shall remain available until expended for Polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program; the balance to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the amount appropriated is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

MAJOR RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

For necessary expenses of major construction projects pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, including authorized travel, $135,300,000, to remain available until expended.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education and human resources programs and activities pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, authorized travel, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $885,720,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That to the extent that the amount of this appropriation is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $9,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $170,040,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under ''Salaries and expenses'' in fiscal year 2002 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $6,760,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), $105,000,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be for a homeownership program that is used in conjunction with section 8 assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4101–4118 for civilian employees; and not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses; $25,003,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever the President deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Where appropriations in titles I, II, and III of this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this provision does not apply to accounts that do not contain an object classification for travel: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System; to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to travel performed in connection with major disasters or emergencies declared or determined by the President under the provisions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to travel performed by the Offices of Inspector General in connection with audits and investigations; or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules: *Provided further*, That if appropriations in titles I, II, and III exceed the amounts set forth in budget estimates initially submitted for such appropriations, the expenditures for travel may correspondingly exceed the amounts therefor set forth in the estimates only to the extent such an increase is approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 402. Appropriations and funds available for the administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Selective Service System shall be available in the current fiscal year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 403. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

SEC. 404. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 405. No funds appropriated by this Act may be expended—

(1) pursuant to a certification of an officer or employee of the United States unless—

(A) such certification is accompanied by, or is part of, a voucher or abstract which describes the payee or payees and the items or services for which such expenditure is being made; or

(B) the expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law; and

(2) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office or is specifically exempt by law from such audit.

SEC. 406. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between the domicile and the place of employment of the officer or employee, with the exception of an officer or employee authorized such transportation under 31 U.S.C. 1344 or 5 U.S.C. 7905.

SEC. 407. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for payment, through grants or contracts, to recipients that do not share in the cost of conducting research resulting from proposals not specifically solicited by the Government: *Provided*, That the extent of cost sharing by the recipient shall reflect the mutuality of interest of the grantee or contractor and the Government in the research.

SEC. 408. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used, directly or through grants,

to pay or to provide reimbursement for payment of the salary of a consultant (whether retained by the Federal Government or a grantee) at more than the daily equivalent of the rate paid for level IV of the Executive Schedule, unless specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 409. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Nothing herein affects the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission pursuant to section 7 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 et seq.).

SEC. 410. Except as otherwise provided under existing law, or under an existing Executive Order issued pursuant to an existing law, the obligation or expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for contracts for any consulting service shall be limited to contracts which are: (1) a matter of public record and available for public inspection; and (2) thereafter included in a publicly available list of all contracts entered into within 24 months prior to the date on which the list is made available to the public and of all contracts on which performance has not been completed by such date. The list required by the preceding sentence shall be updated quarterly and shall include a narrative description of the work to be performed under each such contract.

SEC. 411. Except as otherwise provided by law, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be obligated or expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), for a contract for services unless such executive agency: (1) has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder; and (2) requires any report prepared pursuant to such contract, including plans, evaluations, studies, analyses and manuals, and any report prepared by the agency which is substantially derived from or substantially includes any report prepared pursuant to such contract, to contain information concerning: (A) the contract pursuant to which the report was prepared; and (B) the contractor who prepared the report pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 412. Except as otherwise provided in section 406, none of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency.

SEC. 413. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in 15 U.S.C. 2001 with an EPA estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon.

SEC. 414. None of the funds appropriated in title I of this Act shall be used to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental is more than $300,000 unless the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits a report which the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress and a period of 30 days has expired following the date on which the report is received by the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 415. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 416. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to implement any cap on reimbursements to grantees for indirect costs, except as published in Office of Management and Budget Circular A–21.

SEC. 417. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2002 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 418. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 419. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2002 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 420. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term ''qualified student loan'' with respect to national service education awards shall mean any loan determined by an institution of higher education to be necessary to cover a student's cost of attendance at such institution and made directly to a student by a state agency, in addition to other meanings under section 148(b)(7) of the National and Community Service Act.

SEC. 421. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to promulgate a final regulation to implement changes in the payment of pesticide tolerance processing fees as proposed at 64 Fed. Reg. 31040, or any similar proposals. The Environmental Protection Agency may proceed with the development of such a rule.

SEC. 422. The Environmental Protection Agency may not use any of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to implement the Registration Fee system codified at 40 Code of Federal Regulations Subpart U (sections 152.400 et seq.) if its authority to collect maintenance fees pursuant to FIFRA section 4(i)(5) is extended for at least one year beyond September 30, 2001.

SEC. 423. Except in the case of entities that are funded solely with Federal funds or any natural persons that are funded under this Act, none of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties to lobby or litigate in respect to adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act. A chief executive officer of any entity receiving funds under this Act shall certify that none of these funds have been used to engage in the lobbying of the Federal Government or in litigation against the United States unless authorized under existing law.

SEC. 424. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

SEC. 425. All Departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding, to expand their use of ''E-Commerce'' technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 426. Section 104(n)(4) of the Cerro Grande Fire Assistance Act (Public Law 106–246) is amended by striking ''beginning not later than the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.'' and inserting in lieu thereof, ''within 120 days after the Director issues the report required by subsection (n) in 2002 and 2003.''.

Mr. WALSH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, through page 93, line 25, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. BISHOP:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

Subtitle B of title VI of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5197–5197g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 629. MINORITY EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish a minority emergency preparedness demonstration program to research and promote the capacity of minority communities to provide data, information, and awareness education by providing grants to or executing contracts or cooperative agreements with eligible nonprofit organizations to establish and conduct such programs.

''(b) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—An eligible nonprofit organization may use a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section—

''(1) to conduct research into the status of emergency preparedness and disaster response awareness in African American and Hispanic households located in urban, suburban, and rural communities, particularly in those States and regions most impacted by natural and manmade disasters and emergencies; and

''(2) to develop and promote awareness of emergency preparedness education programs within minority communities, including development and preparation of culturally competent educational and awareness materials that can be used to disseminate information to minority organizations and institutions.

''(c) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.—A nonprofit organization is eligible to be awarded a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section with respect to a program if the organization is a nonprofit organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code, whose primary mission is to provide services to communities predominately populated by minority citizens, and that can demonstrate a partnership with a minority-owned business enterprise or minority business located in a HUBZone (as defined in section 3(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p))) with respect to the program.

''(d) USE OF FUNDS.—A recipient of a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section may only use the proceeds of the grant, contract, or agreement to—

''(1) acquire expert professional services necessary to conduct research in communities predominately populated by minority citizens, with a primary emphasis on African American and Hispanic communities;

''(2) develop and prepare informational materials to promote awareness among minority communities about emergency preparedness and how to protect their households and communities in advance of disasters;

''(3) establish consortia with minority national organizations, minority institutions of higher education, and faith-based institutions to disseminate information about emergency preparedness to minority communities; and

''(4) implement a joint project with a minority serving institution, including a part B institution (as defined in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2))), an institution described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 326 of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1063b(e)(1)(A), (B), or (C)), and a Hispanic-serving institution (as defined in section 502(a)(5) of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)(5))).

''(e) APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCEDURE.—To be eligible to receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section, an organization must submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Director may reasonably require. The Director shall establish a procedure by which to accept such applications.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,500,000 for fiscal year 2002 and such funds as may be necessary for fiscal years 2003 through 2007. Such sums shall remain available until expended.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their hard work on this bill and also the Chair and ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the committee which has the authorizing jurisdiction.

I stand before Members today to ask for their support for my amendment to the VA–HUD appropriations bill. My amendment appropriates no additional funds. It only authorizes the use of existing funds for an important program. In substance, it authorizes the director of FEMA to establish a minority emergency preparedness demonstration program utilizing grants, contracts and agreements with community-based 501(c)3 nonprofit corporations. The program will allow the nonprofits to research the status of emergency preparedness in minority households in urban, rural and suburban communities and to enhance emergency and disaster response preparedness. It would authorize the director to provide grants or to execute contracts and cooperative agreements with eligible nonprofit corporations to establish and to conduct these programs.

Mr. Chairman, in just this past year, 51 disasters were declared in 33 different States. In fact, this year already 23 disasters have already been declared in 22 different States. These disasters include tornadoes, winter storms, floods, spring storms, earthquakes, and ice storms. Unfortunately, these numbers do not include the hundreds of fires that occur annually. According to FEMA, the impact on minority communities is 2½ times more than on any other group.

It is my hope that all people in high-risk circumstances will benefit from this program which will document and make available information about the dangers that are present in different locations as well as the practical guidance on how to protect against these disasters. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I think it is good for America and it is good for the people.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and thank him for this amendment. The amendment would establish a new program within FEMA for the purpose of increasing the awareness of disaster preparedness needs within minority communities. He has very well stated the need. This is an amendment that we have checked with the chairman of the authorizing committee and the appropriate subcommittee Chair. They are in agreement that this is a good amendment.

While FEMA has existing programs structured to raise the general awareness within all communities of the need to prepare for disasters, I agree with the gentleman that focusing on special populations may be necessary. It is for this reason that I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and urge its adoption.

□ 2100

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to applaud the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for offering this amendment which establishes a Minority Emergency Preparedness Demonstration Program at FEMA.

In my home State of California, we have experienced more than our fair share of natural disasters, earthquakes, floods, fires and what have you, over the past decade. We are still recovering from the pain and devastation created by the Northridge Earthquake back in 1994. Minority communities like the one I represent need more information to help them prepare for these sorts of disasters. After Northridge, many people were left homeless. FEMA did an outstanding job of helping our community, but I think a Minority Emergency Preparedness Program could do even more, if this were funded through FEMA.

People in minority communities are often more heavily impacted by these types of disasters. People often live in poorly designed housing and have limited access to emergency preparedness materials that are printed in their own language. It makes sense to have information available to them in their own language. This would provide assistance to Latinos, Asian Americans, and African Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent amendment. It gives us an opportunity to really reach out to those communities that have been so severely impacted with natural disasters and emergency situations. I believe that this will be a real opportunity for our government to be user friendly to the individuals and to the communities that often bear the brunt of the worst that nature has to offer.

I would ask that we support this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member of the committee, as well as the chairman and ranking members of the authorizing committees for their cooperation and support. We appreciate that very much; and we think that when we have completed our work on this bill, we will have done a day's work for the people of America. I urge passage.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, after having consulted with my ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), we agree this is a constructive amendment, that it is a positive idea, that it helps the bill, and we accept it. We urge its adoption.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Representative SANFORD BISHOP's amendment to authorize FEMA

to establish a minority emergency preparedness demonstration program, under which funding would be provided to eligible non-profit organizations to conduct research into the state of preparedness and disaster response awareness in African American and Hispanic households.

A number of my constituents in Watts, Compton, Lynwood, and Long Beach are minorities who have been affected by natural disasters. There is an ever-present threat of an earthquake and the looming potential of floods. It is essential that they have contingency plans based on timely information in order to prepare for potential disasters. It is critical that funding be made available to determine the degree to which communities of color are aware of and prepared to respond to impending disaster. I offer my support to my colleague for this very timely amendment, and commend him for his foresight.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

At the end of the bill, after the last section (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement or administer the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), to prevent the Veterans Administration from using the existing Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation formula to allocate veterans medical dollars across the country. This is the 3rd year in a row that I have offered this amendment with the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

In 1997, Congress passed legislation that authorized the VA to develop a new formula for allocating veterans medical care dollars across the Nation. The resulting formula, VERA, has not worked as intended. VERA has had a terrible effect of restricting access to veterans medical care in my part of the Northeast, including my district in New Jersey, which is part of Veterans Integrated Service Network, or VISN, 3. This network, which serves parts of New York and New Jersey, has borne the brunt of this funding shift. According to the VA's own figures, funding for VISN 3 has been reduced by 6 percent or $64 million at a time when most other networks have received funding increases.

New Jersey has the second oldest veterans population in the Nation behind Florida. Our State has the fourth highest number of complex-care patients treated at our hospitals. Yet New Jersey's older, sicker veterans are routinely left waiting months for visits to primary care physicians and specialists or are denied care at our two VA nursing homes.

Something is fundamentally wrong with the VERA allocation formula if it continues to decrease funding for areas where veterans have the greatest medical needs. All veterans, regardless of where they live, have earned and deserve access to the same quality of medical care, care that is too often denied under the current formula.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to withdraw this amendment today, but this issue must be addressed.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member seeking time in opposition to this amendment?

If not, the gentleman from New Jersey still has time remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN, along with New York Representative MAURICE HINCHEY, have been tireless crusaders for the rights of our nation's veterans, and this amendment highlights this fact by forcing the VA to abandon its flawed funded formula for providing for the health care needs of America's veterans.

Under the current system, VERA bases its resource allocation on sending more dollars to areas where there are more veterans—not where the needs are the greatest.

While that may sound rationale—the result has been horrendous for areas of the country like Queens and the Bronx, which I represent.

The facts bare out that increasingly more VA dollars are going to the South and Southwest portions of the country were more veterans live—veterans who are often younger and healthier.

The result is less resources in the areas of the country, like New York City, where the veterans are older, sicker, and in more desperate need of care.

I heard a story from a constituent regarding a VA hospital he saw while on vacation in Florida. It was a state of the art facility, with plenty of doctors and nurses on call—and no patients.

He and his wife informed me that the place was virtually empty—but that facility had the best money can buy.

In New York City, meanwhile, we continue to see lay-offs of the professional doctors and nurses at our VA hospitals and clinics; long lines for care; and a far too high ratio of nurses per patient.

I am not saying that we should deprive our veterans in the South and Southwest part of the country their fair share of resources; all we ask for this amendment is that the VA provide equal treatment and resources to all veterans regardless of where they reside.

It is a shame that the VERA system has pitted veterans in one region of the country versus veterans in other regions.

Therefore, I am supportive of the Frelinghuysen amendment to prohibit any Federal funds from implementing or administering the VERA system.

I ask all of my colleagues from throughout the Nation to support this amendment that has caused so much pain for so many veterans.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

My congressional district in southern Nevada has the fastest growing veteran population in the country.

The medical facilities in my district have seen a 24.4 percent increase in the number of veterans that they serve over the past year. This is a phenomenal increase.

Unfortunately, veterans programs in southern Nevada do not receive sufficient funding to provide all the services that veterans need and this shortfall in funding has had a negative impact on the delivery of veterans health care services.

Clinics are short-staffed and veterans are still waiting far too long for medical appointments. Demands for veteran health care services in southern Nevada is increasing faster than the availability for facilities and providers. We need more resources.

The VERA system is a fair and equitable way to ensure that the distribution of VA funds is consistent with the distribution of the veterans population.

The implementation of this system is an essential step forward in the continued improvement of our VA health care system.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman I want to commend the gentleman for his strong advocacy on behalf of Veterans Networks that have a rapidly aging population and an aging infrastructure to maintain. The VA in the State of New Jersey has the tough challenge of providing quality health care services to a veterans population that is the second oldest on average in the Nation. And unlike many other States that have older populations, New Jersey has an aging health care infrastructure that is proven costly to maintain and to operate.

As the gentleman knows, we have been working for some time to find solutions to this problem so that our veterans are not shortchanged by VERA.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for his comments.

As the gentleman knows, I and nearly 30 of my colleagues have introduced legislation to address the problem of resource allocation within the VA health care system. Many of us believe that areas of the country with the high cost of living have been unfairly disadvantaged under the existing resource allocation formula. I also know that the gentleman is working on several VA health care initiatives that are designed to improve the VA health care system to provide better service for our veterans.

My question is, what is the best way to ensure that veterans health services, particularly specialty care services like spinal cord injury treatment, are adequately maintained for all of our veterans, and not just those in certain parts of our country?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I do thank my friend from New Jersey for his excellent question. I believe, like the gentleman does, that a veteran is a veteran is a veteran, no matter in what part of the country he or she happens to reside. As the gentleman knows, in some of our networks, there has been an erosion in certain specialty care services. For example, in 1996, we required the VA to maintain a certain level of capacity in specialized programs. We now know that despite this Congressional requirement, specialty care bed capacity has been reduced by as much as 65 percent.

I wish to reassure the gentleman that, in fact, I am working, as chairman of the full Committee on Veterans Affairs, on a comprehensive VA health care improvement and capacity restoration bill. Once that bill is finalized and I have a chance to share that proposal with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), I believe he and others will find that it will appropriately and compassionately address many of the concerns which the gentleman has raised so adequately on the floor today.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments and for his leadership, as well as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in supporting this amendment. VERA, the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation plan, is badly in need of what my colleague from New Jersey attempts to do with this, and my colleague from New York.

Under the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation plan, I have witnessed the results of cuts that have effectively removed hundreds of millions of dollars from the lower New York area veterans network.

VERA is fundamentally flawed. These flaws permeate VERA's methodology, its implementation, and the VA's oversight of this new spending plan.

The veteran's network in our area has the oldest veterans population, the highest number of veterans with spinal cord injuries, the highest number of veterans suffering from mental illness, the highest incidence of hepatitis C in its veterans population, and the highest number of homeless veterans.

It is inconceivable and intolerable that the VA would continually reduce our region's funding.

VISN 3 has required reserve funding for the last 4 years because our veterans hospitals keep running out of money.

When will we realize that the VA should fund our hospitals properly the first time and leave reserve funds for emergencies?

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment and make the investment in our veterans hospitals necessary to keep our promise to our veterans. The veterans of this Nation were there is our time of need. We ought to do the same for them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Frelinghuysen amendment, for the third year in a row.

Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today in strong support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) which would prohibit funds in the bill from being used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement or administer the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation (VERA) system. Unfortunately this has turned into a regional legislative battle between northeastern states and especially low-population Great Plains and Rocky Mountain states' delegations on one hand, and on the other hand the Sunbelt states with their larger numbers of veterans retirees. Those of us representing the former see our veterans left out in the cold while the money flows to the populace Sunbelt states. Once again, we may be out-voted but it certainly isn't fair to veterans in our states.

From the time the Clinton Administration announced this new system, this Member has voiced his strong opposition to VERA because of its inherent flaws in inequitable distribution of funds, and has supported funding levels of the VA Health Administration above the amount the Clinton Administration recommended.

This Member is proud to have supported the increases in funding which Congress has provided for veterans health care recent years. However, the veterans health care system in Nebraska continues to experience growing service and funding shortfalls each year even after the forced closing of two of our three inpatient facilities, reducing the number of full time employees fourteen percent and completing integration of all three VA Medical centers. In fiscal year 1999, the VISN 14 area—consisting of Nebraska and Iowa experienced a $6 million shortfall. In fiscal year 2000, the shortfall was $17 million. In fiscal year 2001, the shortfall was $48 million. For the short-term, the VA Central Office has provided VISN 14 with a $32 million loan, which it will be required to repay, and a $16 million grant. While VISN 14 continues to experience growing shortfalls in funding, the number of patients continues to increase.

Clearly the VERA system has had a very negative impact on Nebraska and other sparsely populated areas of the country. All members of Congress should agree, Mr. Chairman, that the VA must provide adequate services and facilities for veterans all across the country regardless of whether they live in sparsely populated areas with resultant low usage numbers for VA hospitals. The funding distribution unfairly reallocates the VA's health care budget based strictly on a per capita veterans usage of facilities. There must be at least a basic level of acceptable national infrastructure of facilities, medical personnel, and services for meeting the very real medical needs faced by our veterans wherever they live. There must be a threshold funding level for VA medical services in each state and region before any per-capita funding formula is applied. That is only common sense, but the Clinton Administration had too little of that valuable commodity when it comes to treating veterans in our part of the country humanely and equitably.

In closing Mr. Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to support the Frelinghuysen amendment and fulfill the obligation to provide care to those who have so honorably served our country—no matter where they live in these United States of America.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) for his passionate advocacy on behalf of our Nation's veterans and veterans in his district. I am sympathetic to his concerns about VERA, being myself from the Northeast.

This is not an easy issue for every Member from the Northeast or Midwest, many of whom have a concern about the impact of medical dollars moving to growing regions. We hear from colleagues representing the South and the Southwest worried that not enough is being provided in their regions.

So I am hopeful that the new VA Secretary will give some attention to this issue, and that, together, we can find a solution. I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my leader on the subcommittee for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is bad enough that the veterans health care budget submitted by the Bush Administration is woefully inadequate to meet the needs of our veterans across the country, but because of the computer formula known as VERA, veterans in New York and other States will suffer disproportionately.

VERA and the inadequate funding levels in this bill will guarantee cuts in health care for many veterans across the country. While VERA purports to provide equitable health care in all regions, without question it has lowered the quality of care in many places. VERA is not equitable or fair to veterans in many parts of the country.

Since 1995, in the Hudson Valley Health Care System, area which serves part of New York, we have seen the following: there has been a cut in the number of employees by 34 percent; beds have been cut by 52 percent; while the number of unique patients has increased by 76 percent; and the number of visits has increased by 84 percent.

Despite increasing enrollment, our share of resources continues to shrink under VERA. VISN 3 and the region that I represent treats older and sicker veterans more so than any other VISN in the country. They have the highest fuel costs in the Nation, by far. We have the highest reported incidence of hepatitis C in the Nation and are treating the greatest number of hepatitis C patients, and have the highest rate of homeless veterans. VERA does not account for any of these costs.

Despite the cuts in services and efforts to maximize operating efficiencies, we are still facing even more funding shortfalls in this part of the country. All the cuts in personnel and facilities that can be conceived of have been made in our region, yet VA facilities are facing a $32 million shortfall in the Hudson Valley area of New York, while VISN 3 as a whole is facing a $160 million shortfall.

Under VERA, every year is a funding emergency, forcing us to beg for additional funding to address these shortfalls. This year, 4 VISNs are receiving emergency funds because of inadequacies in this VERA formula. My region, number 3, is receiving $64 million, far short of what is needed. Because of VERA and this year's inadequate budget, it is an absolute certainty we will need emergency funding to get through this next year.

While those being injured the most under VERA are those who reside in the Northeast and Midwest areas of our country, other regions have suffered in the past and may do so again under VERA in the immediate future. In fiscal year 2002, the losses would include VISNs serving the following regions: the Bronx, New York; Ann Arbor, Michigan; Chicago, Illinois; Long Beach, California; Baltimore, Maryland; Phoenix Arizona; Albany New York; and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

□ 2115

Our veterans should not be penalized because of where they live, but as long as the Veterans' Administration is allocating resources in the name of this VERA formula, we will continue to have these inadequacies and injustices that do a great disservice to veterans in my part of the country and in many others.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. WAXMAN:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement any provision of the April 2001 report entitled ''Plan for the Development of a 25-Year General Use Plan for Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Healthcare Center''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

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

This is a noncontroversial amendment clarifying that an April 2001 report entitled ''The Plan for the Development of a 25–Year General Use Plan'' for the VA West Los Angeles Health Care Center is a preliminary plan in the development of a master plan for the lands on that property. There is concern about the status of this preliminary plan because it contains some controversial provisions strongly opposed by the local residents, community groups, and public officials. This might have been avoided, but no local, county, and State officials, and only a very small number of community organizations in the area were allowed to participate in the process to develop this plan. The West L.A. VA also opposes parts of the plan.

The VA will make its decisions for the future use of the West L.A. VA lands under the existing CARES (Capital Assessment Realignment for Enhanced Services) process that was initiated in 1999. Under this process, the VA will conduct a detailed analysis of VA property throughout the country to determine the best option for serving veterans in each area.

This amendment would bar the use of Federal funds to implement any of the April 2001 plan's provisions. Its intent is simply to clarify that it is only a preliminary report and that this final plan for use of the land will be developed under the CARES process.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing controversial about this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, but I am not in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a noncontroversial amendment. We have discussed this with the gentleman. The request is to put the implementation of this study on hold until there is more input from the community and with the local representatives. We would be prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. RANGEL:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 4____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the requirement under section 12(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437j(c); relating to community service).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

The amendment would strike the funding for the redundant provision that is in the 1998 Public Housing Act that requires tenants in public housing to do community work. It has taken about 3 years for HUD to put together the regulations in order to guide this, and HUD does not oppose the striking of the funds that are imposed upon the tenants in public housing, because there is no other provisions for other people that receive Federal funds to do this type of thing.

In addition to it, the local and State communities are all working hard under the welfare reform legislation to see that people who are able to work can work, and it is an unfunded mandate, and I am certain that HUD could be using the funds for other purposes. I understand the authorizing committee has no objections to this.

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prevent any HUD funding to be used to implement the community service requirements that we passed as part of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998. As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I worked with my colleagues on this provision and know it to be very fair with a great deal of flexibility for those subject to it.

This amendment seeks to reverse an important initiative that was part of

our welfare reform effort. In approving the Community Service Initiative, we sought to create a mutuality of obligation between the provider of the housing and the recipient of the housing. This obligation is not overwhelming, it only calls for 8 hours a month of assistance from the resident; that is only 2 hours a week. It is a very flexible requirement.

The initiative was crafted to have no real limits to what can be considered community service so that it can be satisfied by planting and maintaining a garden, voter registration efforts, or can be work with the big brothers or big sisters programs. Under the language of the provision we give the individual Housing Authorities full authority to make the determination for what is an allowable activity.

This initiative enjoys bipartisan support and was not only supported by the Clinton administration, it was included in former President Clinton's own public housing reform proposal which he sent to the Hill prior to our consideration of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998.

Who is required to comply with this initiative? Residents of public housing who have the time. The language of the law clearly exempts the elderly, the disabled, the employed, those who are in school, and/or are receiving training, those in a family receiving assistance under a State program, and those who are involved in the welfare reform program. With all of those exceptions, who is left? Individuals who are unemployed, those who have dropped out of school, those who are fully capable and have the time to give something back to the communities in which they live.

What happens if these individuals choose not to comply with this community service provision? They are not immediately tossed out on the street. However, noncompliance can be grounds for nonrenewal of the public housing lease at the end of the 12-month lease term, which can lead to eviction.

This issue comes down to one of personal responsibility. This was a major theme of the welfare reform laws we successfully changed. President Clinton signed those laws; they were good laws. This is one of them. The language from the Senate committee report seems to best sum up, and I am quoting: they say, ''The provision is not intended to be perceived as punitive, but rather considered as a rewarding activity that will assist residents in improving their own and their neighbors' economic and social well-being and give residents a greater stake in their communities.''

In recent years we have made great progress in an effort to reform welfare and reform public housing. This initiative has a strong link in this effort. Recently, I saw residents of the Housing Authority of New Orleans buildings outside cleaning up yards after the weekend. They were patrolling areas that might not otherwise have been clean. They would have been filled with trash. They told me, the residents who were cleaning them up, that they had been cleaning a lot of trash up. Now the yards are clean on a Monday morning, the children are outside playing in the grassy areas, grandmas are walking their grandchildren around, helping them learn to ride their bikes.

Mr. Chairman, this initiative works. I think we have to preserve the community service provisions of the 1998 Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to please consider this opposition to the Rangel amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from New York is right in dealing with the exceptions that are under this law. After we get finished with all of that, the only people that are left are the elderly, working families, and the disabled, and those who are in school.

This is not a part of welfare reform. We have legislation that deals with welfare reform. We have legislation that deals with communities and States that require working for those people who are able to work. This is the only type of allowing the indignity of putting this type of burden on poor folks in public housing when there is no such requirement for any other type of Federal assistance, including Section 8.

Now, HUD knew how difficult it would be for them to superimpose their standards on the welfare standards. This is a housing bill; this is not a welfare reform bill. That is the reason that they took so long in getting these regulations that are almost unenforceable, and that is the reason why they do not object to having this stricken from the record.

Mr. Chairman, we have cut a lot of good services out of the HUD programs to be able to give assistance to kids to get education and recreation and to avoid drug addiction. But this is also an unfunded mandate that forces the public housing people to take a look at this and to put this burden on people when we have the cities departments of welfare, the State departments of welfare to do it. The Housing Authority is no place to enforce the welfare laws.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I had a conversation with the gentleman prior to this debate. I had no knowledge that anyone on our side would oppose him and based on the conversation we had and right at this very moment, I still feel that this is an amendment that I can support. The agency from New York, in conversation with the gentleman, has agreed with him on this. So I continue to support the gentleman's amendment and I would be prepared to accept it.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Rangel amendment.

This is an amendment that respects the dignity of public housing residents.

In 1998 the Congress passed legislation that essentially says that public housing residents aren't as good as other Americans.

It requires residents to fulfill community service because they receive the benefit of public housing.

Mr. Chairman, this provision was mean spirited when it was passed and we should overturn it today.

Residents of public housing do receive a government benefit. In that way they are similarly situated to hundreds of millions of other Americans.

They receive a benefit just as home owners are allowed to deduct mortgage interest from their taxes.

They receive a benefit just as FHA and VA home loans receive a benefit.

They certainly do not receive a benefit as great as those that huge multinational corporations are granted on taxes from federal, state, and local governments.

I could stand on the floor of this House and name thousands of special interests that receive some sort of special government benefit because they have been determined to be worthy of such treatment by Congress.

Just as many of these residents are moving from welfare to work we have singled out public housing residents has having to justify themselves by completing community service.

We should be ashamed of such shoddy treatment of people with lower incomes.

How will we administer this mess of a requirement?

In New York City, NYCHA administers housing for 426,000 residents—30 percent of whom are elderly.

This community service requirement, even with exemptions for the elderly, will require a huge amount of resources to monitor compliance.

In the context of a housing bill that already under funds housing—administration will simply take additional much needed resources away from where they are needed.

This is truly meddling by the federal government in the affairs of local citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and repeal this belittling requirement of public housing residents.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 40 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill (preceding the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

The trade deficit in America has risen to $30 billion a month. It now approaches close to $360 billion a year. That is unbelievable. I think the least that we can do is wherever possible in expending Federal dollars, and certainly there are quite a few dollars being expended in this bill, would be to look for the probability and the possibility of spending those funds on American-made goods.

This amendment not only does that, but it would disallow and prohibit anyone who is violating the Buy American law from being eligible for grant money under the bill.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment. We are very much prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2130

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

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

I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their hard work in putting this bill together.

I rise for the purpose of engaging the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy.

Given the subcommittee's overall funding allocation, the task of the chairman and the ranking member was a daunting one, to say the least. This bill funds many of our Nation's priorities: veterans, housing, the environment, FEMA, NASA, and science.

Unfortunately, the subcommittee's overall allocation was too low to meet all of these priorities. One of those underfunded priorities in this bill is clean water.

I was prepared to offer an amendment tonight to restore funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund back to its current-year level. Our country's water infrastructure and environmental needs are not diminishing. In fact, EPA's own estimates show that our local communities are facing a $330 billion gap in water infrastructure investments over the next 20 years. Now is not the time to reduce the Federal commitment to these communities.

Mr. Chairman, the State Revolving Funds are an important financing tool that helps them meet their growing clean water needs. I want to commend NUCA, the American Oceans Campaign, the Sierra Club, NRDC, the League of Conservation Voters, and others for helping to highlight our country's environmental and infrastructure needs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and his staff for agreeing to work to increase the overall funding for the Clean Water SRF as this bill goes to conference with the other body.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for raising this important issue, and I remain committed to work to increase the allocation for the Clean Water SRF as we go to conference with the Senate. I agree that our communities face growing environmental and infrastructure challenges, and we must maintain our Federal commitment to them. It is the right thing to do for our environment as well as the economic development of these communities.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for a colloquy.

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

I just wanted to continue along the venue the gentleman had with the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER). I just wanted to commend the chairman for his personal interest and leadership in helping us zero in on these issues dealing with water and infrastructure.

I am particularly interested in the gentleman's willingness to work with us on the State Revolving Fund, because this is an area that, from my perspective, ought to be able to bring together a wide variety of opinions because of the fact that it is a revolving fund that deals with loans rather than grants; that requires more of an investment from local communities; the fact that for some instances where people do not have the start-up money, it actually is better than a grant, and that it has money over time.

I want to express my appreciation for the gentleman's focus on this and offer any help that I can give to help reinforce this as it works its way through the legislative process, because it means so much to the livability of our communities.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman for his thoughts on this issue, Mr. Chairman. I spoke earlier on the Barcia amendment. I know he feels very strongly, as do I. There is a tremendous, tremendous void out there in our ability to deal with combined sewer overflows, with clean water issues throughout the country.

Clearly, the Congress needs to step up and take this issue on head on. We are looking for direction from the authorizing committee. I would be more than happy to work with the gentleman to help to reorder some of the priorities, because this is something that I certainly rely on in my community, and I know the gentleman does. There is broad interest throughout the Congress on this. I thank the gentleman for his interest.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for a colloquy.

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

I join my colleague in supporting the increased funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Investment in wastewater infrastructure may not be a glamorous issue, but it is a fundamental component of efforts across the country to create and maintain livable communities.

The Clean Water State Revolving Fund has been the Federal Government's primary and most effective tool in helping communities meet wastewater and infrastructure needs. The needs are enormous. Even under the most conservative estimates, we are still not investing enough in wastewater infrastructure. We wonder how our water gets dirty. We need to fix our wastewater problems.

The EPA estimates that we face over $300 billion of wastewater infrastructure needs over the next 20 years. New figures have been coming out showing significantly higher figures. The longer we wait to address these needs, the worse the problem will become. It is imperative that we do everything we can now to assist our communities in building environmental infrastructure.

I commend the chairman for putting in funding for the State Revolving Fund which is significantly higher than the level proposed by the administration, but I do believe that an even higher funding level will be necessary in the coming years.

I offered, with my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, a bill, H.R. 668, which calls for $3 billion in funding for the State Revolving Fund. I do understand the constraints faced by the chairman in funding the many programs in this bill; but I hope, at the very minimum, that we will be able to reach the fiscal year 2001 level of $1.35 billion in this bill.

I look forward to working with the chairman and trying to achieve a funding level in this bill that more accurately represents the tremendous needs of our communities across the Nation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her strong support for this program and for her leadership in helping to make the Hudson River fishable, swimmable, and even more beautiful than we found it.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—

(1) to obligate amounts for the International Space Station in contravention of the cost limitations established by section 202 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106–391; 42 U.S.C. 2451 note); or

(2) to defer or cancel construction of the Habitation Module, Crew Return Vehicle, or Propulsion Module elements of the International Space Station.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would start off by explaining to this prestigious body what this amendment does do and what it does not do.

First of all, what it does not do: it does not eliminate funding for the Space Station. This is not a killer Space Station amendment. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a fencing, a capping amendment.

This simply states, and it reiterates what they have done in the United States Senate, language offered by Senator MCCAIN, and passing the Senate, that there will be $25 billion allocated for the life of the Space Station for construction costs, $17 billion for Space Station shuttle launch costs, for a total of $42 billion, $42 billion.

Mr. Chairman, where I come from and where most Americans come from, that is a lot of money. That is not a killer amendment. That is just simply saying, you guys have to build the Space Station for this cost, and you cannot continue to go over it with inefficiencies and delays and overruns, because that hurts other precious programs: housing programs for our poor, feeding programs for our hungry, education programs for our children. We are going to be fighting for every dollar we can get this fall in our budget.

I would say to the Members, $42 billion, is that enough? Is that enough, when we have 18 percent of our children in this country in poverty? When we have some soldiers who are on food stamps, is $42 billion enough? We will see.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer this amendment is because, according to a Bush administration Office of Management and Budget document, here is what they say about the international Space Station: ''Recent cost growth on the Space Station is estimated at approximately $1 billion for 2001 and 2002 and $4 billion for the next 5 years.'' That is recent cost growth. That is a total of $5 billion in recent cost growth.

Mr. Chairman, that is Washington parlance, for those out there, saying that we have a humongous cost overrun, $5 billion. So that is why we are saying that we have to fence the money, $42 billion they have in NASA to spend on the Space Station, and that is it.

Now, we will probably have some proponents say, well, that is not enough. What if we go over by $3 billion or another $10 billion? No other program gets that latitude. We do not have education programs that come back to the Government and say, well, we had more hungry kids in the school lunch program, Mr. Congressman. Can you give us another $5 billion? It does not happen. It happens here. So what we are saying, like the Senate said, put a fence around it and cap the costs.

I continue, Mr. Chairman, to be very worried about this program. We continue to be very concerned about it because the science is dwindling. Instead of sending up scientists to the Space Station, we are sending up tourists to the Space Station. We need people, if they are going to be up there, performing the kind of science that will help our citizens and lead to good discoveries to cure people of disease, rather than selling the Space Station to the highest bidder, $15 million today, $25 million tomorrow. We cannot afford to do that. That tourist takes up valuable space that we need to perform science.

Mr. Chairman, the science is dwindling; the cost is going through the roof. Let me read to the Members what scientists are saying about the Space Station.

In Florida Today on June 16 of this year, they said, ''Now, a year since construction began in earnest on the station, it is still hard to find a scientist outside of NASA who expects much progress from the station research.''

Robert Park, a researcher for the American Physical Society, says this: ''It is impossible to name a field of science that has been changed or even altered by this kind of research. You finally end up with a Space Station that does not do science.''

I can go on. Kenneth Baldwin, with the Department of Biophysics at the University of California, says, ''If you are going to use the justification for the Space Station to have science as the primary product, should you continue to build up and maintain it with a 3-person crew when you cannot have any science?''

Mr. Chairman, I am going to shortly reserve some of my time and come back after we hear from some of the proponents of the Space Station who have some good and compelling arguments. But I sure hope they are not arguments about limiting them to $42 billion. That is $42 billion.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) seek time in opposition?

Mr. WALSH. I rise in opposition, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the Committee on Science.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, first and foremost, let me say that I have the deepest admiration for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and this body will be certainly not as bright and not as profound a place when he no longer is with us. And I know that he is not planning to run for reelection. We will miss him very much.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very grateful to have had the opportunity to serve with the gentleman in the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics. Over the years, he has been a voice for prudence and a voice for, yes, for second thoughts about the Space Station.

Let me say that in the beginning of his term, his arguments made a lot of sense, a lot more sense. As the years have gone by, however, and we have invested billions and billions of dollars into this program, yes, in the beginning it might have made sense to postpone the Space Station for a number of years. The voice of the gentleman from Indiana was there saying, Do not waste the money.

But sometimes once you have made a commitment, it is actually more responsible then to move forward and make sure that the project in which you are involved is a success, rather than turning back.

If we support the Roemer amendment now, what it will mean is we will not have science on the Space Station. That is what it will mean. The laboratory will not work. We will not have the science experiments. Yes, there is some question whether or not, and from the beginning, whether or not we were going to have great achievements in space in these science labs; but one way to ensure that there is never any great achievement or breakthrough for mankind on this in the microgravity research being conducted in the Space Station is to pass the Roemer amendment, which fences off this money.

Yes, we are now in a crisis at the Space Station. There has been an overrun, and we are going to need to come up with $5 billion. It does not mean it has to come from us. I am going to Ireland; I am going to Italy. I am speaking to other allies.

□ 2145

I will be traveling over the break to those other countries and will be speaking to leaders, for example in the Gulf region, to try to find other people who might want to invest in this incredible, historic engineering project in space.

If we look into the sky, we see a bright shining object that was not there before. We can either turn out that light and say that it is a failure and it represents the failure of mankind, or we can work at this moment, now, and make sure that we succeed in this endeavor. It is not time to turn back, it is not time to just fence things off, to put shackles on the hands of those of us who are trying to make this project succeed. Together, Democrats and Republicans, and it has always been a bipartisan project, can work together to make sure that that light in the sky is a symbol of progress and hope and, yes, even overcoming bureaucratic obstacles and great hardships, and overcoming them together.

The gentleman from Indiana has had a great career. It has been an honor serving with him. But I ask my colleagues not to support his amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank my good friend from California for the kind words. I very much not only enjoyed serving with him but learning a great deal from him as well; learned about science and learned about surfing as well too.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), a Republican sponsor of this amendment.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague from Indiana for his persistence on this amendment. We have had this debate a lot. Before I came to Congress in 1995, a few years before that, there was a huge debate on this, and the space station only stayed in existence by, I think it was about a one-vote margin. It was very, very close.

At that time, opponents to the space station pointed out basically what has happened, and that is that we have had these tremendous cost overruns. The science was questionable. We are now down to a module that will hold three people. It takes two-and-a-half people to keep the thing running, so that leaves about 10 hours a week for somebody to do science in the space station.

We are looking at Russia not having kept its commitments. Cost overruns. This amendment would cap the space station funding at $25 billion for construction costs and $17 billion for related launch costs. It would not cancel the space station funding for fiscal year 2002, but the space station is expected to be $4 billion over budget by 2006. That puts it substantially over the $25 billion budget cap imposed in the fiscal year 2001 NASA authorization act. NASA has proposed cutting scientific research to pay for the construction cost overruns.

I think it is time for this body to realize that we are just not getting the benefit for the cost. Will it make a difference in terms of what this body decides to do for the gentleman from Indiana and myself to have brought this amendment back up again tonight? Probably not. But I would still urge my colleagues to do the right thing and vote for the Roemer-Ganske amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman who is offering the amendment in a little discussion about his amendment, but first I want to join the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) in commending the gentleman for his sincere interest in this issue and for his bringing the issue to the Congress in the past, and his persistence in doing it. I think the station is a much better enterprise because of his efforts. We all need challenged, and certainly NASA needs challenged in many areas. So before we start a debate, I want to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman's first International Space Station amendment here. It was an amendment much like the amendments he has offered in the past, I think the last 5 years, as a matter of fact. It was a straight-up cut; was it not?

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. The gentleman is correct, the amendment I offered earlier and withdrew was a kill amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. That would have straight-out eliminated the station program. I understand why the gentleman did that. It has been defeated on this floor a number of times and the body has spoken pretty overwhelmingly with regard to that issue.

I frankly do not quite understand this amendment, and that is why I want to engage the gentleman in a discussion of it at the front of this overall debate. I have the amendment here before me and it says, ''None of the funds made available in this act may be used by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to obligate amounts for International Space Station in contravention of cost limitations established in section 202 of the 2000 authorization for NASA.'' Correct?

Mr. ROEMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, and if he is reading the amendment, then that is the way it is written.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. That is the first paragraph. ''None of the funds may be used to obligate amounts in contravention of that act. Then it says, ''or defer or cancel construction of the habitat module crew return vehicle propulsion module.'' As I understand that, the gentleman is saying they cannot expend above the authorization on the one hand; is that correct?

Mr. ROEMER. Is the gentleman yielding to me to explain my amendment?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Yes, I am, in an ongoing discussion.

Mr. ROEMER. I will be happy to explain the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. No, no. If the gentleman will just answer the question.

Does the first paragraph say, that to obligate amounts under here, that ''none of the funds made available may be expended in excess of the authorization in section 202.''?

Mr. ROEMER. The first part of the amendment, as the gentleman knows, simply states what the United States Senate has passed as a cap for what can be spent according to the authorization levels for both launch and construction costs.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reclaiming my time. In the second paragraph, the gentleman prohibits deferment or cancellation of construction of three pieces to the station, the habitation module, the crew return vehicle, and the propulsion module. Is that correct?

Mr. ROEMER. I am delighted my friend is so interested and intrigued with the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Well, it is the amendment we are debating here on the floor, so I am quite intrigued with it.

Mr. ROEMER. The amendment states they shall not exceed an authorized bill for a cap; they cannot go over what we have already approved and passed as a Congress and been signed into law for a cap. And then it says do not jeopardize the lives of the scientists and the astronauts on that by cutting life-sustaining or life-threatening equipment that may get them off the space station that is in danger. Do not cut an escape vehicle needed to get those people off.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. And that is a really good cause. I acknowledge that, and I agree with the Member on that. But the Member is setting up here an impossible situation. The gentleman is taking the flexibility away from NASA to manipulate funding between these projects, to engage the international community to help fund these projects, to delay projects in order to stay within the authorization.

Mr. ROEMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the flexibility is there. I simply say they have $42 billion, $42 billion, to decide what to do to build a safe and scientifically worthwhile space station.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I understand that, but the gentleman understands, because he is a real student of this, that the dollars are just too far in excess of the authorization and that complying with both paragraph one and paragraph two is impossible.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Just to note that in terms of flexibility, the crew return vehicle and the habitation module, which the gentleman just mentioned, those are two areas we are working with right now to see if our allies could pick up the cost for these. Under the Roemer amendment, we would have to pay for them ourselves rather than if we could pick up an extra $2 billion from our allies. Why not let them pay for a crew return vehicle or habitation module?

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Every time we have engaged these other countries in trying to help us, like the Russians, we end up paying for everything they were supposed to pay for. It is yet another cost overrun for us.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said in his opening remarks that it is not a killer amendment. I think it is a killer amendment for the reasons that I have tried to bring out here in our discussion. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Science.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here and to join in the accolades for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). It is an annual group of accolades, and I am very pleased that the vote on the amendment will not reflect the veneration that we have for this Member that is leaving.

We are a Nation of slogans. I think MacArthur said ''the object of war was victory,'' I think Franklin Roosevelt said, ''The only thing we have to fear is fear itself,'' but Billy Graham said one that I can use here. He said, ''Love the sinner but hate the sin.'' And here I really love the gentleman from Indiana, but I absolutely hate this amendment.

I have the amendment memorized because I think this is the fifth or sixth straight time that the gentleman has come with this god-awful amendment, and I just hope that my colleagues will listen carefully and vote their conscience.

As crafted, this amendment could eventually force unwise choices to NASA's human space flight program, which includes both the shuttle program and the space station program. It is a bad amendment. It is an amendment that looks reasonable at first glance, but it really creates more difficulties than it solves.

Actually, simply put, the Roemer amendment would deny NASA the ability to make any adjustments to the space station program that might be needed to live within the funding cap contained in last year's NASA authorization bill. We already have a cap. There is a cap. It would also prevent NASA from making the adjustments to the space station program included in the President's fiscal year 2002 budget. I think the President was a little conservative in his budget, and we are working with him on that. I think it is short of the needs we need.

So I think we should oppose this amendment and once again wish the gentleman from Indiana good sailing. May the wind be at the gentleman's back when he goes back to Indiana and becomes, maybe, the next governor or the United States Senator from there. God bless the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would echo the great respect for my neighbor and colleague from Indiana expressed in the Chamber today. I am more convinced than ever that the gentleman from Indiana is one tough customer, but I will rise as a new member of the NASA Committee on Science to express my opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague.

Now, my colleague's amendment seems to be predicated on the assertion that we cannot spend additional money because we cannot afford to make mistakes in the space program. Mr. Chairman, there has certainly been some growing pains associated with the space station over the last year in particular. But original ground-breaking research is, by its very nature, fraught with failure and disappointment. We should expect a project of this magnitude to benefit from an environment defined by academic freedom. Adopting this measure will be ignoring the original intent of the Congress that has always supported full funding of the space station to produce a world-class research facility.

Mr. Chairman, if we want great science, we must defend the programs that make it possible.

□ 2200

The amendment authored by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), Mr. Chairman, today would not so much kill the Space Station as he has attempted to do before perennially in this Chamber, but it may well wound it and wound it mortally. But I would offer this conclusion, that this debate is not just about dollars and sense, Mr. Chairman; all Americans are descendents of pioneers who journeyed to or prevailed in this wilderness Nation.

More than any other people in modern times, we are a Nation of explorers and adventurers. Let us not, in this day, abandon the most compelling aspect of American character. Our ancestors led the world into the unknown with faith and courage. Let us continue to lead the world with that same faith and courage into unimaginable riches of space.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer amendment to cap funding for the International Space Station. I rise to thank our good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his leadership on this issue and many other very important issues here in the House of Representatives. He will be missed.

When I came here 9 years ago, the gentleman was leading the effort in proving the point that the Space Station was too costly for what we were going to get out of it for this Nation. I was with him then, and I am as convinced today as I was 9 years ago that the gentleman is absolutely right on this issue.

I am a member of the House Committee on Science. It is hard to be a member of the House Committee on Science and not support the Space Station. But I can say as a member, I am respectful of the very valuable work that NASA does to push the envelope of technology for the aeronautical field and for understanding our universe in general.

I support the Romer amendment, however, because I believe one NASA project, the Space Station, has cast too large a shadow over our Federal budget. When the Space Station was proposed in 1984, the estimated price tag was about $8 billion. Can we all imagine $8 billion?

Now the construction price alone has quadrupled the original price tag. On the Committee on Science we are still holding periodic hearings that discuss the continuing cost overruns for the Space Station.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest we can do better by our budget and we can do better by our children. By voting to cap the construction and launch costs for the Space Station, we can invest this money in as worthy but more reliable programs, both at NASA and other areas of our Federal budget. In this time of tight Federal funding, I believe now is the time to put the reigns on the Space Station. Invest in our country.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to add to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), that I have enjoyed serving with him.

We have fought this battle many years now. I happen to disagree with him over this particular issue. We have agreed on a lot of other issues. He has offered this House a valuable service. Frankly, he has offered NASA a valuable service by keeping the pressure on NASA.

I have to say, though, I hope the gentleman will withdraw this amendment much like he withdrew the other

amendment. This is a very ill-advised amendment.

The chairman and ranking member of this subcommittee have done an outstanding job of making sure that NASA's budget was kept within the perspective of this particular bill. The ranking member has made excellent points in arguing why this amendment today does not work.

The Roemer-Capps amendment is a Catch-22 for NASA. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing. The gentleman is trying to put a cap on this, but a cap already exists and the committee has worked within that cap. Do not support this ill-advised amendment. It does not provide NASA with the flexibility to deal with the cost issues that it must deal with. I hope the gentleman will withdraw this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

The Space Station is in orbit. We have research going on up there right now. As we all know, NASA recently recorded significant cost overruns. The administration responded appropriately by canceling three elements.

I think there are some serious problems with the proposal the administration has put forward. I certainly agree with the sentiment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that we need to work with our European allies to see if we can get at least the crew return vehicle and the module built.

The proposal the gentleman from Indiana is putting forward essentially says we have to stay within the cap, and we already have a cap, but we have to go ahead and build all those elements.

That is like your spouse comes home and says, Honey, we are over budget. We cannot screen in the porch and buy that new car. Then you were to respond, we are going to stay on budget and we are going to screen in the porch and buy that new car. Your spouse might turn to you and scratch her head and say, Gee, honey, how the heck are we going to do that?

This is in many ways a very clever amendment, but it is a totally unworkable amendment. I believe it is just another attempt to try to kill the Space Station program. I would strongly encourage all my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

I think the basis most clearly articulated by our ranking member, who pointed out that by operation of the first half of the amendment NASA is precluded from going over the cap and by operation of the second portion of the amendment NASA is precluded from deferring or delaying enhancements that would, in effect, force it to exceed the cap. It is unfortunately a Catch-22 that takes away the flexibility that NASA needs to sustain this program.

The Space Station holds out great promise in terms of science, the advancement of science and the development of commerce. I urge my colleagues to reject this Catch-22 amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I am for the amendment, so I do not have to say anything nice about the gentleman from Indiana. But I would anyway if it were relevant.

We have been sitting here for 3 days on this bill. In area after area important to the most needy people in our society, we have had a large degree of agreement that we have not been able to do what is required. We have cut funds for fighting drug-induced crime in public housing. We have not got enough in Section 8. We are about to have a rollcall in which veterans in one part of the country will be pitted against veterans in another for health care.

The list of pressing unmet basic needs is very long. That is why I am for this amendment. The Space Station is a good thing in itself; but in the context in which we are operating and which we have not got the funds to provide some people with the basic necessities of housing, of health care, of a decent education, I do not think it is justified to continue to spend as much as we have been spending on the Space Station.

I was a supporter of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) when we tried to stop it. It is obviously too late to stop it. But it is not too late to impose very stringent fiscal controls. The reason is, I would hope, clear to anyone who has been following this debate. We have not got enough money to meet the mandate of the Clean Water Act. We have not got enough money for people to be decently housed in the face of a housing crisis. We cannot provide veterans health care everywhere we want. This is an amendment that does not say the Space Station should not happen. We have lost that fight. But rather, that we have to impose fiscal restraints. If we do not impose them here, we impose them in housing, we impose them in veterans health care, and we impose them in the environment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the people who I think about when I listen to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) speak is Keely Woodruff, a 6-year-old girl who has a developmental age of only 2½ because of epileptic seizures, who now is progressing nicely because of a device invented through our efforts in space. The contributions NASA has made to our country and the world are absolutely priceless.

This is an ill-conceived, ill-thought-out amendment. It actually works against the apparent interest of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) of holding down costs as it requires construction without a thoughtful plan, a construction effort, I might add, comparable to our first trip to the Moon. It could actually cause deeper cuts in the station itself and cause the so-called cap to be a killing blow. Is that not the real intention?

The annals of great events of history are not filled by those content to live in the present without vision, but by those who sought to understand the unknown and change their future. If we cancel this program, what will we say and what will that say to our partners in the international community about U.S. leadership in the 21st century?

How can we begin to place a dollar value on the improvements and quality of life for all humanity that we know from the last 20 years of experience will come from space research. Vote down this killing amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Roemer capping amendment. I will reiterate all of the compliments previously stated, having served with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. The International Space Station is something that is working; but regarding the capping of it, Mr. Chairman, we do not have enough money to do everything we want to. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) talked about that. We need to continue what we should be doing in the space program, and the International Space Station is a great example of international cooperation. It had some rough sledding, but it is on schedule now. We have had crews up there since October 2000. They have made so much long-term progress in research in biotechnology, radiation, health, and such classroom-friendly lessons as Earth and near-object observation.

Mr. Chairman, that is why this amendment should be defeated, because there are so many other things that we can talk about.

The ISS has been a model of multinational coordination between Europe, Russia, Canada, Japan, Brazil and the U.S. If Congress eliminates or even caps funding for the station by passing one of these amendments, it would be a betrayal of our international partners.

Since October 2000, two crews have occupied the station and brought many of the early scientific experiments on-line. These experiments include research into long-germ space

flight on humans, biotechnology, radiation, health, and such classroom-friendly lessons as earth and near object observation.

The space station is on track and operating, with several missions already complete. This NASA budget maintains that momentum and builds on the successes of this program.

Critics have charged that funding the space station will push out any smaller space exploration endeavors like the Mars Pathfinder Mission or the Hubbel Space Telescope, which have had enormous success.

This simply is not true. NASA, with the development of the space station, will have a platform from which future space exploration and research can be launched.

Members of the shuttle crews, along with station inhabitants, have been able to overcome all of the problems that they have encountered, showcasing their ingenuity, creativity and skill. The ground support personnel have also played crucial roles in overcoming these obstacles.

We are standing on the brink of the twenty-first century. Capping funding for the international space station would be irresponsible.

It would cost us billions of dollars, along with countless hours of hard work and effort by NASA scientists, researchers, astronauts, and engineers. We would be best cripple and at worst lose our foothold to future space exploration and a valuable platform for scientific research.

Again, I am opposed to the amendment and support the funding for the international space station in this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Let me say as everybody else has said that I have nothing but the greatest respect for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), although I suspect he will be here 1 more year, so we may have to do this one more time. Having said that, I hope that the gentleman's amendment is defeated.

Mr. Chairman, this is something of a red herring amendment. We have already decided we are going to build the Space Station. We have already invested tremendously in it, and we have a cap that exists in the law and we have the ultimate cap that exists on the floor of this House and on the floor of the other body. Ultimately Congress decides how much money we are going to spend, regardless of whether we put some rhetorical cap in or not.

This is a program which is already up and running. It would be a mistake to pass this type of amendment which would actually be counterproductive to the program. Quite frankly, it could ultimately result in further cost overruns as you delay projects going forward. I hope my colleagues will look at this amendment, see that it is unworkable and defeat it.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Chairman, it is written in the Bible that without vision the people shall perish. Certainly vision in our great society means technology and science. It means that bright, shining star in space that is our Space Station. But vision also means justice. Justice for all of the people in this great country. Vision means hope and dreams for the great people called Americans in the United States.

And in this bill which these two gentlemen have worked so hard to craft, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), we need even more justice and hopes and dreams for veterans that are not getting sufficient health care in this country, and risked their lives for this country overseas. For children, for children being raised in some of our public housing that is despicable, that is rat-infested. Yet we will go $5 billion over budget without blinking an eye for 3.5 people in space.

□ 2215

Where is the vision and the justice and the fairness in that kind of allocation of resources?

When we talk in the Bible, Mr. Chairman, about vision and fairness for these great people, we mean for AmeriCorps, which is not funded in this budget; we mean for public housing, which is not adequately funded for the poorest of the poor in this great country; and we mean to help us fight the scourge of drugs which are especially hurting the most vulnerable people in inner city areas.

I would hope that we would at least cap and fence the funds on this program.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority whip.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members of this body to oppose this amendment because it will seriously damage our space program.

I say to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Chairman, that our vision is circling the Earth. The vision is the Space Station that is circling the Earth. I say a fully functioning Space Station is the linchpin of our vision of human space flight. The intention of this amendment, make no mistake about it, is to kill the Station. It effectively denies NASA its flexibility to ensure that the Station remains viable.

The prohibition against deferring the habitation module, the crew return vehicle, and the propulsion module seems designed to help the Space Station; but in fact it does not. This amendment requires NASA to develop these parts of the Station under a cap, without the flexibility of working within their budget. And this amendment, make no mistake about it, kills the Station. The fact is we have an obligation to our international partners. The United States is the leading pioneer in space travel, and we ought not renege on agreements we have made to the nations that are following us into space through the International Space Station team. More importantly, we have an obligation to protect the investment of American taxpayers and the vision that we see in space travel.

I implore Members to reject this amendment. I hope they will support the underlying bill, because it will provide the necessary resources to achieve our human space flight goals.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK:

Page 93, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 427. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are hereby revised by reducing the aggregate amount made available for ''PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND'', reducing the amount specified under such ''PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND'' item for the Inspector General for Operation Safe Home, reducing the aggregate amount provided for ''MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL'', and reducing the amount specified under such ''OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL'' item that is to be provided from the amount earmarked for Operation Safe Home, and none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fix, establish, charge, or collect mortgage insurance premiums for mortgage insurance under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) made available under any multifamily housing mortgage insurance program affected by the interim rule issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development on July 2, 2001 (66 Federal Register 35070; Docket No. FR 4679-I-01), in an amount greater than the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990) of such program, by $5,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

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

I want to talk here in this amendment about the Federal Housing Administration, the FHA. Earlier this year, this House passed a bill to reduce the fees that were charged to people trading in stocks. The rationale was that the stock fees charged through the SEC were bringing in more than it cost to administer the program, and so we put through a substantial reduction in that cost.

In fact, what happened is that the FHA is following a similar pattern. The FHA statute, which I reference in this

amendment, defines cost. Cost is the break-even point for the FHA. We have been told that the FHA cannot engage in subsidizing programs. In fact, and it is a mark of great disappointment to many that this Congress and this administration have allowed the multifamily FHA programs to lapse for want of a $40 million credit subsidy as it is called. And what has happened is that we now learn that while the FHA is claiming it has to shut down some programs for credit subsidy, it is in fact overcharging elsewhere.

This amendment simply says that the FHA can no longer overcharge and make a profit for the Treasury on these multifamily programs but must stay at cost.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. FRANK for offering this amendment to prevent unnecessary rent increases in affordable housing and I urge my colleagues to support it.

We are in a housing crisis. The economic expansion of the past few years has been accompanied by skyrocketing home prices and rents. There is a severe shortage of affordable housing, and in many areas, any type of housing.

In my home state of California, about half of renter households pay more than the recommended 30 percent of their income toward shelter. However, 91 percent of low income renter households, with annual incomes less than $15,000, spend more than 30 percent of their income toward rent. These low income households outnumber low cost rental units by a ratio of more than 2-to-1, both statewide and in Los Angeles County.

About two-thirds (66 percent) of senior renter households pay more than 30 percent of their income toward shelter. 85 percent of low income senior renters pay more than 30 percent toward rent. And with the aging of our population, these percentages will soon translate into much higher numbers.

Furthermore, the rising tide of the recent economy has failed to lift all boats. Household incomes of renters in my state have failed to keep pace with inflation, falling significantly between 1989 and 1999 in inflation adjusted terms. The inflation adjusted income of poor renters fell nearly 14 percent, and the median income for renters with children fell 11 percent.

Overcrowding and substandard housing conditions continue to be a severe problem, particularly in Los Angeles County.

The Federal Housing Administration's (FHA) multifamily mortgage insurance programs support new construction and substantial rehabilitation of apartments by both private and nonprofit developers. These units are crucial to meet the critical need for affordable rental housing. In my home state of California, there is a shortfall of almost 600,000 affordable units.

These programs, which require federal budget appropriations in the form of a credit subsidy allocation, have been shut down since April because funding for fiscal year 2001 has been exhausted. This has jeopardized more than $3 billion in construction loans for more than 50,000 rental units across the country. This shutdown impacts more than $53 million in loans for 827 units in my home state of California, where, as I have stated, the need for such units is dire.

In addition, this Administration has refused to use $40 million dollars in emergency funds that were appropriated at the end of last year to keep these programs open. An additional $40 million was allocated by the House in this year's supplemental appropriations bill, but the money was stripped in the Conference Committee. As a result, the program is unlikely to reopen until the next fiscal year. Furthermore, the Administration's budget request for FY 2002 is also inadequate.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as well as most of the housing industry agree that the current system of calculating credit subsidy needs is fundamentally flawed. Currently, there is a HUD study underway in conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) that is likely to show that these programs are self-supporting without congressional appropriations. This study is expected to be completed by the beginning of the next fiscal year.

In the meantime, to address the credit subsidy shortage, HUD plans to increase the mortgage insurance premium for these programs by 60 percent, from 50 basis points to 80 basis points. This will relieve the alleged need for credit subsidy but will undercut the ability of the programs to provide affordable rental housing.

This premium increase will raise rents in the affected housing developments by 4 or 5 percent, by HUD's own estimate, and may reduce the production of affordable rental units.

This amendment by my colleague from Massachusetts will prohibit HUD from raising premiums in excess of what they need to run the program without a credit subsidy. The Frank amendment will prevent a build up of surplus funds that are not used for housing and would end up returning to Treasury for other purposes. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to prevent unnecessary rent increases for affordable housing.

We should not penalize those who can least afford it for the Administration's failure to address this issue.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized on his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of Budget Totals for fiscal year 2002 on July 26, 2001, House Report 107–165. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee suballocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the act.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone else wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I understand this point of order. Just in case, I did have a second version that is allowed which we will get to if this point of order is sustained.

I did want to make clear to people what the basis of the point of order is. The Congressional Budget Office has apparently ruled that the FHA has been making a profit off the multifamily programs; and, therefore, an amendment which would say that the FHA in the future must not make a profit, must in fact in the future set these premiums only at cost, is out of order because it is a budget charge. In other words, the basis of the point of order is a CBO ruling that the FHA has been making a profit, not the FHA, the Treasury has been making a profit off multifamily housing. That is why the National Association of Homebuilders and Realtors and others have been supportive of my amendment.

But the sad fact is that given the way our rules are, I do acknowledge that my amendment requiring the FHA to set these fees at a break-even price will cost some money and it would stop the FHA from making a profit for the Treasury off multifamily housing, regrettably.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The Chair is authoritatively guided by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to section 312 of the Budget Act, that the net fiscal effect of this amendment would be an increase in budget authority of $20 million and that this amendment would therefore cause the level of budget authority provided in the bill to exceed its section 302(b) allocation.

As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act and the point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK:

Page 93, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 427. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are hereby revised by reducing the aggregate amount made available for ''PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND'', reducing the amount specified under such ''PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND'' item for the Inspector General for Operation Safe Home, reducing the aggregate amount provided for ''MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL'', and reducing the amount specified under such ''OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL'' item that is to be provided from the amount earmarked for Operation Safe Home, and none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fix, establish, charge, or collect mortgage insurance premiums for mortgage insurance made available pursuant to the program under section 221(d)(4) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715l(d)(4)) in an amount greater than the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990) of such program, by $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a more limited amendment and it is in order because it has an offset. The offset comes from a program which has been severely criticized by the General Accounting Office. It is a program called Operation Safe Home which is run inappropriately, many of us feel, including, I must say, the General Accounting Office, by the Inspector General of HUD. Inspectors General should be checking up on other people's programs, not running their own. So it takes $5 million.

What this amendment says, and it builds on what I said before, we have one of the multifamily housing programs in the FHA and it is known as 221(d)(4). The FHA is planning to raise the premiums on the 221(d)(4) program telling us that it is now running at a deficit. Remember, other multifamily programs are running at a surplus. That is why my first amendment was ruled out of order, because I tried to recapture that surplus by lowering the fees.

What this amendment simply says is that when the administration raises the fees on the 221(d)(4) program, they can only raise them to break even, they cannot make a profit. The legislation defines cost, cost being what you break even at, including, obviously, an estimate of losses.

This amendment is very simple. Again, it is strongly supported by the homebuilders, by the Realtors, by I think most organizations concerned with housing supply. What it says is when people go out to build housing, and we are talking here about private profit-making entities under the (d)(4) program doing unsubsidized housing, this is not housing for the very poor but housing for middle-income people, for working people, the FHA should not charge them for insurance more than the cost of that insurance. The Federal Government should not deter the construction of multifamily housing at this time of great housing crisis by charging an extra fee over and above what is needed for the program to break even.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, we do not make money on this program, a program that benefits only for-profit developers to build moderate- and high-income housing, not low-income housing. In fact, the taxpayer through, this appropriation bill, has repeatedly subsidized this program. In fact, last year, we subsidized the program to the tune of over $80 million. Even that was not sufficient to satisfy the industry's demands, and the program has been shut down since that time.

To put it in perspective, the amount of money the gentleman now says we are, quote, ''making off this program next year'' is less than $3 million compared to the $80 million it cost the taxpayer in fiscal year 2001. Making money in the sense that the gentleman explains it is nothing more than somebody's estimate about a series of economic factors that may or may not occur over a period of time.

Lord knows, we have seen OMB and CBO make bad estimates, not to mention the Members of our own committees. So I think it is a little disingenuous for the gentleman to argue that we have been using this program to pay for other things when in fact it is just not generating funds.

As a practical matter, this amendment would have little impact on the amount of the premium increase charged. In fact, HUD estimates that this amendment would increase the premium by a mere two one-hundredths of 1 percent.

I believe the real intent behind the gentleman's amendment is to try to somehow stop these premiums from going forward. There is broad opposition among the special interest groups to stop this premium increase. But in order to make this program work and in order to prevent further appropriations against this bill, FHA needs to go forward with this premium increase.

We have seen the kinds of hellacious decisions that we have had to make, the trade-offs that we have had to make throughout this bill. If this premium increase does not go forward, we could be back here next year trying to find an additional $230 million somewhere in this bill to offset the cost of this program.

Mr. Chairman, the choice is relatively simple. Do we continue to allow the program to remain shut down, or do we allow the premiums to go into effect? I think we should allow the premiums to go into effect and let the program run. If we adopt this amendment, at a minimum we would delay the restart of the program, because HUD would have to reissue new rules to change their premium for what amounts to less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of an increase. We would also be giving a break to a single group of for-profit developers, including nonprofit developers. These are all nonprofit developers.

□ 2230

I believe it is inequitable and it sets a terrible precedent that causes further delays in the restart of the (d)(4) program. I would urge this amendment be defeated.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, first, I believe my friend from New York may have contradicted himself. First he said we are not making money off this program, but then he said we would only be making a little.

What HUD has told us is they raise it not two-tenths of a percent, but three-tenths of a percent. Now, that may not seem like a lot, but, I do not know, if your mortgage went from 7.2 percent to 7.5 percent, would you shrug that off? Costs are cumulative. It is millions of dollars.

By the way, the argument, and I want to make it very clear, the structure of this amendment, the amendment says they can only charge what the statute describes as break even, as cost. And who says that that will be a money loser? CBO.

In other words, the Congressional Budget Office scored my amendment. I did not ask them to. I did not run to CBO and say, boy, I really wanted you to tell me this is going to cost money. If I never heard from CBO again for the rest of my life, I would be very happy. But CBO says, wait a minute; if you tell the FHA that it can only charge break even, we are going to lose money. This is what CBO says.

Then the gentleman says I am doing this for these special interests. I did notice he talked a little unkindly it seemed to me about profit-making institutions.

I like one thing about housing. In almost every debate, people on the other side criticize us for not understanding the beauty of capitalism and the importance of the profit motive. But when it comes to housing, all of a sudden respect for the profit motive disappears, and the gentleman says, oh, these people want to make a profit.

I am glad there are people trying to make a profit trying to build multifamily housing for working families. And these special interests, yes, there are some special interests. Let me read them. I confess. Mea culpa. The Mortgage Bankers Association of America, the National Association of Homebuilders, the National Association of Realtors, the National Apartment Association, the National Multi-Housing Council, yes, they are special interests. They are especially interested in getting housing built, and that is why they support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I think it is a simple, straight forward, commonsense amendment that would simply prohibit HUD from overcharging users of the FHA multifamily insurance program.

Now, no credit subsidy funding has been provided in this bill for the multifamily for-profit program, and I understand the committee's decision to eliminate that subsidy. Unfortunately, however, elimination of the subsidy requires an increase in the premiums

that are paid by program users. That could translate into higher debt service and up-front costs for owners and higher rents for families that depend on this housing.

Many users of the for-profit program think that the credit subsidy formula that HUD is currently using to calculate premiums may not accurately reflect the actual risk to the government of the loans as they are now being underwritten. In other words, the premiums next year could be higher than are necessary to fully support this program.

HUD has reportedly initiated a reassessment of the credit subsidy formula to see if this is the case. This amendment simply makes clear that if, based on its reassessment of the credit subsidy formula, HUD determines that the formula should be changed, then program premiums should not be higher than is necessary to support the program. It is as simple as that. It makes good sense. It simply underscores what I hope HUD would do on its own.

I urge support for this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively arcane amendment. I do not suspect there are even 10 Members in the Congress who have a full grasp of what is going on here.

We are governed by the Budget Act. We are governed by credit reform. We cannot make changes in those rules. What we have to do is respond to the program. What we traditionally do to respond to the needs in the program is appropriate additional funds.

This program should be pay-as-you-go. I want to be clear: if this amendment were to pass and this language is added to this bill, we would have to go to conference and find another $230 million for an offset to fund the program.

Now, you have seen the choices we have had so far. There is not a good choice that we have seen in the 3 days we have been working on this bill. But I submit we will have to come back in conference, we will have to come back and look for additional funds to come up with $230 million. There are only so many places you can go. You can go to the Veterans Administration, you can go to NASA, you can go to HUD, you can go to National Science Foundation, you can go to FEMA, but those are not good choices.

I would urge the House to stick with the committee bill, to oppose the gentleman's amendment. Please do not put us in a position where we have to go out and find an additional $230 million in an already tight allocation. Reject the gentleman's amendment and let us go forward to conference with the bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my friend from New York. I think he may have qualified if we gave out Academy Awards for the best original screen play.

The gentleman says $230 million. CBO says $5 million. I mean, CBO scored this amendment. Now, there was one version which they said was going to cost hundreds of millions. Yes, to do what I would most like to do across-the-board with the FHA would cost several hundred million.

But this amendment deals only with the (d)(4) program where HUD has proposed to raise it by 30 basis points, three-tenths of a percent, and I got a CBO score, and it says, which is why this is in order, I have a $5 million offset. If I only had a $5 million offset for $230 million, obviously I would be out of order.

Secondly, I would say the gentleman says we have to work with the Federal Credit Reform Act. I agree. That is what the amendment says. The amendment says do not raise the premiums in an amount greater than the cost, as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990. So what this says is, live by the Federal Credit Reform Act definition of cost, and CBO says this particular amendment only costs $5 million.

I had an earlier amendment that might have cost more. The gentleman succeeded in getting that one knocked out of order. This one is $5 million. It does set the principle that they should not be making a profit. Five million dollars is not a huge amount of money, but it is more than they should be getting out of multi-family housing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

First of all, I think the point the chairman makes and the author of the amendment makes is this should not be handled in an appropriations bill. The Committee on Financial Services ought to be looking at this. If FHA wants to raise the fees, it ought to come under the Federal Credit Reform Act, and that is where it ought to be dealt with.

Second of all, the reason why I support the gentleman's amendment, and there is a lot of confusion of how these credit subsidy programs work, and the chairman is well aware of how they work, he understands how they work, but there is a problem in the (d)(4) program and in the (d)(3) program, and part of the problem is that Congress appropriated money for the current fiscal year, but part of that had emergency designation. The Office of Management and Budget has held up that money, and that is why the program is not working at this point in time.

In my State, and I would assume in most States, there are a lot of projects, nonprofit projects, that utilize both the (d)(3) and can utilize the (d)(4) program, which have been shut down, and that affects the housing stock for middle-income and lower-income families around the country.

Finally, I think it is unconscionable that the administration, on the one hand, wants to receive money for the general fund in the form of offsetting receipts through raising the premiums, while at the same time they will not release money that the Congress has already appropriated that was done for the current fiscal year. Yet, in the budget that we passed and through legislation which we have not taken up on the floor of the House, but went through the Committee on Financial Services, and legislation that I supported, we are making reductions in excess or offsetting fees for the Securities and Exchange Commission registration fees and investor fees in there. Now, I support that, but that is counter to what this does.

So, I think the gentleman is on the right track. We ought to pass his amendment. The administration ought to release the additional subsidy allocation that is in the current fiscal year's budget so the (d)(3) and (d)(4) programs can get back up and running, and let the authorizing committee address this problem going forward.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused by the chairman's position on this proposed amendment. The amendment says do not raise FHA premiums above what it would cost to actually insure.

Now, when I first heard the chairman's argument, he said well, we are not making any profit on FHA premiums. Then, by the time I got to the floor I heard that if we did this, it was going to cost us $280 million. The CBO says that it would cost $5 million, which is what the gentleman from Massachusetts has found as an offset to make the budget back in balance.

The problem is that if FHA premiums are raised beyond the actual cost of the insurance, people who are buying houses will pay that extra cost. It is that simple. No funny business, no fuzzy math. If the premium is higher than the actual cost of the insurance, that extra cost is going to be borne by homeowners or home buyers. In a market where people are trying to acquire homes, that could be the difference between somebody being able to afford a home and somebody not being able to afford a home.

So, I think this is just simple, straightforward math here. It cannot be that the provision is redundant, which is what the chairman of the committee said originally, because we are not making any profit on this. If that were the case, the amendment that the gentleman from Massachusetts has offered would simply be a redundant provision, because what his amendment says is we do not want you to make a profit. If it is as the CBO has indicated, that the offset required is $5 million, then he has found a $5 million

offset, and it is an appropriate offset. If the premiums are raised $280 million, then home buyers are going to bear that cost.

Whatever the case, the gentleman from Massachusetts should have his amendment passed, and we should not pass the cost on to home buyers.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say in fairness to the gentleman from New York, it is true, my concerns do not deal only with the 221(d)(4) multiple family housing program. I do object to the FHA's pricing in general. But, under the rules, the only one that could be in order now, because I needed an offset, was this narrow one.

□ 2245

I do agree, as the gentleman from Texas has said, that this is an issue that ought to be addressed in the authorizing committee. The fact is we have a situation in which multifamily programs of the Federal Housing Administration were shut down because they said they needed $40 million more in credit subsidy, while the totality of programs in the FHA were returning many times that to the Treasury, and the analogy of the gentleman from Texas about the SEC was appropriate. So I hope the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity will address this.

Getting the FHA out of the business of making a profit is a very simple and straightforward way to reduce the cost of housing, multifamily, single family, across the board. That is up to the authorizing committee. But here we can set a precedent which says, to the extent that we can control it, we will tell the FHA, live by the definition of cost in the bill, do not charge more for the insurance premium than is necessary for you to break even, and do not burden the people who are going to live in multifamily housing or any other patrons of the FHA by charging them more than would otherwise be necessary.

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

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

Let me just state that the Administration is strongly opposed to this amendment. There are a number of special interest groups who have contacted Members on this amendment, but the Administration is clearly in opposition.

This is a very complicated issue that not a lot of Members have spent a lot of time with. Let me just try to make it as clear as I can.

The intent of this amendment is to kill the premium increase. There was a lot of discussion about this earlier in the year, about attaching additional appropriations to the supplemental; the industry was lobbying for more money, no premiums; more money, no premiums. The intent of this amendment is to kill that premium increase.

We want this program to be successful, but we want it to pay as it goes. If it is going to pay as it goes, we have to increase the premium. If Members support this amendment, it will kill that premium increase and if that is the case, we go to conference looking for $230 million in additional outlays and allocation.

Do not put us in that position, I would say to my colleagues. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 24 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA); Amendment No. 6 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS); and an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BARCIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 24 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 99, noes 325, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—99

Allen
Baird
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Berry
Bonior
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Camp
Cantor
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Castle
Chabot
Coyne
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
English
Etheridge
Farr
Fossella
Frank
Gephardt
Goodlatte
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hart
Hayworth
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Neal
Olver
Otter
Pascrell
Petri
Pickering
Pomeroy
Rivers
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Shows
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thune
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Upton
Waxman
Woolsey

NOES—325

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Carson (OK)
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes

Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Conyers
Hansen
Istook
Jefferson
Lipinski
Payne
Radanovich
Spence
Stark

□ 2311

Messrs. BACA, KING, KUCINICH and WEINER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. TAYLOR of Mississippi, BARTLETT of Maryland, MOORE, DICKS, PICKERING, and BAIRD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 231, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—190

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank
Ganske
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Honda
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Shaw
Sherman
Shows
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Strickland
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—231

Aderholt
Akin
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barton
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (SC)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Carson (OK)
Chabot
Chambliss
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehrlich
English
Evans
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Gallegly
Hansen
Istook
Jefferson
Lipinski
Payne
Radanovich
Saxton
Sherwood
Smith (MI)
Spence
Stark

□ 2319

Mr. ROTHMAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 212, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—212

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt

DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—212

Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Hansen
Istook
Jefferson
John
Lipinski
Payne
Saxton
Spence
Stark

□ 2329

Ms. HART, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PICKERING, and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. HARMAN changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2330

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002''.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the VA/HUD appropriations bill. This bill severely under-funds public housing and other critical programs. At a time when 5.4 million families are paying more than half of their income to live in substandard housing throughout the country, the Bush administration has decided that public housing programs are no longer a priority for our country.

The VA/HUD appropriations bill approved by the Appropriations Committee cuts public housing and community development programs by $1.8 billion.

This budget is clearly headed in the wrong direction. More than 34,000 households are on the waiting list for housing vouchers in the city of Chicago, and under this budget, and under this budget they will have to continue to wait for a long time.

This bill reduces Section 8 reserves by cutting $640 million. This cut will result in as many as 30,000 families losing Section 8 vouchers. The bill also reduces the number of Fair Share Section 8 vouchers by 78 percent.

In addition, this bill eliminates funding for the Public Housing Drug Elimination Fund. This is a crucial initiative, and Chicago and other cities have used it successfully to combat drugs in public housing to give public housing residents a safe place to live.

This bill further endangers those most in jeopardy, our homeless, by cutting almost $100 million from homeless prevention and shelter programs.

Under the bill we are debating today, Community Development Block Grants funds are cut by over $300 million and zeroes out funding for empowerment zones—a $200 million cut. These are the resources upon which our cities rely to perform important economic and community development. They should be restored.

I find it unconscionable that the Bush administration would declare a surplus and consider our country well off enough to provide its richest 1% the bulk of a $1.3 trillion tax cut, but in the same breath finds it appropriate to cut $1.8 billion that would provide housing for our nation's most needy.

No American family would ever declare a surplus if they can't afford to put a roof over their head. However, as an American family, we are doing just that with this bill. I urge all Members to support amendments that will attempt to restore funding for public housing and other programs that were cut in the administration's request and the underlying bill. And, if it is not amended, I urge a no vote on the VA/HUD bill.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2620, the Fiscal Year 2002 Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act. This bill provides $112.7 billion for these agencies, seven percent more than current funding and $2.1 billion more than the President's budget. Most importantly, I support this bill because it provides $1.3 billion in disaster relief for FY 2002, which will be needed in Houston and many other current and future disaster areas.

In a normal appropriations year, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, housing, scientific research and the Veterans Administration are my largest concerns in the VA–HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act. However, this year is extraordinary because on June 5, Tropical Storm Allison, which formed spontaneously in the Gulf of Mexico, dropped up to 40 inches of rain on parts of my district over a week-long period. Harris County, Texas experienced an estimated $4.8 billion in damages, over 90,000 people in Texas have sought federal assistance, and the Texas Medical Center, the world's largest medical center, experienced over $2 billion in damages, shutting down Houston's three largest hospitals for weeks.

As a result of this unexpected calamity, FEMA's FY 2001 funds are expected to run out or barely cover expenses for this year. FEMA expects their responsibility for Texas alone to reach $2.4 billion, which the FEMA and the Office of Management and Budget realize will require additional funding over the $2.3 billion initially provided by the Subcommittee. We are in the midst of hurricane and wildfire season for 2001 and we will experience those dangerous times again in 2002. 31 federal disaster declarations have been made this year and as many will surely be made again next year. Just the declaration of Tropical Storm Allison will claim the majority of disaster relief funds for this year and next. As such, I ask all my colleagues to support the effort to provide an extra $1.3 billion for FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund.

As a final note on FEMA, I support the effort led by Representative LOIS CAPPS to restore

funding for Project Impact, a pre-disaster mitigation program that has provided warning radios to schools in my district, among other useful damage prevention measures. All too often, we neglect prevention and only focus on recovery. I would remind my colleagues that every dollar spent on prevention like Project Impact reduces the bills of disasters like Allison.

Many may be upset that my colleagues and I from the Southeast Texas area are requesting approval from the House for this emergency request to aid our area recover when many other emergency requests have been denied. However, I believe that this $1.3 billion is absolutely necessary, not only for Allison victims, but for all of this year's disaster victims, next year's disaster victim, and all victims of major disaster in many past years. During the FY 2001 Supplemental debate, my colleague from North Carolina, Representative WALTER B. JONES pointed out that victims of Hurricane Floyd in 1996 are still receiving disaster aid to complete the recovery of that area from one of the decade's worst storms.

Again, this emergency disaster relief request is not earmarked for Texas or Tropical Storm Allison, it is for recovery aid for all current and future disaster victims. Again, FEMA and OMB publicly state there is a need for additional FEMA funds. The Senate has proposed $2 billion, $700 million more than the House Appropriations Committee. From my firsthand experience in my district, I believe that the $2 billion figure is a conservative estimate of what will be needed.

Besides including additional disaster relief funding, I commend the chairman and the entire Appropriations Committee for correcting a major flaw in the President's budget regarding research on the International Space Station. The entire bill provides $15 billion in total for NASA, 5 percent more or $666 million more than current funding and also $440 million over the President's budget request. Importantly, this legislation fully funds the space station at the $1.8 billion budget request. While the President's budget did not reduce NASA funding, it kept the increase below inflation, reducing purchasing power, and zeroed out the crew return vehicle (CRV) and habitation module. These two integral parts of the space station are necessary to have a research presence on the station, which is why we have constructed this orbiting microgravity laboratory.

I commend the Subcommittee and Committee members, especially Chairman WALSH and Representative BUD CRAMER for their commitment to restoring the CRV. The scientific and international communities were worried back during the Spring budget season that the new Administration was going to preclude significant research activities on the station by targeting necessary components for elimination. Since we have made this unparalleled investment in the betterment of mankind, it would be folly to abandon our goals now, after we have gone through all the work to get a near complete station orbiting the Earth. The subcommittee is also to be commended for increasing funding for biological and physical research activities and academic research programs.

I am relieved that the committee reversed the President's request for scientific research and increased it by 8% or $414 million. This bill includes $4.8 billion federal funding for research through the National Science Foundation. As a member of the House Budget Committee, I cosponsored an amendment to the House budget resolution to increase scientific research funding through the National Science Foundation, NASA, and DOE by $1 million over the House leadership's budget for 1 year and by $11 billion for the next 10 years. I am convinced of the necessity of increasing federal basic scientific investments from hearing from scientists in my district at the Texas Medical Center, Rice University, the University of Houston, and Texas Southern University.

While I am pleased with many of the changes that the subcommittee and full committee have made to this legislation, I am concerned that this measure does not provide enough funding for veterans programs. I have consistently supported expanding the health benefits for our nations veterans, many who have made incredible sacrifices in order to preserve our freedom. While I am pleased that this bill would provide $4.3 billion more for the veterans' health care programs than was available in 2001, I join Veterans' Affairs Ranking Member LANE EVANS in his criticism that this bill does not do enough for improvement and modernization of veterans' health facilities the delivery of that care. In a time when many of our nation's veterans are aging and seeking more health care services, it is vitally important that these facilities are modernized to provide cutting-edge treatments for those who have served, without demeaning these men and women with delays.

In my home state of Texas, we have a growing veterans population who will not be served until we find the additional resources which Mr. EVANS is calling for. However, I have to reluctantly oppose his amendment removing $1.52 billion from the space station. As a member of the House Budget Committee, I opposed the Republican leadership's budget, which has led us to unreasonable subcommittee allocations. Now, at the last moment, this budget has forced Mr. Evans to turn on other productive programs to make up shortfalls in the administration's request for the Veterans Administration. Congress' budget, in a time of healthy revenue, should not force Members like myself to choose between the NASA research necessary to maintain America's technological and scientific superiority and funding for veterans' care in their districts.

I am concerned that this legislation does not provide sufficient funding for housing programs. This bill provides $1.4 billion or five percent more than last year. However, this $1.4 billion budget is $600 million less than the President Bush's request for housing program. One good example is that this bill reduces funding by five percent for the Community and Development Block Grant (CDBG) which has helped many communities to redevelop in areas where our capital markets have failed to invest. This bill also eliminates all funding for the urban empowerment zones, which means that the city of Houston will not receive any funds next year in their efforts to rebuild the fifth ward. This bill also eliminates public housing drug-elimination grants which have helped many public housing project to reduce the use of drugs in their communities.

It also eliminates funding for AmeriCorps, a program that has been shown to help our nation's youth. This public service programs helps to meet the needs of communities by encouraging young people to donate their time in exchange for earning college scholarship funding. For many people who are not ready to enter college, this volunteer program has been a good alternative to simply going to work directly and giving them valuable skills to compete in our workplace. I urge my colleagues to insist on the Senate's language on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, while this bill could be better, it is a good bill under the circumstances. In particular the FEMA emergency funding is terrible important to my constituents and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman. I rise to commend the chairman and ranking member of the VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee for the funding levels in this bill for veterans programs.

This measure provides $51.4 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs, and fully funds Veterans Medical Health Care by providing a $1 billion increase over last year. This increase comes on the heels of a $3.1 billion funding level for VA health care over the last two years. This funding is crucial to the veterans facilities in my district in Marion and Crown Point, and more importantly, to the veterans who utilize these facilities.

This measure also increases veterans medical and prosthetic research by $20 million over FY02, to bring the FY02 funding to $371 million. The measure fully funds current and new cemetery operations and the National Shrine Initiative. It fully funds cost of living increases in compensation and pensions. The bill provides $300 million in new funding for the Veterans Hospital Emergency Repair Act, which passed this House on March 27.

Over the last several years, Congress has worked hard to ensure that veterans and their families receive the benefits they have earned. As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I continue to stress and advocate adequate funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs to meet the standards and quality of health care that our veterans deserve. At a time when medical costs are rising and aging veterans health care needs are increasing, I am pleased that this Chamber continues to provide the necessary funding for veterans programs.

The increase in funding is a testament to our commitment to the men and women who have served our nation proudly, sacrificing so much for the good of our country. I fully support this legislation on behalf of our nation's veterans, knowing that it is well deserved.

This is a good bill for our veterans and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no other amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMP) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2620) 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, 2002, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 210, he reported the bill back to the House

with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BOYD

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOYD. I am, in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOYD moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2620, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back to the House promptly with an amendment which increases funding for veterans medical care programs by an amount adequate to fund the full cost of all currently authorized services including those authorized by the Veterans Millennium Health Care Act, Public Law 106–117.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of this House feel very strongly about keeping commitments that they and this Government makes to its citizens. That is why I am asking the House to recommit this bill to the committee for the purposes of adding $500 million to the Veterans Administration medical programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is the amount above the funding level contained in this bill that was unanimously recommended by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to the Committee on the Budget for the purposes of meeting the obligations and the commitment that we have and we have provided in the authorizing bills for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us in this House have the greatest respect for the two gentlemen who lead this subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). I do not think there is any doubt about that. I think we also have a great deal of respect for the gentlemen who lead the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) and the previous chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP).

Mr. Speaker, the additional funds that we are asking for in this motion will not be used to provide additional services or new services to our Nation's veterans. These funds, Mr. Speaker, are simply required to provide the services that are already authorized, they are already committed, and they are already promised to our veterans. But they will not be provided at the funding levels contained in this appropriations bill.

This motion, Mr. Speaker, is really about whether we want to stand behind our commitments to our citizens or whether we are willing to make promises in one bill, that is, the Veterans' Affairs authorization, and then when it comes time to pay for those services we are going to say to those folks, Well, we didn't really mean it. It was just all for show. I do not think that is right.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, there are more than 3.6 million veterans who use the VA health care system. As a group, these people are much older than the average American and their health needs are much greater. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has made a real effort to address the problem of the rising cost of providing health care to these individuals. But the 4.9 percent increase contained in this bill is about half of the increase required to meet the national average rate of increase in health expenditures. The number of physicians now employed by the Veterans Administration is simply not adequate to meet the needs of those eligible for VA medical services. The time it takes to see a doctor is already too long; and if we do not act, it will grow longer.

It is an unfortunate fact, Mr. Speaker, but it is a fact that a significant number of those who have served in uniform suffer from chronic mental disorders and that we are simply not providing adequate mental health services to a significant number of these individuals. While we have also promised to cover pharmacy costs, this appropriation does not provide enough money to fully meet that promise. We will also not be meeting our commitments with respect to veterans in need of long-term care or veterans in need of emergency medical services.

In a letter dated July 16, 2001, the major veterans service organizations stated that the funding levels in this bill ''are simply inadequate to meet the needs of the sick and disabled veterans at a time of skyrocketing health care costs and rising demand from an aging veterans population.''

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress and this Nation to meet the commitments that it has made to the veterans, to the folks who have served in the uniform of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues tonight to send this bill back and add these additional needed funds.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, let me read from the bill report language: ''The committee stands behind the commitments Congress made in the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act, Public Law 106–117, to provide veterans with additional long-term care and emergency care services.''

The subcommittee stands behind the authorizing committee and the commitments that it made.

''The committee urges the administration to include full funding for the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act in its fiscal year 2003 budget request.''

In this year's bill, the 2002 bill, the President's budget fully supports the provisions of the Millennium Health Care Act. In addition to the President's budget request, we added another $1 billion, building on our commitment, providing a $4 billion increase over the last 3 years in health care.

Mr. Speaker, there is $51 billion in this bill for veterans. Clearly, clearly that expresses the priorities of this body. Last year, we provided the President's request plus $1.3 billion for VA medical care, fully funding the provisions of the Millennium Health Care Act.

□ 2340

However, the VA could not spend all that money. Over $300 million provided in fiscal year 2001 was not spent on Millennium Health Care Act activities. On our subcommittee, in fact, the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), questioned the VA Secretary extensively on this subject; and the Secretary testified that $548 million estimated in the budget was adequate to meet the Millennium Health Care mandates. The Secretary and the Under Secretary for Health testified that a number of provisions that are already implemented, and a number are delayed in the final notice in rule process.

There are a number of reasons for this delay, primarily because VA and OMB have not been able to promulgate and vet the rules in a timely manner. Some of the delay is simply the rule process, it is long and complicated. Some of the delay is due to the new administration carefully reviewing the rules before publication and notice. Regardless, the VA is not able to spend the money we have already provided because they cannot.

So, to add additional money to this bill begs the question of what is the purpose of this motion to recommit. Clearly the motion to recommit would send the bill back to committee; in effect it would kill the bill.

Now, we want to pass this bill. We worked very hard on it. My ranking member and I have tried to do this in a bipartisan way. There are lots of Member requests in this bill. The priorities of the Members are clearly expressed in this bill. We provided $400 million more for construction for veterans hospitals as a direct response to the Members. We think this is a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge support of this.

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

New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just say I certainly appreciate and empathize with the motion to recommit; but the committee has, in my opinion, tried to carefully and painstakingly craft a budget that fully funds a number of very important veterans' programs. I believe Chairman WALSH and Ranking Democrat MOLLOHAN have produced a generous allocation of Federal funds for veterans' programs. VA construction gets more—and much needed monies—under the bill. As a matter of fact it fully funds the first year of my bill, passed by the House—H.R. 811—Emergency Hospital Repair Act of 2001. The Walsh bill provides approximately $1.6 billion over and above last year in the area of discretionary spending, and a significant $1 billion more in VA medical care funding.

Sure, I would like to increase VA appropriations beyond what is in this bill. We would all like to spend more. But we have to live within at least some budget restraints. No budget or appropriations bill is ever perfect, Mr. Speaker, but is the result of careful compromise and a weighing of competing priorities.

Tomorrow I will bring to the floor the Veterans Benefits Act of 2001, which provides a $2.7 billion increase over 5 years, to boost COLAs for more than 2.3 million disabled vets. And to assist Gulf War vets and for insurance and other purposes. This plus H.R. 1291 the doubling of the 61 education benefit—from $23,400 to $36,900—and H.R. 801, the Veterans Survivors Benefit Improvement Act of 2001 signed into law demonstrates are commitment to vets.

So I just ask Members, however well-intended this motion is, I think it breaks the budget; and I would urge that it be voted down. Both the chairman and ranking member care deeply about veterans and have done their level best within their allocation to fund veterans programs.

I just would ask for a no vote on this.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support on this. Please vote no on the motion to recommit and let us move the bill forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 230, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—196

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—230

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Hansen
Istook
Jefferson
Lipinski
Payne
Spence
Stark

□ 2358

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 336, nays 89, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—336

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp

Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carson (OK)
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—89

Ackerman
Allen
Baldwin
Barrett
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Castle
Conyers
Costello
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Doggett
Eshoo
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Honda
Hostettler
Jackson (IL)
John
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Maloney (NY)
Markey
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Menendez
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Owens
Paul
Petri
Pomeroy
Reyes
Roemer
Rothman
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanders
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Smith (WA)
Stenholm
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Udall (CO)
Velazquez
Waters
Weiner
Wexler

NOT VOTING—8

Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Istook
Jefferson
Lipinski
Payne
Spence
Stark

□ 0007

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2563, BIPARTISAN PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 2001

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet this week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process to H.R. 2563, the Bipartisan Patient Protection Act of 2001.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a very brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in H–312 of the Capitol no later than 5 p.m. Tuesday, July 31, which is where we are right now.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of H.R. 2563 as introduced in the House. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1954. An act to extend the authorities of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 until 2006, and for other purposes.

□ 0010

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Tuesday, July 31, 2001 at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3179. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 075–01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3180. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3181. A letter from the President, Federal Financing Bank, transmitting the Annual Management Report of the Federal Financing Bank for FY 2000, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3182. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Amendment 13 [Docket No. 001030303–1127–02; I.D. 091800E] (RIN: 0648–AO41) received July 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3183. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013–1013–01; I.D. 071901B] received July 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3184. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final

rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pelagic Shelf Rockfish in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010122013–1013–01; I.D. 071901C] received July 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3185. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustments [Docket No. 001226367–0367–01; I.D. 062601A] received July 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3186. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Amendment 14 [Docket No. 000906253–1117–02; I.D. 061500E] (RIN: 0648–AL51) received July 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3187. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 010112013–1013–01; I.D. 071801C] received July 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3188. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shortraker and Rougheye Rockfish in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013–1013–01; I.D. 071301A] received July 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3189. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013–1013–01; I.D. 071301B] received July 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3190. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013–1013–01; I.D. 071801D] received July 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3191. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Black Sea Bass Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Quarter 3 Period [Docket No. 001121328–1041–02; I.D. 071101C] received July 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3192. A letter from the Secretary, United States Senate, transmitting the Advisory Committee's Third Report to Congress, dated December 31, 2000, established under authority of Public Law 101–509; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 213. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–171). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 214. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2505) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning (Rept. 107–172). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2510. A bill to extend the expiration of date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAUZIN. Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2441. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to redesignate a facility as the National Hansen's Disease Programs Center, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 2291. A bill to extend the authorization of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program for an additional 5 years, to authorize a National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107–175 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2291 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2291. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than July 30, 2001.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 2672. A bill to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at 8th Avenue and Mill Street in Eugene, Oregon, as the ''Wayne Lyman Morse United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 2673. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to prohibit offering for sale, selling, or purchasing in interstate or foreign commerce certain shark fins; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FROST (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2674. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include coverage under the Medicare Program for rehabilitation services provided by State vocational rehabilitation agencies to older individuals who are blind; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. HART, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2675. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to add National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day to the list of days on which the flag should especially be displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2676. A bill to ensure that minority farmers are adequately compensated for years of discrimination in the operation of programs of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 2677. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the quality of care furnished in nursing homes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the establishment of National Character Counts Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a postage stamp commemorating Langston Hughes, a great American literary figure; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H. Res. 215. A resolution honoring the Colorado Wing of the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 17: Mr. FILNER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 25: Mr. KING and Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.R. 162: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 184: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 218: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 274: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 287: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 439: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 440: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 460: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 854: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 902: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 936: Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 937: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 938: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 969: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. CANTOR.
H.R. 1071: Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 1093: Mr. HULSHOF and Mr. GRAVES.
H.R. 1167: Mr. SABO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1168: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LEACH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1169: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1202: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1255: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 1268: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 1289: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1354: Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 1377: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 1475: Mr. FORD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1494: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1512: Mr. JEFFERSON and Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 1556: Mr. BOYD, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 1636: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1674: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 1700: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 1718: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1739: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1770: Mr. CRANE, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Ms. HART.
H.R. 1771: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 1782: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1808: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1822: Mr. MCNULTY and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 1828: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1849: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1927: Mr. OTTER and Mr. KERNS.
H.R. 1949: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1979: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
H.R. 1990: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 2018: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KELLER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 2035: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2073: Mr. GILLMOR and Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 2081: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2087: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2117: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 2123: Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 2148: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2175: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2180: Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 2184: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2220: Mr. FROST and Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 2223: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 2269: Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. NEY, and Mr. PORTMAN.
H.R. 2283: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2308: Mr. MCHUGH and Ms. HART.
H.R. 2319: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2323: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 2327: Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 2340: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2349: Mr. BARRETT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2353: Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 2375: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HORN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BACA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2389: Mr. OTTER.
H.R. 2423: Mr. STENHOLM.
H.R. 2453: Mr. GEKAS and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 2476: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2498: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2534: Mr. DREIER and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2555: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. FARR of California.
H.R. 2669: Mr. TOWNS.
H.J. Res. 15: Mr. CHAMBLISS.
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. COYNE.
H. Con. Res. 148: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. QUINN.
H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. SAXTON.
H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H. Con. Res. 180: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H. Con. Res. 188: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
H. Res. 211: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H. Res. 212: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. SAWYER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4

OFFERED BY: MS. BERKLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In division A, in title III, strike section 301, redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly, and make the necessary changes to the table of contents.

H.R. 4

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 34, after line 7, insert the following new section and make the necessary conforming changes in the table of contents:

SEC. 129. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FUEL CELL PILOT PROGRAM.

Title V of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act is amended by adding the following new part at the end thereof:

"Part 5—Federal Fuel Cell Pilot Program

"SEC. 571. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FUEL CELL PILOT PROGRAM.

''(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Energy shall establish a program for the acquisition of—

''(1) up to 100 commercially available 200 kilowatt fuel cell power plants;

''(2) up to 20 megawatts of power generated from commercially available fuel cell power plants; or

''(3) a combination thereof,

for use at federally owned or operated facilities. The Secretary shall provide funding for purchase, site engineering, installation, startup, training, operation, and maintenance costs associated with the acquisition of such power plants, along with any other necessary assistance.

''(b) SITE SELECTION.—In the selection of federally owned or operated facilities as a site for the location of power plants acquired under this section, or as a site to receive power acquired under this section, priority shall be given to sites with 1 or more of the following attributes:

''(1) Location (of the Federal facility or the generating power plant) in an area classified as a nonattainment area under title I of the Clean Air Act.

''(2) Computer or electronic operations that are sensitive to power supply disruptions.

''(3) Need for a reliable, uninterrupted power supply.

''(4) Remote location, or other factors requiring off-grid power generation.

''(5) Critical manufacturing or other activities that support national security efforts.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy $140,000,000 for the fiscal year period from fiscal year 2002 through 2004 for carrying out this section.''.

H.R. 4

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 34, after line 7, insert the following new section and make the necessary conforming changes in the table of contents:

SEC. 129. ENERGY INDEPENDENCE.

(a) DOMESTIC ENERGY SELF-SUFFICIENCY PLAN.—

(1) STRATEGIC PLAN.—The Secretary of Energy shall develop, and transmit to the Congress within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, a strategic plan to ensure that the United States is energy self-sufficient by the year 2011. The plan shall include recommendations for legislative and regulatory actions needed to accomplish that goal.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy $20,000,000 for carrying out this subsection.

(b) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FUEL CELL PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Energy shall establish a program for the acquisition of—

(A) up to 100 commercially available 200 kilowatt fuel cell power plants;

(B) up to 20 megawatts of power generated from commercially available fuel cell power plants; or

(C) a combination thereof,

for use at federally owned or operated facilities. The Secretary shall provide funding for purchase, site engineering, installation, startup, training, operation, and maintenance costs associated with the acquisition of such power plants, along with any other necessary assistance.

(2) DOMESTIC ASSEMBLY.—All fuel cell systems and fuel cell stacks in power plants acquired, or from which power is acquired, under this subsection shall be assembled in the United States.

(3) SITE SELECTION.—In the selection of federally owned or operated facilities as a site for the location of power plants acquired under this subsection, or as a site to receive power acquired under this section, priority shall be given to sites with 1 or more of the following attributes:

(A) Location (of the Federal facility or the generating power plant) in an area classified as a nonattainment area under title I of the Clean Air Act.

(B) Computer or electronic operations that are sensitive to power supply disruptions.

(C) Need for a reliable, uninterrupted power supply.

(D) Remote location, or other factors requiring off-grid power generation.

(E) Critical manufacturing or other activities that support national security efforts.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy $140,000,000 for the period encompassing fiscal years 2002 through 2004 for carrying out this subsection.

(c) FEDERAL VEHICLES.—Each agency of the Federal Government that maintains a fleet of motor vehicles shall develop a plan for a transition of the fleet to vehicles powered by fuel cell technology. Each such plan shall include implementation beginning by fiscal year 2006, to be completed by fiscal year 2011. Each plan shall incorporate and build on the results of completed and ongoing Federal demonstration programs, and shall include additional demonstration programs and pilot programs as necessary to test or investigate available technologies and transition procedures.

(d) LIFE-CYCLE COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—Any life-cycle cost benefit analysis undertaken by a Federal agency with respect to investments in products, services, construction, and other projects shall include an analysis of environmental and power reliability factors.

(e) STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT INCENTIVES.—

(1) GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Energy shall establish a program for making grants to State or local governments for the use of fuel cell technology in meeting their energy requirements, including the use as a source of power for motor vehicles. Each grant made under this section shall require at least a 10 percent matching contribution from the State or local government recipient.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy $110,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2006 for carrying out this subsection.

H.R. 4

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 42, after line 17, insert the following new section and make the necessary conforming changes in the table of contents:

SEC. 136. FUEL CELL GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 363 of the energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6323) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

''(g)(1) The Secretary of Energy shall make grants to State or local government for the use of fuel cell technology in meeting their energy requirements, including the use as a source of power for motor vehicles. Each grant made under this section shall require at least 10 percent matching contribution from the State or local government recipient.

''(2) There is authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, $20,000,000 in fiscal year 2003, $20,000,000 in fiscal year 2004, $20,000,000 in fiscal year 2005, and $20,000,000 in fiscal year 2006, to carry out this section.''.

H.R. 4

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 95, after line 18, insert:

(c) DOMESTIC ENERGY SELF-SUFFICIENCY PLAN.—Section 801 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (44 U.S.C. 7321) is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

''(e)(1) Each plan submitted under this section after the date one year after the date of enactment of this subsection shall include a strategic plan to ensure that the United States is energy self-sufficient by the year 2011.

''(2) The strategic plan under this subsection shall examine and report on the status of existing energy technology and domestic resources as well as developing energy generation and transmission technologies, including, but not limited to fuel cell technology, and should focus on their integration into an overall national energy portfolio to meet the stated goal of achieving energy self-sufficiency within 10 years.

''(3) The strategic plan shall include recommendations to Congress for targeted research and development in promising new energy generation and transmission technologies, and funding levels necessary for specific programs and research efforts necessary to implement a plan providing for the energy self-sufficiency of the United States within the next 10 years.''.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 30, 2001 No. 108

Senate

The Senate met at 1 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, You have told us that to whom much is given much is required. Thank You that You have taught us also that to whom much is required, much shall be given. Lord, You require a great deal of the women and men of this Senate. Provide them with an extra measure of Your strength, wisdom, and discernment for the crucial work of this week. Help them to know what You want and then to want what they know; to say what they mean and mean what they say. Give them resoluteness and intentionality. Free them to listen to You so intently that they can speak with courage and conviction. Keep them in the battle for truth. In Your all-powerful name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the first half hour is for that of the Democrats. The second half hour is for that of the Republicans. We are going to have time evenly divided between 2:30 and 5:30 on the motion to proceed to the emergency Agriculture supplemental authorization bill.

The majority leader has directed me to announce to everybody that we have a schedule this week that we must complete. We have to complete work on this very important Agriculture supplemental. It is an emergency measure that is very important to the country. We have the VA–HUD appropriations bill to complete. We have to complete the work of the past week on the Transportation appropriations bill. Also, we must do the Export Administration Act.

The reason we must complete the Agricultural Assistance Emergency Act is because, if we don't, we lose funding. It is targeted so that if this money is not spent prior to the first of September, it is basically lost for the farmers of this country, and that would be a real disaster.

The reason we must complete the Export Administration Act—the most important piece of legislation the high-tech industry has this year—is because this act expires in the middle of next month. Even if we extend it, it is not anything that will help the high-tech industry. We need to change the basic foundation of the act because what is happening is American companies are having to go overseas to start manufacturing these products because some of the real simple pieces of equipment that can be bought at Radio Shack, such as the PalmPilot that I use, people say is in violation of the present act. We need to be able to sell these export products to foreign countries, where about half of our market is.

The Transportation appropriations bill—the leader indicated that sometime this week he will call for another cloture vote. Based upon prior votes on this matter, cloture should be passed—cloture should take effect, and we would have 30 hours after that.

We have a tremendous amount of work to do this week prior to the August recess. I hope that we can complete all of these things in a timely fashion. As soon as we complete them, we can start the August recess. Until we do that, it will be difficult to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1:30 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

Also, under the order previously entered, the time until 2 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, or his designee.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one of the things I want to visit about this morning is something I read in the morning newspapers; that is, there is now another effort being made to pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I hope that people will get a new page in their song book. We have danced that tune. We have had long hours and days of debate in the Senate on a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

From the information I have received, they still want to do it using the Social Security surpluses. It seems to me that we have done very well without a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. When this debate started, as you will recall, based upon the beginnings of the Reagan administration, there was an effort to cut taxes and increase spending. That was a recipe for disaster. We now have a debt of about $5 trillion as a result of that. We have now, it seems, the same basic scenario. There is being an effort made to cut taxes, and we already know, based upon having passed the supplemental appropriations bill, Mr. President, that our surplus is basically gone.

In an effort to further grind down domestic spending, it appears there is an effort being made to go back where we were a few years ago saying what we really need to make things great in this country is a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. When that debate started during the first Bush administration, there was an annual deficit of about $300 billion.

In the last 8 years, we have been able to do a great job without a constitutional amendment. We have reduced the annual deficit to where now we are having surpluses. Prior to this budget—we will see how much damage this budget does to the progress we have made—we have been able to have many months of low inflation and low unemployment, the longest in some 40 years.

We have been able to reduce the Federal payroll, separate and apart from the military, some 300,000 fewer jobs than we had before. Job creation has been really significant. Some 22 million new jobs have been created. I am trying to figure out why we need, at this stage, a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

I am afraid what has taken place in this short administration of Bush II is, it appears, a recipe for disaster. I say that because the income of this country will be cut back significantly.

I made a call today, and I am not going to divulge the name of the individual to whom I spoke, but I would be happy to do that privately with the President pro tempore or anyone else who wants to ask me, but I will not do it for the press because it was a relatively private call with someone at a large corporation.

He indicated that in the last few days the value of this stock, of this major American corporation, international corporation, has dropped some 70 percent—in a matter of about a week.

The chief executive officer of this major company told me this morning he believes for the first time this softening of the economy we have all talked about is now being felt worldwide. This is a worldwide company. For this stock, in a week's period of time, to decline 70 percent indicates this country had better slow down and slow down its efforts to change the way things have been going.

They have been going great. Senator Moynihan, who was a valued Member of the Senate, said there are Members of the Senate, Members of Congress, people in and outside of government, who for decades have determined they cannot cut back domestic spending by facing it head on and saying we want to cut this program for the Forest Service or for any program one wants to pick—the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, which entities do so much good—they cannot do this head on because these entities do so much good. I have just picked a few off the top of my head.

What they are doing instead is just squeezing down the domestic discretionary spending so these entities will, in effect, starve themselves, and that is what is happening. That is what Senator Moynihan said was going to happen, and it appears he is right. What they are trying to do is starve the domestic aspect of our spending.

We are going to have to realize what we are facing. There are going to be huge requests even this year for more defense spending, and I am sure there is a need for more defense spending, but also there is a need for domestic discretionary spending.

I held a hearing in my subcommittee of the Environment and Public Works Committee last Monday, dealing with this Nation's infrastructure. I brought in mayors from around the country to talk about what is happening in their cities. It is scary, to say the least.

The mayor of Atlanta, GA, said that most mayors in America now are on term limits and the No. 1 wish of mayors from around America is: Please do not have the water system, the sewer system, break down, before my term is up. Let the next mayor face the problem because it is coming. It is just a question of when.

The mayor of Atlanta said in this relatively new, modern city in the sense that most of the growth has taken place recently, there is a very big backlog of things which need to be done. Some of their water systems in Atlanta are very old and are being put together by—I am exaggerating—chewing gum. They are just holding them together. They do not have enough money to do it right.

I had Mayor Williams of our National City, Washington, DC, testify in my subcommittee. Those of us who spend a lot of time in Washington, DC, have all seen and read in the paper about the manhole covers blowing off in the Georgetown area. He said that is a result of work not being done that needs to be done with the electricity, with the sewers, with the water systems. He said some of the water pipes in Washington, DC, are old wooden pipes.

We heard from the Mayor of Washington, DC, saying the infrastructure needs of this metropolitan American Federal city are disastrous. He needs help. If there is a city in America we should help, it is Washington, DC, where tourists come to see the Nation's Capitol, but we have manhole covers blowing off into the air like mortars. He said there are going to be more of them; they do not have the wherewithal to fix them.

Mark Morial, the mayor of New Orleans, came in and testified. New Orleans is a famous city, with a great and rich heritage. I am reading a book now about Andrew Jackson, ''Battle of New Orleans.'' It is a wonderful book. New Orleans has 100 water pumping stations. That is the way it is. That is the way they have to get the water out of the city. There is lots of water. If they did not pump the water out, the city would be flooded. The pumping stations use pumps over 100 years old.

The mayor said, how much longer can they keep doing what they are supposed to do? The pumps are 100 years old. Some of those pumps came into existence before the turn of the last century, and we are still using them.

The mayor of Las Vegas, NV, Oscar Goodman, testified. It is the most rapidly growing city in America, the fastest growing State in America.

I asked: Is it true, Mayor Goodman, we must build 12 new schools every year in the Las Vegas area, 1 every month, to keep up?

He said: Senator, you are wrong. It is now up to 14. We have to build more than one school every month to keep up with the growth there. We really need help. Las Vegas needs help. Clark County, where Las Vegas is, needs help.

What are we talking about doing? Spending time on the Senate floor talking about a constitutional amendment to balance the budget? We need to talk about ways to help the cities of Atlanta, New Orleans, Las Vegas and Washington, DC. That is what we need to be spending some time on.

We are on a literal powder keg of things that need to be done for our cities.

I also say this: If there was ever a time for bipartisanship, it is now. The Senate is under the control of the Democrats, just barely. The House is under the control of the Republicans, just barely. We have a man who is President of the United States, who received fewer votes than the person he beat. It would seem to me this is a time that cries out for bipartisanship, to work together to get things done.

Yet we had a filibuster last week that held up another appropriations bill. It was based on an issue—and I know the people who disputed the Mexican trucking issue believe fervently in their side. There were two sides, and both believed in their causes. What went on in this Chamber was not good for the well-being of the country. We needed to pass the appropriations bill, take it to conference. That is where it is going to be decided. It is not going to be decided in the Senate.

The House has a provision that, in effect, bans Mexican trucks coming into America. It passed by a 2-to-1 margin. What we had crafted by Senators SHELBY and MURRAY was a middle ground,

and that still was not good enough. The bill was taken down and will be brought back up. We will vote again on cloture, and this week sometime we will pass the Transportation appropriations bill.

But we need to work on issues that are important to this country. Last week a report came out dealing with Social Security and what needed to be done. One of the main directions of that report is for the President's commission to do an analysis of Social Security. Most everyone said the people had a preconceived idea before they were appointed, and that is to privatize Social Security. We have heard from a lot of people that such a plan would require a 41 percent cut in benefits in order to maintain Social Security solvency, according to an October 2000 Century Foundation analysis by the country's leading economists. It is very unlikely that private accounts would earn enough to dig out of the hole. Average single earners would still face 20 percent cuts, with married couples and lower earners doing even worse. So there are a lot of issues that we are being forced to talk about by the administration.

I think it is important we take a look at Social Security to see what we can do to build it up in the outyears, but for people saying Social Security is a disaster, it is broke, simply isn't true. Everyone will draw 100 percent of the benefits until almost the year 2040. And if we did nothing with Social Security prior to 2040—and I certainly hope we will not—people would still be able to draw 80 percent of their benefits. They should be able to draw 100 percent of the benefits.

I think that another direction we are getting from the White House is not appropriate, and that is talking about Social Security being bankrupt. It is not. We need to take a look and do some things so in the outyears it is going to be strong and everybody can draw 100 percent of their benefits, not just 80 percent of the benefits. We also look forward to having the committee chairmen work hard on having hearings so that we can report out as many of the President's nominations as we can. I personally think that the process isn't good; it takes so long. There is a huge hole at the end, and all these nominations are stuffed in this hole. At the other end, where they come out down, it is about this big. It is a very tiny little hole. It is a funnel that has a small end on it. What happens is we do not have the opportunity in a timely fashion to look at these people. They go through the Justice Department, vetted by the White House, and outside entities take a look at them. It has become so burdensome that even an independent analysis says the quickest President Bush can have all his nominees in place will be next February. That is really too slow, and we are going to do our best to process these nominees as fairly and expeditiously as possible.

Mr. President, I would hope that we are allowed to go to the Emergency Agriculture Assistance Act of 2001. It is very important legislation for almost the entire country—I shouldn't say almost the entire country. It is important for the whole country. Title I deals with commodities, and these commodities are things that we take for granted. When we go to the grocery stores, these things are always there. Farmers have difficulty year after year doing what needs to be done. This is an emergency supplemental. As we have heard on this floor from Senators from different parts of the country, if their farmers don't get relief, they will, in effect, go bankrupt. That is why we need to do this as quickly as possible.

Title II is very important. It deals with conservation. There is a new part of the bill that has received a lot of direction and attention. The conservation aspect of this bill is important because we are looking at things we haven't done in the past, such as wetlands reserve programs and conservation reserve programs. So I would hope that Senators HARKIN and LUGAR, who will be the managers of this legislation, are allowed to go forward with this bill as quickly as possible.

It is too bad we are going to have a cloture vote on the motion to proceed, but that is what we have been asked to do.

Title III deals with nutrition, which is a substantial part of this program. It requires a Farmers' Market Nutrition Pilot Program, distribution of commodities, things that again we take for granted. So I hope that we move to title IV dealing with credit and rural development, which is certainly something that Nevada cares about; title V dealing with research; and title VI, disaster assistance, we can move as quickly as possible.

We understand there will be a number of amendments. We hope that we could move to these amendments quickly and not have to face another cloture motion on the bill itself. I think all we are doing is holding up legislation that is vital to the very existence of the family farm. We have heard time and time again how important family farms are to America. This legislation will preserve thousands of family farms that are in desperate shape at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as if in morning business. I understand 30 minutes has been allocated to Senator GRASSLEY. I would ask unanimous consent that since Senator GRASSLEY has indicated he cannot be here at this time, 20 minutes of the 30 minutes be allocated to me and the balance remaining, approximately 10 minutes, to Senator CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would it be permissible to the Senator that Democrats still have 5 minutes at the end of his time?

I ask unanimous consent that we have the last 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat the request.

Mr. REID. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska have 20 minutes, Senator GRASSLEY 10 minutes, and the Democrats would have the last 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I believe Senator REID misunderstood me. This was Senator GRASSLEY's time. Senator THOMAS wanted the remaining 10 minutes. I have no objection to providing the last 5 minutes to the other side.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI.

ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I very much appreciate the senior Member of this body, the President pro tempore, who is presiding at this time, for giving me the opportunity to advise my colleagues of the seriousness of the energy crisis in this county. I think we would all agree that the matter of energy is something we take a good deal for granted. We take for granted that America has been blessed with an affordable, plentiful, reliable supply of energy which pretty much provides us with a standard of living second to none. But it is something, again, that is there. We take it for granted. And we look forward to it continuing.

We have had some attention given to the crisis out in California, but for the most part it has not hit the majority of Americans. I think it is fair to say from the following information we have seen there is a growing concern that perhaps what happened in California could spread to other parts of the country.

As far as our national security is concerned, we have had a lot of discussion; we have seen communiques; we have seen articles concerning the national security of our country tied into energy simply because we have increased our imports of crude oil into this country from about 37 percent in 1973 to over 56 percent at this time.

As a consequence, we have become more beholden to OPEC and, the OPEC cartel, and the OPEC cartel has set a price structure of $22 to $28 and reduced supply. It is pretty much assumed now we are going to be in a period of increased dependence on imported oil from OPEC in the Middle East for the increasing timeframe in the future until we find another alternative to crude oil, which is not likely to occur.

In addition, we have economic security which, of course, is fostered by

growth and our continued expansion of jobs and the personal aspects associated with energy. The security of our lives is somewhat dependent on energy, the future of our dreams. We have factors to consider such as commitment, safety, and freedom from harm. Energy is directly related to that in the sense of what happens when our kids are home; the lights go out, the security alarm does not work—things to be concerned about in a very rapid period of time. We have the issue of job security to keep Americans at work and create more jobs. Energy powers the workplace, and that moves this economy forward, bringing each of us along with it.

As we look at our standard of living, our plentiful supply of energy, the affordability, and the recognition that some of this is in question, I think we have to look at the reality associated with the actions being contemplated in this body and the House of Representatives. It is our understanding that the House of Representatives will be addressing an energy bill this week.

The reason things are different this time is we have brought together a set of circumstances which I have highlighted on previous occasions, but previously it was different. We have had a series of situations highlighted by what is happening in California. We have seen an increased dependence on foreign oil, as I have indicated, of 56 percent. The Department of Energy indicates that will increase to 64, 65, 66 percent by the year 2010.

What is different about oil compared with our other sources of energy? America and the world move on oil. We have other sources of energy for electricity, including coal, natural gas, wind, hydro. But we use oil. As we look at our increased dependence on foreign oil, we recognize it affects our national security. Yet we are becoming more and more subject to control by the Middle East. We have not had any nuclear plants licensed in over 10 years in this country; nuclear is about 20 percent of our energy. We have seen gas prices soar from $2.16 to over $10 and then come down again, but nevertheless we have seen a dramatic increase at a time when we are using natural gas at a faster rate than we are finding new gas reserves. We have not seen a new oil refinery in this country in almost 20 years. We have not seen a coal-fired plant built in the last 10 years. We find suddenly we do not have adequate transmission; the transmission lines are overloaded, both natural gas and electricity. So things are different now.

I fear as we pursue an energy bill in the Senate, we are going to end up where we were the last time we attempted to make some subjective corrections. I think it is important to recognize this in the Energy Committee where most of this legislation resides. In 1992, we passed a number of very positive, meaningful bills out of committee to increase domestic production, to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, to expedite infrastructure, develop alternative fuels, encourage renewable fuel development, promote conservation, and increase funding for the LIHEAP program which provides assistance for those with low income.

My point is we passed a meaningful bill but what we enacted was virtually nothing: Double flush toilets and a left turn on a red light. That is what we passed.

If we pursue an energy bill this time, it appears to me we are pursuing much of the same that we passed in committee but are not passing into law simply because of a concern by well-meaning environmental groups that there is something wrong with increasing supply. We will have to increase supply.

I also point out job security. This is a jobs issue in the United States. It was interesting to hear the debate the other day in the House of Representatives. The Teamsters and the Democratic caucus had an opportunity to express the merits of increased supply.

As a consequence of the points I made relative to the fact that things are different, yet we are pursuing the same old alternatives, we are putting emphasis on renewal, putting emphasis on alternatives, placing emphasis on wind power and solar power, but we are not really increasing supply as the demand has increased.

This chart demonstrates what is happening. The burden of increasing energy bills hurts most those families who can afford it the least. Almost 14 percent of the family budget is spent on energy for families earning less than $15,000. The point is obvious and most convincing: Runaway energy rates are costing Americans a great deal of money in their households, as well as costing jobs.

We have reviews from coast to coast. American working families have seen more than 400,000 jobs basically disappear since the first of the year. A large reason for that, a significant reason, is the cost of energy. In June alone, 114,000 jobs were lost. Most of those were good-paying jobs, manufacturing jobs, for so many families. We saw Northwest Airlines lose 2,000 jobs; International Paper, 3,000 jobs; aluminum plants in the Northwest find it more profitable to sell electricity than make aluminum; Miller Brewing Company found high energy costs made it more economic to brew beer in Dallas and ship it to California instead of brewing it there in the first place. In Delaware last week, Du Pont indicated it was relieving its workforce by some 1,500, and possibly up to 5,000, jobs and another 1,500 contract jobs. The reason? Increased energy costs.

The problem is widespread: 54 companies had mass layoffs in Wisconsin in May, a significant portion due to high energy costs; Oregon alone has had 7,000 employees laid off since last summer. State officials blame rising energy and fuel costs. California blackouts have cost 135,000 jobs in California. Unless we turn this around, the economic doom of a few short years ago will turn into a prolonged bust. The reason for this is the demand has increased but we have not increased the supply.

As I indicated, the emphasis has been on renewables and alternatives. We spent some $6 billion, but they still account for less than 4 percent of the total energy mix. That includes hydro as well. As we look at potential solutions, there are some at hand. That is the President's comprehensive, balanced natural energy plan. The plan includes more than 100 specific recommendations to increase conservation, improve energy, and domestic supplies of energy as well. This plan will directly create more than 1.5 million new jobs. We need these jobs in the United States today.

The direct benefits speak for themselves, but the indirect benefits will be immeasurable. By easing energy costs, returning stability and reliability to our energy grid, businesses can again look forward to growth, and that means jobs. Through incentives to promote new energy production, the energy plan will help to ensure meeting our growing demand. New energy supplies mean new jobs. They mean the stability of existing jobs. The plan places an emphasis on American ingenuity and American technology. We are using our best and brightest to craft solutions to these energy problems. It will take hard work. It will take new thinking and new jobs as well.

The plan also encourages development of resources that exist here at home, and that includes the safe exploration for energy under a small portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

It is interesting to see some of the propaganda on this issue. I have here a page from Rollcall. It is sponsored by a number of the environmental groups—American Rivers, Defenders of Wildlife. It is rather interesting because what it says is what, in effect, we did in 1992. It says:

> Let's Promote Clean Energy
>
> A responsible bill would encourage the use of clean energy and set significantly higher efficiency standards for motor vehicles to reduce global warming pollution. Clean and renewable energy sources, such as wind, solar and geothermal. . . .

That is where we were in 1992. Surely we want this technology. But it simply is not here yet. It now constitutes less than 4 percent of our energy supply.

This is part of the problem when we listen to our well-meaning friends who simply propose a clean energy bill. They do not say how we are really going to increase the supply. We have to dramatically increase the supply.

Rollcall says:

> Let's Reduce Pollution
>
> We could significantly cut emissions of global warming pollutants by setting stronger fuel economy standards for cars, SUVs and light trucks.

They talk about 40 miles per gallon. But they do not talk about the preference of Americans to buy automobiles. One of the interesting things in this country is that the 10 most fuel-efficient automobiles on the market today constitute exactly 1.5 percent of the automobile sales.

They also say:

Let's Improve Energy Efficiency

The cleanest, cheapest, quickest way to meet our energy needs is to improve energy efficiency. To help consumers, let's have an energy bill that dramatically increases the fuel economy of our vehicles. . . .

That is fine, but what does it do to increase supply? We have hydro; we have nuclear, but it does not say anything about increasing nuclear energy in this country, which is clean.

We are going to fall into the same trap we did in 1992. We are going to go through a lengthy process here, but we are not going to produce any more energy. One of the things that bothers me a little bit is the misleading statement in this particular ad. It says:

The bill would open up pristine and ecologically fragile lands like the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and the Rocky Mountain Front to oil drilling. There's no excuse for sacrificing these and other national treasures and the wildlife that depends on them. . . .

They further say:

The economically recoverable oil in the Arctic Refuge would meet only six months of our nation's needs, and wouldn't start reaching us for ten years.

Both those statements are absolutely false. To suggest it would be a 6-month supply would be to assume that there would be no other energy produced in the United States or imported into the United States for a 6-month period.

If you want to turn it around, you say: Therefore we are not going to allow any development to occur in Alaska. Therefore the United States will be short a 6-month supply.

It is used over and over again. It is a standard environmental pitch. It says it would take 10 years. It would not take 10 years. The Department of Energy and Department of Interior have indicated they would have oil on line in 3.5 years, if indeed the oil is there in the abundance it has to be.

In conclusion, I think we should note a couple of facts that are very real. We are looking at jobs in this country. Opening ANWR would create about 700,000 new jobs nationwide, associated with the development of ANWR if, indeed, it carries the reserves that we anticipate.

We anticipate somewhere between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels of oil. That would equal what we would import from Saudi Arabia over a 30-year period of time.

Here at home we have this opportunity. We are not going to drill our way out of this crisis, but we can substantially relieve our dependence.

The other point I want to make is about national security. We are becoming more and more dependent on countries such as Iraq where we enforce the no-fly zones. Sadam attempted to shoot down our U–2 just last week. We buy a million barrels of oil from Iraq, and what do we do with the oil? We put it in our planes and go bomb him, take out his targets. He develops a missile capability and aims it at our ally, Israel. I don't think that is the best foreign policy.

If you look at the ANWR chart, you get a different view of the realities. And the reality is there is a huge area called ANWR. It is a relatively significant portion of dedicated wilderness: 8.5 million acres are in wilderness, 9 million already in refuge, and 1.5 million acres are the 1002 area that we are considering opening. There is no scientific evidence that says we cannot do it safely.

What about refuges? We do all kinds of development in refuges. We have 30 refuges all over the country where we drill for oil and gas. These are the States that have them. We have the specific refuges here in Texas, Oklahoma, North Dakota, New Mexico, Montana, Mississippi, Alaska, California. What is so different about ANWR?

Is there a reason we cannot use this technology in ANWR? Refuges are open to exploration for minerals and oil and gas as well. It is easy to confuse a refuge with a wilderness or with a park, but we do not allow any motorized access in wildernesses and parks. Each is unique to its own specific purpose. The balanced use of Federal land is commonplace in a refuge. It is the norm. So many people misunderstand that.

In more than 30 Federal refuges from coast to coast we safely explore for mineral resources. There are over 400 wells in Louisiana alone, so what is different about ANWR?

By definition, refuges are balanced places where the environment is always protected and resources are explored only where the resource exists. ANWR is a refuge and it is no different. To suggest we cannot do it safely is not proven by any scientific evidence. This is an emotional argument brought about by the environmental community to generate revenue and dollars.

Let me conclude with a couple of references because my time is almost up. We have new technology in ANWR. The new technology is the directional drilling which lends itself very much to 3D seismic. The old way you used to drill was to go straight down. If you hit it, you were lucky. This is the new systematic 3D seismic which allows you to get into the pockets of oil. It is estimated by the technologists, today if we were going to drill under this cap, we could come out at gate 8 at Reagan Airport. This technology has advanced that much.

We have the toughest environmental standards here in the world. Prudhoe Bay is the finest oilfield in the world even though it is 30-year-old technology.

What is Prudhoe Bay? Prudhoe Bay has produced its thirteen-millionth barrel of oil. It was supposed to only have 10 million barrels. My point is, as we look at the prospects for ANWR, the prospects for a major discovery according to the geologists is quite good, with an estimate of 5.6 to 16 billion. If it is 10 billion, it would be as big as Prudhoe Bay which has supplied this Nation with 20 percent of its crude oil for the last 20 years. Exploration would be limited to a sliver of land, roughly 2,000 acres.

We have ice roads, which is new technology, as the chart will show. This is the directional drilling. There are the ice roads. We build these out of water. Some people say there is no water in the North Slope. That is ridiculous. You build snow fences, generate snow, you can drill down below permafrost and there is plenty of water, or you can take the salt water and use it through a desalination process, which is quite common.

This advanced technology makes the footprint manageable. A 2,000 acre-foot would average five average family farms. Caribou do not calve in the 1002 area. They did not this year or the last 2 years. Here is a picture of the calving area. The environmental arguments just do not support any of these generalizations.

There is an abundance of drilling on the Canadian side. There is a caribou herd. Here is the information on the charts. It shows where Anderson Exploration conducted seismic studies. There are lease sales and echo plan areas all over the Canadian side. Here is the range of the Porcupine caribou herd, and here is the drilling that is going on. Of course, here is Alaska and here is Canada.

My point is to suggest that while the Canadians object to our initiating activity, they have a very aggressive ongoing program. Obviously, they look at themselves as competitors with Alaska supplying the United States with oil and gas.

Exploration and development of ANWR is supported by Alaskans. Alaskans are proud and protective of the environment. Alaska has the best oversight in the world in the development of oil and gas. Prudhoe Bay is required to adhere to State law as well as Federal law. We care about where we get our oil. If we look at the area of Saudi Arabia and OPEC nations, we don't seem to give any consideration on how it is produced and whether it is done environmentally and in a compatible manner.

Alaskans are proud and protective of the environment, and we are willing to do our part to end the energy crisis. There is no NIMBY in my State; that is, ''Not in my backyard.'' Seventy-five percent of all Alaskans favor exploration. The Alaskans who live there—the people who must breathe the air, drink the water, and make the decisions about their communities—support exploration. It is absolutely unfair to deny them the same kind of opportunity everyone else enjoys in this country.

Kaktovik is a small village in ANWR in the 1002 area. Environmentalists say there is nothing there, that it is the Serengeti of the north. It is a village of about 250 people. There is a physician there, a small school, and a general store. They are real people.

Do not be misled by the suggestion that somehow we don't have the capability and we cannot do it safely. We can. Why not do it for American jobs?

This issue reaches a critical mass this week as Congress finally—and I emphasize ''finally''—begins to work on a comprehensive energy bill. I urge my colleagues both here and in the other body to recognize that this is a fork in the road, and our efforts can have great impact for the American worker. Do we continue down the path of instability and rising energy costs—a path that finds more American families with pink slips and uncertain futures—or do we head down a path for job creation based on solid science and growth?

With a comprehensive, balanced national energy strategy in place, we can look forward to reliable, affordable, and plentiful energy that has fueled this economy in the past and that will power a bright future. I hope that is the choice because we cannot afford to make the mistakes we made in 1992.

I will not stand by in this body and allow us to pass an energy bill that does not increase the supply of energy in this country. It simply is unconscionable. That is apparently where we are headed, to some degree.

I think it is important that we recognize what is going on in the House of Representatives and those in opposition who are suggesting alternative renewables with no increased supply, and recognize that we have a serious concern over the loss of jobs in this country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Chattanooga Times by Lee Anderson who has been to ANWR and has some interesting things to say about it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President George W. Bush wants to help head off our future energy problems by drilling for oil in the far, far north of Alaska, in an area called the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Environmentalists and liberals are yelling, ''Over our dead bodies.'' And now that the Democrats control the United States Senate, they think they will win. But would you rather continue to rely on Iraq's Saddam Hussein and a host of other foreign nations for American oil?

There are some facts about Alaska and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge that sensible people should look at rationally—though many people won't do that.

In the first place, the proposed drilling site is so far away and in such a desolate, cold and forbidding area that almost no one will ever see it.

Second, it's not far from Prudhoe Bay, where current oil production is proceeding without serious problems.

But perhaps most important is the fact that the proposed oil production would affect very little land. Consider:

Alaska spreads over 615,230 square miles; already has 125 million acres in national parks, preserves and wildlife refuges.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge consists of 19 million acres. But the area proposed for drilling is only 1.5 million acres. And of that, only about 2,000 acres—about twice the size of Chattanooga's Lovell Field—would be used.

Will reason prevail and bring oil production? Probably not soon.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield any remaining time to the Senator from Wyoming. I thank the Chair for his attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I appreciate the comments of my friend from Alaska. Certainly that issue is important to all of us. We will be dealing with it soon.

SENATE AGENDA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to talk about some of the bills that are coming up and what I see as a very important aspect of what we do here in the Congress. What we do, of course, is important. But let's have some reasoning about where we want to be over time so that the decisions we make as we go through our daily work will be implemented with a vision of where we want to go.

Obviously, we have different views of what our role is here. I was listening to my friend from Nevada, who is concerned about balanced budgets because the Federal Government will not be able to spend enough. Others believe that maybe a balanced budget is where we ought to be and that there ought to be some limit on the size of government.

The fact is that States and local governments are very important components. It makes a difference in where you see things down the road.

I am specifically interested in what is happening in agriculture. We will have a bill before us today on supplemental funding for agriculture. Before long, we will have the 2002 appropriations for agriculture. More importantly, perhaps next year or even at the end of this year, we will have a new farm bill. That farm bill and the appropriations bills we are now dealing with will help us decide where we are going in agriculture.

Those are the kinds of decisions in the longer term that we have to make. Of course, we have to deal with the necessary daily things, but we really ought to be asking where we want agriculture to be in 10 years or in 15 years. These appropriations bills will have a great deal to do with where we go.

I think the same thing is true with health care. We are in the process right now of seeking some revision of Medicare. It is needed. We are talking about how we are going to handle pharmaceuticals. What is it we want? How do we want health care structured over time? What do we think is the best way to serve the people of this country? Those are the kinds of decisions that I think too often we don't really give enough consideration to—where we are tied up with how we are going to get funding for this for next year and how we are going to keep this program at this level.

Hopefully, we can step back and see with some vision. Maybe you call it 20/20. Where do we want to be over a period of time?

The Senator from Alaska talked about energy. We are doing some things with energy. Here again, I think we ought to be talking about where we are and some of the things we want to have happen over time, with less dependency on overseas and less dependency on OPEC. At the same time, I am sure we want to be certain we have an adequate supply so that we will have a strong economy and so we can do the things we want to do—reasonably priced—over the long range.

One of the things we experience in my State, an energy-producing State, is boom and bust. All of a sudden, natural gas is worth $9 when it was $1.5 or $2. Everything goes up all of a sudden. Then the price comes down, and the economy comes down.

We want diversity of fuel; we don't want to be dependent on one thing.

Conservation: Obviously, we need to decide what to do. What do you want over time? We want conservation. Is that too much of a sacrifice? Can we do research so that conservation will allow us to use less fuel and still have the same kind of services? I think so, with renewables and new uses.

I remember someone talking at an energy meeting in Casper, WY—where I live—saying we have never run out of a fuel. I suspect that is true. What do we do? We find new and better sources or we use them in a better way. I suspect that is what we ought to be thinking about in terms of applying our long-term efforts.

What about agriculture? Obviously, we want sufficient food. Obviously, we would like to be able to supply food to foreign markets. We want clean food and safe food.

I think most people would like to see family farmers remain on the farm so we don't become an entirely corporate body. Of course, we want to preserve open space. We want to preserve the lands that are being used—and farm communities.

These are some of the things we really ought to measure against what we are talking about to see if they indeed have the best chance to produce those kinds of visions.

Medicare: We want health care for everyone. We want to keep it in the private sector—at least some of us do. Sometimes that is a different point of view. We want to encourage research. We want to limit catastrophic costs so no one is saddled with unreasonable

costs; and, of course, control utilization. How do you do that? Certainly, each of us has to have a little participation in the cost. We want top-quality care.

My time has about expired. I want to make the point that we have some opportunities always, but particularly on those three bills. There will be others that will help shape the future. Education, of course, is another one. Where do we want to be over a period of time?

I am hopeful that in addition to doing those things—obviously, in the short term—we will also measure what we do and how it will impact what we give when the time comes for us to deal with it in the future.

I think my time has expired. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I want to summarize where we are on the comprehensive energy legislation issue that all of us are interested in moving ahead, and to tell you my perspective on it at this point.

As we began the year, we identified two sets of issues. There were the short-term challenges we faced as a country, and then there were the more long-term issues. The short-term challenges included the very high prices for electricity in California, which I think all of us recognized at that time were not just unreasonable but were exorbitant really for many residents in California. Really, the wholesale prices, being very high, were not being passed on to consumers at that time, although the consumer retail prices started to reflect those high prices that had been charged for such a long time.

Second, of course, natural gas prices were very high. That was a concern.

A third short-term concern was the inadequacy of funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. That is the program Congress put in place many years ago to help low-income families in this country pay their utility bills. The demand on that program was so great during this last winter, and even into this spring and early summer, that most States that operate that program, and are dependent on Federal funds to do so, were out of funding. So that was another short-term problem we needed to address.

Fortunately, most of these short-term issues have been addressed in some significant way. The price of wholesale power in California has come down, perhaps not as far as it eventually will and should, but it has come down substantially. The price of natural gas has come down. Again, that is not being reflected to the extent it should as yet in home utility bills, but that hopefully will happen quickly, too.

As to the LIHEAP program—the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program—we have put $300 million of new funding into the supplemental appropriations bill that we sent to the President to try to keep that program functioning through the rest of this summer.

So those are short-term issues we have seen resolved to some extent. And I feel good about that.

There remain, however, a great many long-term challenges that the country has in dealing with its energy future. Let me mention a few of those because I believe we can work in a bipartisan way to deal with them to help resolve those issues.

One, of course, is supply. We do not have assured adequate supply going forward over the next several years. We need to look at ways to increase supply. One is affordability. We are concerned about the price of the various sources of energy: Electricity, natural gas, gasoline at the pump.

Efficiency in the use of energy is a major challenge. We have tremendous inefficiency in power production in this country. We need to find ways to increase efficiency in that respect. In many cases, two-thirds of essentially all the power for fuel going into our power plants is lost because of inefficiency in power production.

I believe we all want less pollution from the burning of fossil fuels. I think we have come to recognize that as fossil fuels burn we do have pollution. We need to find ways to diminish that. We need more diversity in our fuel supply. We need to shift to more use of renewable energy, to the extent the technology permits that, and to the extent the cost of producing that renewable energy permits.

So we have a great many long-term goals that the country wants to achieve. I believe we can do that. I think we can do it in this Congress. I think we can do it in this session of this Congress.

The President, to his credit, has presented the country with a national energy plan. There has been a lot of criticism of parts of that plan. I share some of that criticism. But I do think the President should receive credit for having made this a priority issue for the country. He has said this is something he thinks needs to be addressed. I agree with that; this is something that needs to be addressed.

We need to pass an energy bill addressing these long-term concerns. The House of Representatives is expected to act this week on a major energy bill. There will be substantial controversy about some of the provisions in that bill. And there are, frankly, several provisions in the bill, as it comes to this Chamber, with which I do not agree.

I do not agree with the proposal to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling and exploration. I do not think that is a substantial solution to our problems. I do not believe we should produce legislation to accomplish that, and send it to the President, even though he has requested that we do so. So that is one point of disagreement.

I hope very much that we will do something significant to improve vehicle fuel efficiency. We are always concerned about the growing dependence on foreign sources of oil. And those sources are growing. We import a tremendous amount of oil. Most of that goes into the transportation sector, and most of that for cars and light-duty vehicles of various kinds. So we need to find ways to increase vehicle fuel efficiency. We can do that as well.

Let me say there are a great many other challenges we also have. I know time is short. I intend to begin a mark-up of an energy bill in the Energy Committee this Wednesday. I hope we can move ahead on a bipartisan basis. Then we can also set the framework for moving ahead, when the Congress returns in September, on the balance of a comprehensive bill.

This is something that will benefit the country; it is something we can do in the Senate; and we can do it on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves, I ask if he will respond to a question I have about the energy bill.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I am pleased to respond.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, through you to my friend from New Mexico, I was speaking with Senator LUGAR. One of the things that has so intrigued me about the legislation you will mark up is that there is a section in the bill that deals with renewables; is that right?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, we will have a section in the bill dealing with renewable energy production. The one we are marking up this Wednesday deals with research and development and training programs. When we come back in September, we expect to have a section dealing with renewable energy production.

Mr. REID. There isn't any one answer to the energy problem, is there? It is a combination of solutions that you have talked about, such as renewables. It is going to take a lot of cooperation and partnering to be able to answer the energy needs of this country; is that right?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator, he is exactly right. There are a variety of technologies that can help us to meet our

energy needs. There are a variety of sources for energy production. We need to move ahead on each of them. That is my view.

Mr. REID. There is no magic bullet, not one thing that is going to solve all the problems of energy relating to our country's needs; is that true?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, again, that is certainly my view. There is no single solution to the problem. We need to make progress on increased energy supplies from a great many sources. We need to make progress on more efficiency in various ways. Clearly, we need to do a better job of conserving the energy we do produce.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired. Morning business is closed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the matter now before the Senate?

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1246, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to proceed to the consideration of (S. 1246) a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agriculture producers.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken to one of the managers of the bill, Senator LUGAR, for a few minutes. He has now left the Chamber. Senator HARKIN will be here probably around 2:30. Senator LUGAR and I thought it would be appropriate, until the two managers arrive, if anyone wants to speak on this bill or agricultural matters in general, they should feel free to do so.

If not, I respectfully suggest that we should move to morning business until the two managers are ready to move forward on this most important legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, unfortunately, the Senator from New Mexico, chairman of the Energy Committee, is not in the Chamber now. I had hoped to be able to pose a question to him.

That question would have been regarding his comment indicating he was opposed to opening ANWR. He did not give a reason why, nor did he have to. I hope we will have an opportunity on this particular issue to have a good debate, a debate that evaluates the issue in its entirety.

One of the things I keep referring to, with which the occupant of the Chair has some familiarity, is the unique circumstances surrounding a very small number of aboriginal residents of the north slope, the residents of Kaktovik. Their particular plight lends itself to some consideration by this body.

I don't think I will have the opportunity of using the charts, but I can probably show this better if one of the gentlemen will go back and I can get them to show the actual ownership in the 1002 area of the 92,000 acres of land that is owned by these aboriginal people.

This is the historical land of their birthright. It is their village land. As a consequence of the manner in which the Federal Government chose the structure of management of the 1002 area and the surrounding area associated within ANWR, we found an enclave of 92,000 acres of private land that could not be utilized by the villagers who own the land.

One has to address the propriety of what private land is all about, if indeed you can't use it. This particular area is in such a specific directive from Congress that the residents, the owners can't even drill for natural gas to heat their homes, let alone develop any of the subsurface rights for their wherewithal, simply because there is no way to access the area without trespassing on Federal land. This doesn't seem reasonable or fair.

I am sorry to say the charts have gone back to my office. I will have to address this matter again with a visual presentation.

These are the kinds of considerations that aren't addressed and would be addressed in the proposed legislation to authorize the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Why should this group of Alaska Eskimos be denied the birthright to resource their land as any other American citizen would?

This is just one inconsistency associated with this issue. It is a type of issue that would fall on the ears of many in this body who believe in fairness and equity. That is a factor in the consideration of the merits.

I am continually confronted with Members who say: I am opposed to it. They are very reluctant to get into a debate as to why. The rationale is pretty obvious. There is a lot of pressure from America's environmental community. America's environmental community has generated an awful lot of membership and dollars by taking a stand on this issue and laying down a fear that somehow we cannot open this area safely or that somehow it is contrary to traditional use to drill in a refuge.

As I have indicated earlier in my presentation today, we have oil and gas drilling in 30 refuges in this country. We have 118 refuges where there is actual oil, gas, and minerals. There are over 400 wells in the refuges in Louisiana. We have them in New Mexico. Why is it inappropriate to suddenly say we cannot allow drilling in the 1002 refuge area when we have advanced technology? There is no justifiable reason other than the pressure that is brought on Members by the environmental community. That is the kind of debate I hope we can get into.

I would like to see scientific evidence that suggests, if indeed there is a rationale to support it, that we can't do it correctly; scientific evidence to suggest that Prudhoe Bay is not the best oil field in the world in its 30-year old technology; scientific evidence to suggest that this won't create literally thousands of new jobs, such as 700,000, in the United States. Almost every State in the Union would benefit from this.

I would like to hear a debate as to why it is in the interest this country to become more dependent on the Saddam Husseins of this world. That is what has happened. As we know, 6 weeks ago, we were at 750,000 barrels a day. Today we are a million barrels a day. Are we here to do what is right for America or are we here to simply respond to the pressures of America's environmental community as it laments on fear tactics that are not based on any scientifically sound research?

That is the reality with which we are faced. As we look at what is happening in the House of Representatives this week, they are going to take up the issue.

There is going to be a motion to strike ANWR from the energy bill. It is kind of amazing to me to see what is happening over there because organized labor suddenly has said this is a jobs issue; that we are losing jobs all over the United States. But right now the one item that we can identify that would allow for the creation of thousands of new jobs is opening this area. So it is an argument as to whether you can do it safely; whether we can protect the Porcupine caribou herd; whether we can get the oil on line soon enough—in 3½ years—or whether it is a substantial supply.

As I have indicated, if it is there in the abundance it would have to be to replace what we import from Saudi Arabia in a 3-year period of time, can we do it safely? There is no evidence to suggest that we can't. These are the discussions that we will have. I hope every Member will encourage open debate on this floor on the merits of opening ANWR. I have heard people say, "I would rather this didn't come up" and "I would rather we didn't have to vote on this" and "it makes me feel uncomfortable."

We are sent here to do a job, Mr. President; to take tough votes. We are sent here to do what is right for America. If what is right for America is to increase our dependence on imported oil from Saddam Hussein, well, that is beyond my interpretation of what is right for America.

I look at Saddam Hussein as an enemy. He is attempting to shoot down our airplanes. We are enforcing a no-fly zone. We continue to do that. It is in our national interest. Why should we be importing more and more oil from him? Oil is fungible. If we spilled oil on the desk of the Presiding Officer, it would spill all over the table. If we buy the oil from Saddam Hussein today, we could buy oil from OPEC and let somebody else buy Saddam Hussein's oil. That is one way to dodge this so-called inconsistent bullet. But we don't seem to be doing it.

This Senator is going to—probably on the Jordan bill—bring up an amendment again to terminate our purchase of oil from Iraq. To me, it is absolutely inconsistent that we would depend on that source. It addresses our national security. The national security of this country should not be 56-percent dependent on imported oil.

One thing that continues to frustrate me a little bit is the assumption by many that oil simply comes out of the gas station. You go down there and insert your credit card and fill your tank, and there is very little consideration that somebody has to produce it; that it has to be refined; that it has to be transported; and America and the world move on oil.

We get complacent and somehow we are concerned about electricity. We have a lot of alternatives for electricity. We have hydro, nuclear, natural gas, and coal. But America moves by oil. We have an opportunity to relieve our dependence—not that we are going to eliminate it, but we can relieve it—by coming to America, to my State of Alaska, where we have the technology to do it safely. Again, Mr. President, I will keep this in the perspective of reality. This is a pretty small footprint—about 2,000 acres out of 19 million acres. That is the size of the State of South Carolina. That is what we can do with the technology we have. It is just beyond me that Members fail to want to discuss the merits. They fail to discuss why we should not do it. They are uncomfortable with the issue.

Again, that is not why we were sent here. We were sent here to make hard decisions and vote in the best interest of America. To me, to relieve our dependence on imported oil addresses specifically our national security interest. It is an issue that is coming before this body. It is going to be before the Energy Committee of which I am the ranking member.

I hope Senator BINGAMAN and I, in that committee, can have spirited debates on the specific merits of why it is not in the interest of the United States and our national security to relieve our dependence on these increased sources of oil from the cartels of OPEC, to try to develop sources here at home, keep the jobs at home.

Look at the balance of payments—over half of the balance of payments is the cost of imported oil. We can reduce that. So why should America's labor sources not come to grips with this and begin to lobby it, as they are successfully doing? So this issue is an issue that is timely, an issue that should be addressed fully in an extended debate based on science, not emotion. The emotional arguments have prevailed. They have prevailed very strongly because of an organized, extreme environmental group that fails to recognize that this energy crisis is not going to be solved alone by alternatives, renewables, new technology, solar, wind.

This energy crisis is going to have to be resolved by a balanced process, where we advance, if you will, funding for these new technologies, but they alone can't solve the problem. We are going to have to increase clean coal utilization. We are going to have to address what to do with nuclear waste in this country because nuclear provides us with 22 percent of the energy in this Nation. We are going to have to recognize that we are now using our natural gas reserves faster than we are finding new ones, and we are going to have to again address the realities associated with the generation of electricity from our hydro sources, many of which have not been expanded to any great extent. We are going to need a comprehensive bill, with technology, alternatives, renewables, but it has to have an increased supply. Otherwise, we will go through what we did in 1992 and we will fail. The American people will hold us accountable, as they should.

ANWR is not the total answer, by any means, but it is part of the solution to regaining our independence, reducing the vulnerability of this country, and recognizing that these are real jobs to be created right here at home. I think my friend brought me a chart relative to the ownership by the Native people of Alaska. I started with this, and I think it is appropriate that in the broad scheme of things, the interest of many of the residents is forgotten.

This is the 1002 area here. We have a pointer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent for another minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. This is a million and a half acres of the 1002 area. We have here in white the ownership by the residents of Kaktovik. This is 92,000 acres. As you can see, you have no way out. This is all Federal land. In the selection of their Native lands when they had the original village up here, a location that has been there for many centuries, under the land claims legislation, the provision was they could not develop these lands until Congress had made a determination specifically on what to do with this area. Only Congress has the authority to open it up. These residents sit here in an enclave with private land they cannot develop. They cannot even drill for natural gas to heat their homes. That is an injustice. That would be corrected, among many other things, by this legislation that we propose in opening up ANWR.

I thank the Chair for the time allotted me and allowing me to extend my remarks.

I tell everybody that I look forward to a very spirited debate with enough time so we can get into the meat of this issue. I encourage my colleagues who say, ''I am sorry, I can't support it,'' to start giving us reasons why, other than just the rhetoric associated with it.

I yield the floor.

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter before the Senate is the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1246.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand the parliamentary situation is we are now on the motion to proceed to the agricultural supplemental bill. Is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the motion to proceed.

Mr. HARKIN. We are on the motion to proceed to the Emergency Agricultural Assistance Act of 2001?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. The vote on the motion to invoke cloture will take place at what time, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 5:30 p.m. today there will be a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed.

Mr. HARKIN. At 5:30 today, for the benefit of all Senators, there will be a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the emergency agricultural assistance bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer for clarifying that.

As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I will take this time to discuss what is in this bill and why we should proceed to the bill and not wait any longer.

We have this week to finish, and I understand then the Senate and the House will be going out for the month of August, at the end of this week. This bill really ought to be done this week. Then we have to go to conference with the House, bring the conference report back and send it on to the President. I am hopeful we will do that because most of the monies that are provided in this bill, which are allocated by the Budget Committee, really do need to get out. The fiscal 2001 funds need to

get out prior to September 30. It will take awhile to get the money out in September, although I have information that certainly the Department of Agriculture can get this money out in the month of September.

However, if we have to come back in September to complete action on this bill and then go to conference, back and forth, then there might be a problem. We do have to get this bill done this week, and that is why I am sorry some in the leadership on the Republican side decided to engage in extended debate on the motion to proceed. Otherwise, we would be on the bill right now.

In about 3 hours we will invoke cloture and then be on the bill, and hopefully we can wrap it up very soon.

The need for assistance to America's farmers and ranchers, and the communities in which they live, is very critical. Without the assistance in this bill, tens of thousands of farmers and ranchers are in danger of going out of business. This package is designed to do the best we can to address the many problems in agriculture across the Nation while staying within the limitations of the budget resolution.

I want to underscore that. This package is in full compliance with the budget resolution. There are no points of order that will lie against this bill because it is in accordance with the budget. It is fully in accordance with the budget resolution.

If we compare today's market situation for the crop sector with what it was in the mid-1990s, crop farmers are expected to receive at least $16.7 billion less in net income based on both lower farm prices and higher input costs. The help from existing Government payments only makes up about half that gap, leaving a financial shortfall of a little over $8.5 billion. That is compared to where it was in the mid-1990s.

This package we will have, we hope, before us this evening will offer direct payments and other benefits to a range of crop producers, but it still will not make up that entire gap. Even with this package, farmers, in terms of their net income, adjusting for inflation, will not be where they were in the mid-1990s.

Farmers are in dire need of assistance. The bill we have before us provides considerably more assistance than the House bill. It is a substantial package, and it is considerably larger than the House bill.

Again, I point out the needs are great and they are urgent. Crop prices are low. Production expenses have gone up sharply. Farmers are in the classic cost-price squeeze.

I do not want to cite all the provisions in the bill, but I would like to mention a few. We have included in the bill funding for the full level of market loss assistance that was provided last year. That means this bill will provide an additional payment in September at the rate of the 1999 Freedom to Farm payment for feed grains, wheat, rice, and cotton. That is what it was last year, and it will be the same this year.

I want to make it very clear: I am not a big fan of the AMTA payment mechanism which is used for the market loss assistance payments. I believe there are real inequities in that formula, and we must change it in the next farm bill.

Our staff and I looked very carefully at whether there could be an alternative payment mechanism for putting out the assistance before September 30 other than the AMTA formula. However, in view of this short timeframe for USDA to get the payments out and some other factors, the best available approach under the circumstances is to use the same market loss payment approach that has been used in recent years.

The inequities have been in this since the start of the 1996 farm bill, the so-called Freedom to Farm bill. The market loss assistance payments were based on the AMTA formula, and basically this formula went back some 20 years to look at what the base acreage was in those basic commodities of feed grains, wheat, cotton, and rice.

It was based upon the production pattern at that time and based on a percentage of the base acreage, times the established yield, times the set price that is in the Freedom to Farm bill, which equaled the payment.

Here is where the inequity arises: Let us say we were neighboring farmers. My farm was in Northern Iowa and the Presiding Officer's was in southern Minnesota, right across the boundary, the same farming. Let us say that 20 years ago I decided I was going to put all my land in corn. I was not going to get involved in crop rotations. I just planted everything fence row to fence row of corn. So my base got high.

The Presiding Officer, on the other hand, decided the best way to farm would be to involve himself in crop rotations, maybe a corn/bean-type rotation, or one involving hay and pasture. He decided it would be good to put in buffer strips or grassed headlands.

That was 20 years ago. Let us advance to right now. Let us say now, however, the Presiding Officer and I are planting the same crop mix of corn and soybeans. We both have the same acreage of corn today, but because I planted so much 20 years ago and the Presiding Officer did not, I get more money from the Government because of what I did 20 years ago. That is an inequity. Farmers who practiced good crop rotations and conservation are penalized. Those that planted continuous corn or another crop get the highest payment. It is not fair.

We also found other inequities. Some receive market loss assistance payments who are not even planting any of the grains—they did 20 years ago—but because they established their base 20 years ago they can be doing something else entirely, and they are still getting that payment. Yet another farmer who doesn't have that base history may be receiving nothing or very little.

The AMTA payment mechanism is inequitable and has been since the beginning. It ought to be changed.

In view of the short timeframe we have in getting money out before the end of September, there was no other way to do it. Hopefully, we will be able to change that in the next farm bill.

The present farm bill has one more year to run. Before we get to that mechanism next year, we should come up with a different mechanism.

There are a few other areas of importance. The bill has full funding for soybean and other oil seeds payments at last year's level; also money for cotton seed and peanut farmers; funding to help the specialty crop producers with assistance for commodity purchases and special assistance for apple producers. However, in this bill, the funds for specialty crops in terms of market loss assistance amount to $420 million. This amount, some say, is a lot. It is nearly identical to the $416 million we provided specialty crop producers in crop insurance and appropriations bills last year.

America's apple growers are experiencing the worst economic losses in more than 70 years, having lost $1.5 billion since 1996, an estimated $500 million during the past year alone. Current apple prices, which are as low as 40 percent below the cost of production, are driving many of our family farmers out of existence. The average prices received by growers for fresh market apples in March of this year were the lowest in more than 10 years, 31 percent below prices in March 1999, 29 percent below the 5-year average.

Again, apple farmers need some help. Quite frankly, what could be more healthful for our population and especially for our kids in school than an ''apple a day to keep the doctor away,'' as our mothers used to say. We have a commodity that is healthful, helps prevent illness and disease, yet the people who grow them are in serious financial trouble. I thought it was important in this bill to provide some help and support for apple farmers who are in dire straits.

We also provide in the bill nutrition-related assistance mainly through helping provide commodities for schoolchildren, families, and seniors in need.

The package includes a substantial commitment to agricultural conservation. Several of these programs are out of money. This package puts much needed funding into the conservation programs. There is funding for technical assistance that allows the Conservation Reserve Program to go forward. It has no money for fiscal 2002 presently. There is funding for the Wetlands Reserve Program, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program, and the Farmland Protection Program. Basically, it provides four conservation programs with funds. The demand exceeds the amount of funding by a factor of 5 or 6. In other words,

there are five times more applications, applications that are approved, for the Wetlands Reserve Program than we have the money for.

Some may ask, why fund them in this bill? The answer is, if we wait to fund them until later, several of the programs will lie dormant in fiscal year 2002 for several months, at least, pending a new farm bill or other legislation. We don't know when that may be completed.

Keep in mind, the conservation provisions in the bill reported out of our committee constitute only 7 percent of the total package. I don't think that is too much to ask.

Many farmers are hurting. Of course, we have the market loss assistance payments which I described as inequitable in many cases for many farmers practicing good conservation that don't have a high base. These conservation payments do two things. They help support their income, but it also provides a benefit for everyone in cleaning up our water and our air and saving soil. In that way, it is as much as an emergency need to those farmers and to us as the market loss assistance payments. Surely we can afford 7 percent of the entire bill to care for our land and water and deal with the critical conservation and environmental challenges in agriculture.

For fiscal year 2002, CBO estimates conservation spending will be about 12 percent of USDA mandatory farm program spending. Adding $542 million, as we have in this bill, to the fiscal year 2002 spending on conservation, only raises that share to 13.5 percent. That is a very modest increase at best and still much less than is needed. Even with the money we included, of all of the USDA mandatory farm spending program, it will only be 13.5 percent next year for conservation.

In 1985, I believe about 97 percent of our funding for conservation went to farmers on working lands and 3 percent went to land taken out of production. Today, I believe it is about 85 percent that goes for land out of production and 15 percent on working lands, overall, of all the conservation funding. What we are trying to do is get that balance a little bit more oriented to helping farmers actually working the land rather than just taking it totally out of production.

I strongly believe we have a balanced package, one I hope will receive broad support in the Senate. It has been crafted to address needs across the country, from Florida to Washington State and from Maine to New Mexico and California. It has also been crafted to address the needs on both sides of the aisle.

I come back to the issue of the budget and spending. We will hear a lot of debate about this on the floor this evening and tomorrow. Hopefully we can wrap up this bill up yet this evening.

The budget resolution as adopted by the Congress provides for the Agriculture Committee to spend up to $5.5 billion in assistance to farmers in fiscal year 2001, which ends September 30th this year. That is what we have done. We have not gone over that. We have put $5.5 billion into the bill for 2001.

The Budget Committee also allows the Agriculture Committee to spend up to $7.35 billion next year, in fiscal year 2002, starting October 1st.

The Budget Committee did not say to the Agriculture Committee: You can't meet and decide how to spend it until after October 1st. We just cannot write legislation that outlays the money before October 1st.

Now, a budget point of order would lie if we wanted to take that $7.35 billion and move it to before September 30th. We didn't do that. As we all know, we said we will spend the $5.5 billion this year, but because the needs are great and the fiscal year and the crop year don't coincide, we decided to meet in the committee and determine how to spend $2 billion of next year's money next year. So the $2 billion we decided to spend will be spent after October 1 of this year, in fiscal year 2002, and it is in full accordance with what the Budget Committee allowed us to do. Again, I point out the Budget Committee did not say to the Agriculture Committee: You cannot meet and you cannot decide how to spend that money this year. They just said: You cannot obligate it until after October 1. That is what we did.

We met. We saw the need, and we said we are going to spend $2 billion of that after October 1, which is fully allowed under the budget resolution. There is no shifting from one fiscal year into another.

I heard it in the committee when we were debating this in the committee and I have heard other people on the floor refer to the fact that we have gone way over what the budget resolution allowed; the budget resolution allowed us $5.5 billion and we are up to about $7.5 billion in this bill.

I will continue to say as often as I can—it looks like I am going to have to say it a lot in the next few hours—we spend $5.5 billion in this year as the budget resolution allows. We spend $2 billion next year as the budget resolution allows. That is all we have done. We have the authority to do that. We are completely within the budget to do that.

Again, regarding the use of fiscal year 2002 funds, this package simply reflects the reality of the difference between crop years and fiscal years. Most of the cost of farm programs associated with the crops this year, the crop that is in the ground in many of our States right now, some are being harvested—in wheat country, for example, some of the smaller grains are being harvested. Up in our area, we have not started yet, but that will happen this fall—but most of the crops are in the ground. The impact of the low prices will not really be felt until next fiscal year, 2002. That is just how farm programs work.

I simply cannot see the problem in using some part of the fiscal 2002 money to help agricultural producers deal with the problems of the 2001 crop year. That is all we have done. We have done it in a way that is in accordance with the budget.

Again, contrary to some of the arguments, we are not spending up next year's money. We are saving most of it to be spent at a later time. What we are spending is being used for its intended purpose: to fund programs within the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction. So we had $7.35 billion for the next fiscal year. We have spent in this bill before us $2 billion of that $7.35 billion. That leaves about $5.35 billion for next year that we can use, either separate and apart by itself, or we can fold it into the farm bill if, in fact, we do pass a farm bill later this year.

Let's discuss the package before the Senate today compared with what we did last year. In last year's crop insurance bill, there was a farm assistance package that included $5.5 billion for fiscal year 2000, plus an added $1.64 billion for fiscal year 2001. So the total package we passed last year was about $7.1 billion. This year's package is in that ball park. It is a little bit higher, but really very close to what we did last year.

I just ask the rhetorical question: How could it have been fiscally responsible to provide that level of assistance last year, but it is irresponsible to provide that level of assistance this year?

When it comes to America's crop producers across the country, their situation has not improved and probably has worsened during the last year. So the need is still there. The package is very similar in size to last year. If the situation is every bit as bad as last year, and we have a package of a similar size to last year, I cannot understand any objection to this.

Again, there is a similarity to last year, but there is also a difference. When we approved a package of over $7 billion last year, we had nothing left over the next year in the budget resolution; that is, we enacted a bill during fiscal year 2000 and we used both fiscal year 2000 money and fiscal year 2001 money and we left zero dollars for 2001. That is what happened last year.

This year, however, we are spending fiscal year 2001 money, a portion of 2002 money, and we will have $5.35 billion left over for next fiscal year, which we did not do last year. So, again, I repeat for emphasis sake: We now have $5.5 billion to spend before September 30 on farm assistance. We have already that much left for the remainder of fiscal year 2002. So we are, with this package, maintaining a budgetary position for fiscal 2002 very similar to the one we have for this year.

Some will say: Should we now be spending the money that could be saved for the new farm bill? First, because of the difference between crop-

years and fiscal years, spending on the new farm bill will really focus on fiscal year 2003 and later years, not fiscal year 2002. The farm bill we are under right now runs through next year. It runs through next year. So if our committee is going to be fashioning a new farm bill, really it is going to be focusing on 2003 and beyond, not for fiscal year 2002.

So, again, if those who say that $7.35 billion should be left for the farm bill, are they saying that none of it should be spent next year? They are going to put it in 2003? There are a lot of farmers going to go broke next year if that is the case, and we will be in dire straits next year.

Again, what we have tried to do is provide a smooth transition from this fiscal year to the next crop-year, and then to the next year beyond that when we will have a new farm bill. Whether the money is spent on a new farm bill or not, the objectives are the same: to meet the needs of farm and ranch families and address other priorities of farm policy. There are many farmers in this country who cannot wait for a new farm bill; they need the help right now. They are struggling to hang on. If we can get them some immediate help while saving some funds for the next farm bill, which we are doing, that seems to me to be the right thing to do.

I want to take a moment to discuss a letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget concerning this legislation. In that letter, Mr. Daniels says he will recommend the President not sign a bill providing more than $5.5 billion in additional assistance for crop-year 2001.

Again, I am not certain how we read this. I read this saying we have complied with that. We provide no more than $5.5 billion for crop-year 2001. Even though the letter refers to the 2001 crop-year, I can assume that the letter reflects some confusion between the fiscal year and the crop-year.

I just went through all that, the difference between the crop-year and a fiscal year. Maybe there was some confusion in that letter. As is commonly done, this bill includes assistance for the current crop-year, 2001.

Some of this money will be spent in fiscal year 2002, but it will help cover the shortfall to agricultural producers for crops grown in the 2001 crop and calendar year. Again, there is nothing unusual about providing assistance in the next fiscal year for crops that were, in fact, grown in an earlier numbered crop or calendar year—that is the way farm bills work. The fiscal year ends on September 30. That is not when the crop-year ends, not in my area. The crop-year doesn't end for a long time after that. Some crop-years end about that time or before that, in certain parts of the country. So you cannot just base everything on when the clock tolls on the end of the fiscal year in terms of farm assistance. We do that all the time, provide that carryover.

Again, having said that, I want to underscore that this bill is in full compliance with the budget resolution. No budget point of order lies against this bill. It is within the prerogative of the Senate to approve this legislation. It is within the prerogative of the Agriculture Committee to both spend up to $5.5 billion for this fiscal year, and up to $7.35 billion for the next fiscal year.

I have to question the justification for Mr. Daniels' threat that he would recommend the President not sign this, and I must also question whether or not they are confusing crop-years and fiscal years.

Is Mr. Daniels saying that Congress will not be allowed to deliver the assistance to agriculture that is clearly provided in the budget resolution? I am sorry. The White House and OMB have no jurisdiction over that.

Is Mr. Daniels saying that the promise of assistance to farm families, which is clearly contained in the budget resolution, isn't worth the paper on which it is written? From everything I am aware of, President Bush and the White House were on board with the budget resolution that was put together by Republican majorities in the Senate and the House. That was the budget resolution which provided the wherewithal of the tax-writing committee to put through the tax bill.

I recall Republican colleagues pointing favorably to the budget resolution and agricultural funding when the budget resolution went there also. We are now being told by the White House that the President may not sign it, even though it is fully within the budget resolution.

Why? Mr. Daniels simply says $5.5 billion is enough. That is that. Maybe it is enough until September 30.

But Mr. Daniels ought to go down and sit at some of the kitchen tables in the farmhouses and say, OK. Until September 30, and after that you are on your own.

There is a lot of assistance that will be needed after September 30. The crop-years don't pay attention to when the fiscal year ends.

Tell them that Congress won't be allowed to use the money in the budget resolution until after September 30.

Finally, I must point out that Mr. Daniels is wrong to suggest funding is not needed for conservation. I went through that a little bit ago. The facts are, if we don't provide this funding, several programs will lie dormant for a number of months before they can be funded again.

Again, it is not just payments to farmers for the loss of prices for their corn, wheat, cotton, rice, apples, and a lot of other commodities—peanuts, cottonseeds, and everything else we have. It is also to help farmers—maybe because of their planting history—who don't get much under the AMTA payments. Yet, they have been good stewards. These are good farm families. By providing them some help with conservation funding, we both are able to help them, and we are able to help the country as a whole by providing for cleaner water, cleaner air, and less soil runoff.

This package is substantial, but it is very close to what we had last year in terms of spending. It is very close to what we had last year in terms of specialty crops. All in all, this package is not a heck of a lot different than what we had last year. It is a little bit more. Last year it was about $7.1 billion. This year it is about $7.5 billion. Most of that additional money is going for conservation, which is sorely needed around the country.

It is a balanced package. It is balanced regionally. It addresses a lot of urgent needs. It fits within the budget resolution. I hope we can support it. I am hopeful that any amendments seeking to change it, to shift it, or to cut down on the payments will not be successful.

Again, I am sorry we had to go through this exercise of filing cloture on the motion to proceed. We should be on the bill right now. We have been held up at least 1 day because someone in the Republican leadership on the other side decided to filibuster the motion to proceed to this emergency farm package. We had to file a cloture motion. At 5:30 today we will vote on the cloture motion on the motion to proceed. Again, I am hopeful it will be overwhelmingly approved, and that maybe yet we can even reach some agreement to wrap this bill up this evening. At least that is my desire.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand that when we go into a quorum call the time should be divided equally between both sides. I ask unanimous consent that when we go back into a quorum call the time remaining be evenly divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to talk today about the emergency supplemental bill that will be on the floor dealing with the farm problem we have in this country.

I just heard my colleague, Senator HARKIN, the chairman of the committee. I commend him for what he has

done. I think he made a great statement. I think he has written a good bill, and Congress ought to pass it posthaste.

It is rather strange that we find ourselves in this position. We are in the position of debating the motion to proceed to go to the actual bill on the floor of the Senate. Let me say that again. We are debating the motion to proceed. We are debating whether we should proceed to a bill to provide emergency help to family farmers.

I guess those who are stalling our being able to get to that bill are probably not facing, with respect to their personal income, the circumstances family farmers are facing. Soybeans have recently been at a 27-year low in price; cotton, a 25-year low; wheat and corn, a 14-year low; rice, an 8-year low. Prices have collapsed as if they had dropped off a cliff. They have stayed down for a number of years, only recovering slightly, at times.

So family farmers, who are out there in the country and have invested sweat and equity in their family farm trying to make a living, have discovered that their income has completely collapsed. This has required Congress to try to patch up a bad farm bill with emergency aid year after year after year.

We really need to write a better farm bill. I know Senator HARKIN, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, is leading the effort to do that. I fully support him. In the meantime, we need to provide some emergency help. That is what this bill is designed to do. It is called an emergency supplemental to try to provide some help to family farms.

If one needs more insight into what is happening to our family farms, one can probably see it in the circumstances described to me by a Lutheran minister one day this past year. This Lutheran minister works in New England, ND, as the pastor of the local Lutheran church. We were talking about the struggle that family farmers are having in our country, and especially there, which is near my hometown of Regent in southwestern North Dakota.

She said to me: In our little town, where we have a shrinking population—this is a town of probably 800 people— we have about 4 funerals for every wedding I conduct as pastor of our church. Four funerals for every wedding—I was thinking to myself about that movie ''Four Weddings and a Funeral.'' This is just the opposite: four funerals for every wedding.

What is she saying with that data? What that means is the population in those rural areas is getting older. Young people are moving out. Family farmers are shutting down family farms because they can't make it, and those economies are just shrinking. The root of all of it is a farm program that does not work. It just isn't able to give families a feeling they can stay on the family farm and make a decent living.

We are in this Chamber today on an emergency supplemental bill to try to help family farmers. The Senate can move ahead or it does not have to move ahead. This is not like milking. If this were a dairy operation, come 5:30, if you had 80 cows that were fresh and needed to be milked, you could not sit around the house twiddling your thumbs saying: I don't think I will milk this afternoon. You would have to go to the barn and start milking those cows. If it was spring planting time, you wouldn't have the opportunity to say: I won't go spring planting this afternoon. You have to fuel up the tractor and go plant some seeds.

Farmers understand deadlines. Farmers understand that you need to get things done when it is time to get them done; this Senate ought to as well. Having to debate the motion to proceed is an outrage.

Who is stalling here? And why? We ought not have to debate the motion to proceed to an emergency supplemental bill to help family farmers. On Friday, one of my colleagues on the other side said: I am holding it up because it costs too much money. I say: You have every right to try to reduce the amount of help for family farmers. Let the bill come to the floor and then offer an amendment. If you want to cut it by $2 billion or $4 billion, offer that amendment, and then let's have a vote. If enough Senators vote with you, you will have cut the amount of help for family farmers. I am not going to support that, but why would you consider holding up the bill because you have your nose out of joint that it costs too much? If you think it costs too much, then offer an amendment to decrease it.

Let me say this. From my standpoint, I think this investment in family farms for this country is a bargain. A good deal deserves repeating: I think investing in families who are out there trying to make a living on the family farm is a bargain for this country in that I believe it strengthens this country.

Europe does not have this kind of internal debate. Europe decided long ago that it wants to maintain a network of family farms across Europe. Why? Because it has been hungry. It doesn't want to be hungry again. How does it prevent that? They work to preserve a network of family farmers living on the land in Europe.

Go to a small town in Europe some evening and ask yourself whether that town is alive. It is. Small towns in Europe are alive. They have life because of family farms, which are the blood vessels that flow into those communities, are doing well in Europe.

In this country, family farms are flat on their backs, struggling to make a living because prices have collapsed. Has anyone in this Chamber who makes an income had it reduced by 40 percent? That is what family farmers face when they discover that the price for their crop has collapsed. They put the seed in the ground in the spring. They pray that nothing is going to happen to it: no insects, no hail, no excessive rain, but enough rain. They pray that nothing bad is going to happen. Then they harvest it in the fall and they put it on a truck and take it to the elevator, only to be told that in a world that is hungry, with 500 million people going to bed every night with an ache in their belly because it hurts to be hungry, they are told: Your food doesn't have any value, Mr. Farmer. They wonder about the value contained in that statement.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. I was across the hall watching the presentation of the Senator from North Dakota. I had two questions I wanted to ask him.

Did I understand the Senator correctly when I heard him say that the Senator from Idaho said he didn't like this bill because it was too much money, and the Senator from North Dakota responded, if that is the case, let us go ahead and debate the bill and offer an amendment that it is too much? Is that what you said?

Mr. DORGAN. That is what I said. This bill isn't too much money. It is within the framework of what we decided as a Congress that we were going to spend on the budget. It spends the required amount in this fiscal year, and then $2 billion in the next fiscal year. It does not violate the budget.

The point I was making was that real income for family farmers has fallen to the level of the 1930s. This is the real income achieved by farmers out there who are struggling to raise a family and run a farm. It is clearly an emergency. We have clearly brought to the floor legislation that does not violate the Budget Act. Yet even though it is an emergency supplemental, we can't get to the bill. We have to debate today a motion to proceed to the bill.

I am outraged by the fact that there is stalling on a bill that represents a clear response to an emergency in American farm country.

Mr. REID. Another question I will ask the Senator from North Dakota: Nevada is a State that has some agricultural interests. We have a few green belts, not many. Those we have are very important to the State.

Agriculture is the No. 1 industry in North Dakota; is that right?

Mr. DORGAN. In North Dakota, which is a rural State, agriculture is 40 percent of the State's economy. It is clearly the 500-pound gorilla of economic activity in States such as North Dakota. But it is not just North Dakota, it is Montana, Minnesota, Wyoming, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Iowa. There is a whole heartland in this country whose economies are supported by agriculture, by family farm producers.

Mr. REID. I have served in the House with the Senator from North Dakota and also in the Senate. It is difficult

for those of us who are not from farm States to comprehend what a family farm is. I have heard you say on a number of occasions how the family farms are disappearing.

Would this bill, if we don't pass it in a timely fashion, force other family farmers to go out of business?

Mr. DORGAN. There is no question that will be the case. There isn't any question if we don't provide a bridge, and quickly—between the current inadequate farm bill and a new farm bill that tries to provide a decent safety net and a bridge across price depressions—there isn't any question that family farmers in a number of cases around the country will not be allowed to continue. These are people who are more than just in this for a business. These are people for whom family farming is their life. It is all they know. It is what they do. It is what they want to do.

There is so much value in family farming in a country. Farmers produce much more than just wheat or corn or soybeans. They produce communities. They produce cultural value. It is a seed bed for family values that moves from family farm to small towns to big cities. It is such an enormous contribution to the country. That is why, as I mentioned, in Europe they decided long ago that the kind of economy they want is an economy that has healthy family farm agriculture—a network of producers living on the land throughout Europe producing their food. We should make a similar commitment and write a farm bill that does that.

In the meantime, this emergency supplemental is the bridge to get from here to there. I do hope beyond this afternoon we are not further delayed by anyone stalling with what clearly is an emergency piece of legislation designed to reach the extended hand out to say to family farmers that we are here to help during tough times.

Mr. REID. I say to the Senator from North Dakota, I appreciate his bringing up the family values that we have in farm States.

Our friend, Pat Moynihan, who just left the Senate, used to say that to have good scores on tests for students, high school students, you should just move them near the Canadian border, North Dakota, South Dakota, States along the border, the farm States. The kids do better than anyplace in the country with their tests; is that true?

Mr. DORGAN. That is the case. We have some of the highest tests, education tests in the country. It has a lot to do not so much with the specific teachers or the specific schools, but it has to do with the family values of family farms and small towns and rural life. That is not to denigrate any value that anyone else has. It is simply to say that the kind of family values that spring from a rural State produce good achievement in education.

There was a wonderful author who has since died, world-renowned author, actually grew up in Fargo, ND, and lived in New York and London before he died. He wrote a number of books. His name was Richard Critchfield. He wrote books that described the rolling of family values in this country's history in two centuries, the rolling family values from family farms to small towns to big cities, and the refreshment and nurturing of the value system in the country by having that happen.

I grew up in a town of 400 people—not quite 400, between 300 and 400 people. We raised livestock and other things. But I understood what those values meant when a fellow named Ernest died of a heart attack with his crop out there needing to be harvested. All the neighbors showed up and harvested the crop. It is like the old barn raising, the neighbor-to-neighbor help in which they form communities. Those values by which people form communities to help them through tough times are very important values for the country.

That is why I came to the floor to talk about this legislation. It is money to be sure, but that money represents a bridge. There are very few people in the country who have seen a total collapse of their income the way family farmers have. The income for their work and the income for the measure of their effort is down 40 percent, 50 percent from what it used to be. How many businesses or how many enterprises in this country are getting 1930s level income in real dollars? That is what is happening to family farmers. It is unfathomable to me that we are such a strong country in terms of having this aspiration to build a national missile defense along with all these technologies. We are doing all these things, yet we have 500,000 people who go to bed every night hungry as the dickens.

We have this food in such abundant quantity, yet we can't find the way to connect the two so that family farmers have a chance to make a living and people who are hungry have an opportunity for a better life. There is something that is not connecting very well in this country on this policy. That is why I want us to write a better farm bill. In the meantime, we must have this bridge to get there. The bridge is this bill, an emergency supplemental bill that provides about $5.5 billion in this fiscal year, and roughly $2 billion, slightly less, in the next fiscal year, to help family farmers over these troubled times.

Mr. REID. One last question of the Senator: We know how important agriculture is. We are the breadbasket of the world. And it is important that we do something in this emergency supplemental bill. We were asked by the Chair to withhold. Another bill was brought by the House of Representatives, the Export Administration Act, which has passed the House. All they did was continue the bill that is now in existence, which is also a disaster for the high-tech industry.

The Senator knows that the high-tech industry has a number of things they need to remain competitive. One is to make sure we pass legislation that modernizes the ability of these high-tech companies to export things that are now sold in Radio Shack that, under present law, they can't do.

I want my friend to comment on what he sees happening here in the Senate. I reflect back to last year, when we were in the minority, we passed by the August recess eight appropriations bills. We have now passed three because, as you know, they have been slow-walking the Transportation appropriations bill, and we hope we are fortunate enough to get the VA-HUD bill. We must do something on this emergency bill that we are now trying to get before the Senate on agriculture. We also need to do the Export Administration Act. I think my friend will agree that it will allow the high-tech industry to stop exporting jobs overseas and do them here so they can manufacture equipment here, sell it overseas, and not have to move their businesses overseas to manufacture equipment over there. But we are not going to be able to do that, it appears. It looks as if the House is satisfied with extending the act that is already in existence, which the industry says doesn't do us any good at all.

Will my friend comment on what is happening in the Senate with these things?

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator from Nevada, I think, knows the answer to this question. Not very much is happening in the Senate, regrettably. We have a large amount to do, yet this place has been slowed down. Last week, it was sort of a parade-in-rest all week because people didn't want the Senate to get its work done. Trying to get something done in the Senate is like trying to walk through wet cement. It is pretty hard going. It is not as if there is not a lot to do and there are not a lot of pieces of legislation that need doing now.

The emergency supplemental to help family farmers passed the House, out of the Agriculture Committee. But are we on the bill? No. Why? Because we are debating a motion to proceed. What is going on here, when we have to debate the motion to proceed to deal with an emergency bill to help family farmers?

There can't be a lot of thinking going on about this. Senator DASCHLE is trying to create an agenda that says let's get our work done and get it done soon. Everybody ought to have the opportunity for full debate. For nearly 2 days last week, this Senate sat in session with nobody coming over to offer substantive amendments, but an objection to going to third reading to pass the Transportation bill. Essentially, the Senate was shut down. We have all these things to do, and we have so much ahead of us, yet people think it is somehow to their advantage to slow this place down.

The Senate has never been accused of speeding, in the first place. This is a deliberate body, the place where we deliberate for long periods of time. There

is no excuse under any condition to force us to have to debate a motion to proceed. That is unthinkable, in my view.

In addition, when we get this done, we have to finish the Department of Transportation bill, the VA-HUD and independent agencies bill; and if we get all that done, we will still come up far short of what we need to do. It is not because Senator DASCHLE has not said here is what we need to do, it is because we have some people sitting on the back seat of this bicycle built for two and putting the brakes on. All we want is a little cooperation.

The Senator asks me what is happening here in the Senate. Regrettably, not much. This afternoon, nothing. We are debating the motion to proceed on an emergency bill. I have never seen the likes of this.

So my hope is that those who are stalling, those who are holding this up will come to the floor and say, all right, we won't hold it up anymore. Let's go have our votes and get these pieces of legislation passed. The Senate can do better than this.

Mr. President, I reserve time for others who want to speak on this bill. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, in due course we will be debating a very important bill for American agriculture. As the distinguished chairman of our committee, Senator HARKIN, has pointed out, the needs of farmers throughout our country are evident to most Senators. In fact, all Senators, I suspect, share an empathy for attempting to do what we can to help.

I want to take these moments, before we get into the substance of the debate, to describe the problem as I see it; the reason the Ag Committee and the Senate and our compatriots in the House of Representatives have taken this up.

To begin with, however, I simply want to make a comment with regard to the colloquy I heard in the Chamber a short time ago suggesting delay with regard to the agriculture situation. The comments of our distinguished colleagues really related to more than agriculture, and other bills certainly have a different track, but in the case of this supplemental bill to help American farmers, the House of Representatives passed legislation on June 26. It was not until July 25 that legislation came before our Agriculture Committee. There was almost a month intervening.

I do not charge delay. There are many things in the lives of Senators, many activities in the life of the Senate Agriculture Committee, but I simply point out that at any time from June 26 on we could have acted, even if we were to adopt, for example, the House bill, obviating a conference, and to move on to assist farmers within this fiscal year.

As the distinguished majority leader pointed out last Friday evening at the termination of debate, there is a technical problem of cutting the checks physically and getting the money to farmers by September 30, and that is one reason that the urgency of this bill is apparent to most of us. My own guess is as we approach the cloture vote on the motion to proceed at 5:30 this evening, there will be surely almost a unanimous vote, if not a unanimous vote, to proceed. I think we all understand that.

To suggest on our side we have been delaying action for agriculture would be inaccurate. Perhaps that was not even implied. Putting that aside, the fact is we have had packages of this variety now for the last 3 years.

I just want to review, for the benefit of Senators as well as for the American people, some of the assumptions behind these supplemental packages that arrive at this point in time or sometimes even earlier in the year.

Essentially, we had a very good year in American agriculture in 1996. For a variety of reasons, a lot of income that may have been delayed by events in the world and other circumstances that led to very strong export markets led to a net farm income in 1996 of $54.9 billion.

If we look at the year before in 1995, it was only $37 billion. An average of those 2 years would lead to something between $45 billion and $46 billion. Nevertheless, in 1996, often mentioned in debates because it was an extraordinary year, it was also the year we passed a farm bill. The thoughts are perhaps we were carried away by the euphoria of that situation. I doubt whether anyone was carried away, but nevertheless it was a good year.

Generally, the years came into something else. In 1997, net farm income was $48.6 billion, down well over $6 billion really from the previous year; then in 1998, $44.7 billion; and in 1999, $43.4 billion.

In those last 2 years, the $44.7 and the $43.4 billion, these figures would have been lower still except for the fact we plugged in some income, a supplemental bill just like the one we are discussing now. Those monies brought things to about a $45 billion level.

We can ask, why $45 billion? Because that seemed to be a general average. Those observing the debate should say: Are we saying this is a plus-$45 billion, American agriculture made $45 million? I am saying that. This was always a plus, never a deficit. In no year was there a net farm loss. It was always a net farm gain, and it was substantial.

As we started this particular year, as a matter of fact, even the latest estimate by the U.S. Department of Agriculture is that without action by this body the net farm income in 2001 would be $42.4 billion. That is roughly the same figure the Budget Committees of the Senate and the House had earlier in the year when they had an extended budget debate. They knew that somewhere in the $41 billion to $42 billion level net farm income would come out about that way for 2001.

They knew we had taken action in the past to bring things up somewhere in the $45 billion area, comparable to the years before. We did not quite succeed in 1999 at $43.4 billion, but we did succeed in 2000 at $45.3 billion.

They came to a figure by their deliberations in debate in the Budget Committee that $5.5 billion was about the right size to plug the gap. If this, in fact, were adopted, the $42.4 billion estimated plus the $5.5 billion should come out somewhere around $47.9 billion. That would be about $2.5 billion more than 2000. It would turn out, in effect, to be about $4.5 billion more than 1999. As a matter of fact, it would be very close to the $48.6 billion in 1997, really exceeded only by the banner year of 1996 which, if averaged with the year before that, came out somewhere in the $45 billion to $46 billion level.

Americans outside of agriculture looking into this would say: Is this done for people in the electronics industry or retail stores generally in America, or struggling manufacturing firms, or anybody? The answer is: No, there is no other business in America that takes a look at net income for the whole group of people doing it, every entity collected in these figures, and says we want to make you whole, at least whole at a level of a multiyear picture.

This is the only situation of that sort. It is not by chance. Those of us who are involved in farming, and I have been one of them—my family has been involved for generations. I think it is fair to say that in terms of the truth and being upfront about this bill and this advocacy. I know the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, and his family have a farm in Iowa. When he served on the Agriculture Committee, he and I, I believe were the only two involved in these farm programs to keep the books, to make the marketing decisions, to either have to borrow money and repay it or distribute whatever profits there are to our family members. This bill is one that my farm, 604 acres in Marion County, IN, will have to live with, or benefit from, as the case may be.

I understand intimately what these figures mean. I am not an advocate for clients or just trying to do good for the farmers I have met in my States. I am one of them, a member of the Farm Bureau, a regular at whatever meeting farmers call.

I am sympathetic with the thought that if we are truly interested in family farmers, in retaining farmers in agriculture, we ought to move on this legislation. I will vote for cloture so we

can proceed. I will try to work with my distinguished friend, TOM HARKIN, chairman of our committee, to come to a constructive result in this debate. It is important. It is timely.

Having said that, it is also unique. What has occurred in the evolution of the current farm bill is a quest on the part of the Senate and the House and the President to save every family farmer, every single entity in American agriculture. That is the purpose of filling the gap, of making certain net farm income stays at a level comparable to years before.

To a great extent we have succeeded. One of the interesting aspects of the same agricultural report that has net farm income is a discussion of farm equity. By that, I mean the U.S. Department of Agriculture has pulled together the total assets of all of American agriculture and the total liabilities and has come to a conclusion in this year of 2001. As it stands, total farm equity, net worth, all the farms in America, will be $954 billion. That will be up from $941 billion in 2000. That was higher than $940 billion in 1999, or $912 billion in 1998, or $887 billion in 1997, or $848 billion clear back in the golden year of 1996. In fact, the annual increase in the equity of American agriculture has been 3.2 percent over the period of 1995 to the year 2000.

If one asked, how can that be, given the stories of failing farms, of desperate people all over our country, how is it conceivable that given a whole group of farmers, whatever they are doing, in livestock or grain or the specialty crops, so far there has been a gain in equity. This is true in large part because through our policies, through the supplemental bills, we have almost guaranteed an income for agriculture in America, and at a fairly high level.

One of the dilemmas of this is because of this prosperity—and I say that advisedly, at a 3.2-percent increase in equity over the course of time; in fact, the land prices in that same period have risen on average of 4.6 percent a year countrywide—there is not a region of the country that did not have an overall percentage change in land values that was positive between 1996 and the year 2000—every single part of our country, some a little stronger than others. I note, for example, strangely enough, in the Appalachian region, a 6.3-percent gain in land values on an annual basis throughout that period of time. In the Lake States, an 8-percent change. In the Northeast, only a 2.8-percent change in agricultural lands. But everyone gained.

The dilemma, having said that, and this is why I coupled these two figures—net farm income, roughly $45 billion on an average; net worth of American agriculture, about $954 billion, more or less—if you take those figures, you come out with a figure of roughly 4.5 to 5 percent as the return on invested capital, the invested capital being the net worth, the equity, the net income being the 45, and maybe this year 48 as it turns out.

When I have talked to farm bureau meetings, on occasion the question has arisen: LUGAR, what kind of return do you get on your farm? Why are you still involved in this? I have recited that over the 45 years I have managed our farm, 1956 to the present, we have had roughly a net gain on worth of 4 percent a year on the value of the farm. We have not always gotten 4 percent every year, but nevertheless we made money in all 45 years, and the average return has been 4 percent.

Many say that sounds a little too high to me; I have not been getting 4 percent. I said, we have been fortunate, perhaps. That is not out of line with what appears to be the case with American agriculture across the board—apparently, a return on net worth of about 4.5 to 5 percent.

Outside of agriculture meetings, people say, well, something is missing; you could have gotten 6 or 7 percent on 30-year Treasury bonds throughout this whole period of time and not taken any risk with regard to the weather, exports, or the vagaries of Congress or whatever else might have happened. That is true. In fact, for most people involved in investment, a return over a long period of time of 4 to 5 percent does not appear to be particularly attractive. That is why we are always likely to have agricultural debates with regard to money.

The difficult secret of this is the business does not pay very much. If you are an entrepreneur and you want to go into electronics or into a dot-com situation or whatever venture capital has taken a look at in recent years, the odds are you looked for a much more attractive rate of making your money grow faster.

As I mentioned earlier, I plead guilty to 45 years of staying with this because I like it. That is why people farm. They want to do it. They love the land. They love the lifestyle. They have some reverence for their dads, their grandfathers, the people involved in it. They want to save it, perpetuate that. We know that in the Senate Agriculture Committee or the House Agriculture Committee. That is why we have the debates without apology and we try to make certain that heritage might flow.

All of these debates have to have some proportion to them. I started out by pointing out a $5.5 billion supplemental will elevate income this year somewhere into the $47, $48 billion net as opposed to the $45 we were aiming at. There is no magic about 5.5. The Budget Committee must have gone backward and forward on that subject for some time. But it gets the job done.

I conclude this particular thought by saying the Agriculture Committee of the Senate came forward with a package of expenditures that exceeds $7.4 billion. The distinguished chairman of the committee, I am certain, will have more to say as to how the components were put together. Let me just say from my own experience, not from his—he will have to explain how it happened this year—but as chairman of the committee for the previous 6 years, I was responsible for at least three of these situations. Essentially, you visit with members of the committee. They make suggestions for what ought to be a part of the package.

When we started these packages we were dealing with the traditions of agricultural farm bills which dealt with so-called program crops, programs that have gone on for a long time, since the 1930s and Franklin Roosevelt. The big four in this respect were corn and wheat and cotton and rice. They were programs because, in the 1930s, my dad and others were asked to destroy crops and hogs. At least that occurred on our farm. This was supply management with a vengeance. It was not just planning for the future, it was actual destruction of crops, and rows that were in the fields, and actual livestock at that point.

The philosophy was if you let farmers plant as much as they wanted to plant, inevitably they would plant too much. They simply would use their ingenuity, their land, their resources, and we would have an oversupply and depression of prices. Prices were very low during the beginning of the New Deal period. So the thought was supply management, but a program would come along with that. In other words, you became a member of the program. You worked so many acres, whatever the quantity was that you were dealing with, in return for assurance of payments, therefore a sustenance of your income. There is no reason why this should have gone on for over 60 years, but it did. It was an attractive idea.

In 1996, with this farm bill, we changed and we fulfilled perhaps the worst fears of those in the 1930s because we said Freedom to Farm means freedom to plant whatever you want to on your land; use those resources with your own ingenuity. A lot of farmers did. They made a variety of choices. By and large, less wheat has been planted in some years, more soybeans have been planted. That seemed to meet, really, world market conditions. People have been planting soybeans in different States more than they had been before. I suppose that may be true of cotton, but by and large, less cotton, seemingly, has been produced and perhaps less rice. It is a close call because these are large farms and there are fixed costs and many people have continued on, whether it was a program or not.

When we talked about our supplemental payments, when we began to plug these gaps, we went to the program crops because they have behind them a list of farmers, names and addresses, people who are part of the picture. If you are attempting to get money to people rapidly, checks could be cut to people who were known, with a name and address and a quantity behind their name in terms of planting expectations and history.

Some have come to the fore this year, and to some extent last year—really, I think, for the first time. They said: What about us? We are not in a program crop. As a matter of fact, we plant so-called specialty crops. We have melons, we have apples on trees, we have strawberries and raspberries—and we have problems. If you think people in rice country have problems, you ought to see our problems.

In the old days—and by that I mean, say, the last 10 years—essentially many of those problems were met by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The appropriations subcommittee came along at a time of year in which the weather disasters of the winter or spring or much of the summer, sometimes, were apparent. They made an appeal to the Senate. They said there has been very bad luck in this State or this district or with this crop and therefore we ought to do something about it in an emergency, compassionate sense. Each of us have been voting for these programs for years. I cannot recall those pleas being rejected.

But the so-called specialty situations were enveloped in this. Why? Because it was very difficult to find out the crop histories of people who were involved in melons, for example, or in raspberries. Is there anywhere a 5-year idea or any idea of support payments or so forth? The answer in most cases was no. This means, if you get into melons, the USDA has to formulate a new program. It has to determine who really is eligible. That takes time.

We found that out last year. We had a supplemental. It came along as a part of legislation to strengthen and reform the Federal Crop Insurance Program. That was not totally inadvertent. Agriculture usually has sort of one shot on the floor each year and we had been working on crop insurance reform for some time. It was contentious all by itself, among various groups, as well as the total amount.

Senators, I think, have been advised—they probably understand—that the crop insurance program we strengthened as a result of last year's legislation is a generous one. It was a safety net. It will probably cost an average of $2.9 to $3 billion. That is not a supplemental, it is just there. It will go on permanently.

I would say from personal experience, I have purchased the 85-percent level of insurance coverage on the income of my corn and on my soybeans. Many people in Indiana, I have found, have not gone to the 85 percent because either they have not discovered it or they do not really understand why that is such a good deal. But I would say arithmetically this is a remarkable way of ensuring income, even without the supplemental.

Without getting into an advertisement for crop insurance, nevertheless it is there, and it is important, but not everybody in the Senate sought crop insurance as a priority item. They understood the pleas of those of us from the Midwest and the plains States. They saw some of the difficulties in the South with the program crops. But they said we are from New England—for example. Or we are from States which have never been involved in program crops. What are you going to do for us?

As a result, we had, in addition to crop insurance, the supplemental. The supplemental last year included, for the first time, a number of crops at least that I do not recall being a part of these emergency actions before. As predicted, the checks went out right on time to the so-called AMTA payment recipients—the program crop people. That is quite a number, probably a majority of farmers in our country, in terms of income and acreage. So that was not inconsequential.

We have had testimony, as the Chair knows, in our committee, the Ag Committee, from farmers who said the check got there just in time. So did the country banker testify that it got there in time. The farmer met the banker, repaid the planting loan, was in business again to try again in the year 2001. What seemed to be a potential crisis was alleviated just in time. But with the rest of the group who were not program people, the checks did not come quite so fast. USDA really had to work out the details of a good number of complex programs.

As a matter of fact, in February, March, even April of this year, those qualified were finally being identified. Weeks later, in some cases, the checks finally came that were being sent to them. In many cases, that is being cited with regard to the bill we passed in the Senate Agriculture Committee.

There is a large component, once again, either in the bill for which the distinguished chairman from Iowa and I were present, which was adopted 12–9 in the committee, or in the amendment that I offered, which had a $5.5 billion limit, which was rejected by this 12–9 vote. Both of us had a fairly large component of that in the so-called program crops. In large part, if we are talking about money being dispensed in this calendar year, this is about the only group of people likely to see a check because they can be identified as they were the year before and the year before that.

In the event people come along then and suggest there are other situations, this means they spill over. This is a part of the debate over the additional $1.9 billion to $2 billion. Some would say that is all the spillover from the year before because they were busy attempting to do these things. This year the Budget Committee of the Senate mentioned $5.5 billion. The Office of Management and Budget, through its Director, Mr. Daniels, more pointedly mentioned $5.5 billion in his correspondence with the House committee. Who took that seriously? The distinguished chairman of the committee offered a package of $6.5 billion, but the members of the committee, led, as it turned out, by the distinguished ranking member, Mr. STENHOLM, from Texas and Mr. BOEHNER, a Republican from Ohio, and others reversed that decision. They came out at $5.5 billion, and the House, as a whole, adopted that without rigorous dissent.

All of this could have been adopted by the Senate a month ago. But it was not adopted. A month has transpired in the meanwhile, and in the same way that I collected sentiments a year ago, the distinguished chairman of the committee has collected those sentiments again this year. They add up to $7.4 billion. There is no magic in that figure, and one would say no magic in the $5.5 billion. The whole exercise was attempting to plug a gap between the $42.4 billion in net farm income that was estimated this year and the $45 billion average we have achieved in recent years. The $5.5 billion will get us there. It gets up close to $48 billion, as a matter of fact. The Director of the OMB, Mr. Daniels, has written that. He pointed out, and he even offered some charts in his letter to the chairman of the committee, to me, to the chairman of the Budget Committee, to the ranking member, to Senator DASCHLE, and to Senator LOTT. To the extent we have shared that correspondence with Members, they know the argument of the administration.

We could say after all that the administration has their view and we have ours. Honest people can differ. We are all trying to do the best we can for agriculture.

I made the comment—it has been repeated in the press—about our public deliberations the other day in the Agriculture Committee. Is it really the intent of our committee of the Senate to taunt the President, and say, Mr. President, regardless of what you and your OMB Director and others may have to say about this, we want to do more than you want to do? We really feel more deeply about the farmers than you do. So, by golly, even though it is pretty clear that all of this may lead to zero at the end of the trail, we are going to have a go at it. We really do not believe you will veto it. We think when it comes to agriculture that your heart is in the right place. So is that of the American people generally. So whether the figure is $5.5 billion, $6.1 billion, or $7.1 billion, maybe, for all I know, in conference there will be a larger figure. That is the way these things go. They never have too much discipline or form to them. They just sort of add up so you can get enough people on board to get a majority, and hopefully, in fact, the big majority. Maybe that was the intent, but I doubt it. I think the intent of our committee in the Senate and the House committee is, in fact, to get money to farmers by September 30 so that they will have successful meetings with the country bankers; so that our intent that no family farm should fail will, in fact, happen and they, in fact, stay

alive and stay in business even in difficult times.

Meanwhile, both Houses think about larger farm bills which may go on for many years. The House of Representatives' committee acted on one last Friday, which was a significant bill. The House will still need to debate that. Obviously, our debate lies ahead.

These are important times not to be confused with the supplemental bill that we have at the present for emergency activity for money to be dispensed by September 30. But I take the time of the Chair and my colleagues this afternoon to recite all of this to give at least, as I see it, some background for this enterprise, why we are involved in it at all, to what extent the effects are, if you add up the figures, and what I perceive to be the dynamics of the political situation, if there is one in this.

My hope is that at the end of the debate—I hope we will have one, and, as I indicated when I started, I will certainly vote for cloture on the motion to proceed so we can proceed—the leaders will formulate a program for that process. I am hopeful that I will be recognized fairly early in the debate to offer what I believe to be a constructive amendment that I think will lead to rapid resolution and reconciliation with the House of Representatives and some hope for farmers out there that this is not going to be an interesting debate among Senators but rather a kickoff of activity in a week that some Senators characterize as the fairly slow beginning given the urgency of a number of topics that we need to discuss.

I am optimistic as always. I am sure the Chair shares that optimism and desire for constructive activity. During this rather calm hiatus before the debate really begins, technically, as the Chair knows, we are discussing really whether to proceed. I come out in favor of that. I hope my colleagues will, too. But, after we have proceeded, we need to have at least some framework I believe of how to manage this situation. I look forward to those hours ahead and a constructive result.

I do not see other Senators. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to address the Agriculture supplemental assistance bill and to answer some of the critics I have heard from the other side with respect to this legislation.

As chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, I follow the budget issues very closely and have the responsibility for determining if a budget point of order exists against any legislation. We have heard from a number of our colleagues that the legislation before us somehow busts the budget. That is just wrong. That is not true. This legislation does not bust the budget. It is entirely in keeping with the budget resolution. There is no budget point of order that exists against this bill. Those are all facts.

Mr. President, if we look at the legislation before us, it provides $5.5 billion in fiscal year 2001. That is exactly what is provided for in the budget resolution. In fiscal year 2002, this legislation provides $1.9 billion. The committee is actually authorized $7.35 billion. So there still remains $5.45 billion available to the committee, available to the Congress, next year.

Mr. President, the fact is, this legislation is entirely in keeping with the budget resolution. There is no budget point of order against it. This does not bust the budget, this is in keeping with the budget. Those are the facts. I challenge anyone who has a different view to come out here and raise a budget point of order against this legislation. If they really believe what they have been saying, come out here and raise a budget point of order against this bill because there is no budget point of order—none. This bill is entirely within the budget resolution. It is entirely within the budget, and there is no budget point of order against this bill.

Mr. President, if one has any questions about the design of this bill, I suggest they go to the resolution on the budget that was passed here in the Congress. This is the conference report. This is what came out of the conference between the House and the Senate in the final budget resolution. When you go to the part of that report that deals with the issue before us, it says—and I have highlighted it—it says:

It is assumed that the additional funds for 2001 and 2002 will address low-income concerns in the agriculture sector today.

Not in the sweet by and by—today. That is what this bill does. It deals with the collapse of farm income that is happening today. I must say, when I hear some colleagues stand on the floor and say things are getting better in agriculture, I don't know what agriculture they are talking about. Maybe they are taking about Argentina or China. They are not talking about America because if you ask the American farmer what is happening today, they will tell you what is happening is a disaster—a disaster of collapsing incomes that threatens to force tens of thousands of farm families off of the land. That is what is happening.

This idea that somehow prices are escalating dramatically and all of a sudden there are good times ahead is just plain wrong. What are they talking about? They aren't talking about agriculture in my State. Go to the grain elevator in North Dakota and see what wheat is selling for. Has it gone up a little bit? Yes, it has gone up a little bit. Is it anywhere close to the cost of production? No. I mean, it is almost farcical. Have prices gone up a little? Yes, they have. Are they still so far underwater you can't possibly make a farm operation add up? Absolutely. We all know it is true, any of us who represents agricultural America; and I must say the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Minnesota, knows exactly what I am talking about.

The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. DAYTON, has had a chance to go town to town, community to community, farm to farm, and he knows what I am saying is true because farmers all across the Dakotas, across Minnesota, tell us the same thing: These are as tough a times as they have ever faced. They tell us weekend after weekend, break period after break period: If you guys don't do something in Washington, we are all going to go bust. We are going to be broke. We are going to be forced off the land because this doesn't add up.

When you look at the cost of the things that they buy versus the prices they get when they sell, there is no way of making it add up. That is what this bill is about. This bill is to provide emergency assistance for farmers who are struggling. It does it just in line with what the budget resolution called for.

It is assumed that the additional funds for 2001 and 2002 will address low-income concerns in the agricultural sector today.

That is the wording of the budget resolution. It goes on to say:

Fiscal year 2003 monies may be made available for 2002 crop year support.

That is a very important thing to understand. Why is it that we have a circumstance in which in this bill we pass in 2001, that we not only deal with 2001 expenditures, but we also deal with 2002 expenditures? Why do we do that? Very simply because there is a difference between the fiscal year and a crop-year. Every farmer knows it. Every member of the Agriculture Committee knows it. Others may not know it. So it is easier to confuse the circumstance. But we have always, in every disaster bill since I have been a Member of this body—and I am in my fifteenth year—when we have dealt with an agricultural disaster, some of the assistance comes from one fiscal year and some comes in the next fiscal year because that is the way crop-years work. Crop-years don't just neatly fall in the same fiscal year. That isn't the way it works.

When there is a disaster, it doesn't just have an effect until September 30 of a year. That is when our Federal fiscal year ends. It affects before September 30. That is why we have some money in fiscal 2001, and some of it has an effect after September 30, as harvest is completed, and that is why we have some of the money in fiscal 2002.

Lest anybody have any misunderstanding, that is exactly what the budget resolution recognizes. It says it about as clearly as it can be said:

Fiscal year 2003 monies may be made available for 2002 crop year support.

That is exactly what we are doing with 2002 and 2001. Some of the money is in Federal fiscal year 2001; some is in Federal fiscal year 2002, just as you would anticipate. That is exactly what this legislation provides.

Mr. President, again, I want to go back to the fundamental and basic point for any of our colleagues who are listening and wondering about the critiques they have heard. Is it true that this busts the budget? Absolutely not. The budget says $5.5 billion is available to the Agriculture Committee under their allocation. And the funding that is provided in this assistance package for fiscal year 2001 is $5.5 billion—exactly what is provided for in the budget. For fiscal year 2002, the Agriculture Committee has been allocated $7.35 billion.

This legislation, quite appropriately, uses $1.9 billion of that amount. There is absolutely nothing wrong with what is being done here. It does not bust the budget. It does not add $2 billion to the overall cost of the agricultural budget that has been provided for in the next 2 years. It does not add one thin dime to what was provided for in the budget resolution. It does not add a penny to what was provided for in the budget resolution. It is exactly what the budget resolution calls for: $5.5 billion in fiscal year 2001.

This costs $5.5 billion. In 2002, the budget resolution provides $7.35 billion. Of that, $1.9 billion is used, leaving $5.45 billion next year. That is not going to be a problem.

Why is it not going to be a problem? Very simply, because of the difference between fiscal years and crop years. We are going to have a very short period of time that has to be covered in the next fiscal year because of the difference between a fiscal year and a crop year and the fact that we are writing a new Federal farm bill.

It is very clear in the budget resolution, for anybody who bothers to read it: ''Fiscal year 2003 monies may be made available for 2002 crop year support.'' By doing what we are doing, using the money allocated for 2001 as provided for in the budget resolution and using some of the money that is available in 2002 for 2002, with the anticipation we can use 2003 fiscal year money to deal with the 2002 crop year, that is exactly what is being done in this legislation. No harm, no foul. That is exactly what we have here. There is no harm. There is no foul.

This is completely in keeping with the budget resolution. There is no budget point of order against this legislation. If anybody challenges that, they have an opportunity. They can come out and raise a budget point of order and see what the Parliamentarian says. The Parliamentarian will tell them there is no budget point of order against this bill—none, zero—because it is entirely in keeping with the budget resolution.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to voice my concerns about this Agricultural supplemental appropriations bill. I believe reaching forward into next year to spend an additional $2 billion is fiscally irresponsible and, frankly, unnecessary. Even though some of that $2 billion in additional spending will benefit farmers in my State, I do not believe at a time when we are debating issues of great importance—Medicare prescription drugs, Social Security, other issues such as that, where we are going to be needing resources to solve those problems—reaching forward to next year, when we are going to be doing a farm bill next year, to allocate those resources is the wise course to take.

I do not want you to take my word for it. We have just received a Statement of Administration Policy about this legislation. I want to quote from it:

The Administration strongly opposes S. 1246 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry because spending authorized by the bill would exceed $5.5 billion, the amount provided in the budget resolution and the amount adopted by the House. If S. 1246 is presented to the President at a level higher than $5.5 billion, the President's senior advisers will recommend he veto the bill.

We are about to engage here in a motion to proceed. If this scenario plays out, with the objections that I intend to have to this bill and I know others on this side will have, we will not get around in any way, shape, or form to final passage of this bill until Friday, Saturday, sometime Sunday.

It can all go away. From my perspective, it can all go away. If we stop this overreaching and get back to the budget number of $5.5 billion and we get to the House number of $5.5 billion, we can pass a bill here and, I hope, in a relatively expeditious time. Certainly from my perspective I will not have objections to moving forward. There may be amendments offered, and I certainly want to reserve my right to object if there are amendments offered, but the idea we are going to spend all week here, probably past the time the House of Representatives will even be in session, and pass a bill that the House will not even be here to deal with—it may not even get to the President—and we get no ag assistance at this point in time is irresponsible. To overreach to the point we get nothing at a time when certainly there are some ag needs out there, that is, in my view, an irresponsible action.

I am hopeful with this word from the President, with I think a very strong conviction of many of us on this side of the aisle that this additional spending is not only unnecessary but unwise, we can get this bill done in a rapid, orderly fashion and get it done to a level that has been approved by the Budget Committee and the authorizing committee and move forward and get ag assistance out before the House of Representatives leaves and get a bill that will be signed by the President.

If we go to the $7.5 billion level, I tell you we will be here all week. We will be here past the time the House of Representatives will be in session. And it will be met with a veto by the President.

I am willing to do that. But we are not going to get any ag assistance to people anytime soon if we do that.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for yielding. I am sorry the Senator is still not a member of the Agriculture Committee. He was a very valuable member.

Mr. SANTORUM. I am sorry, too. It is the cost of leadership on our side.

Mr. HARKIN. I am sorry he is not there because he comes from a very important agricultural State.

I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, I have tried to make it clear, again, this Agriculture Committee, in accordance with the budget, spent $5.5 billion this fiscal year, before September 30. The Budget Committee allows the Agriculture Committee to spend up to $7.35 billion in fiscal year 2002, which begins on October 1. There are no instructions in the Budget Committee that say we cannot meet until after that to decide how to spend that $7.35 billion.

There is no reaching forward. There is no moving money from one fiscal year to another, I say to my friend from Pennsylvania. This committee recognized that fiscal years and crop-years do not coincide. So what the committee did, because of the press of business, what is happening this fall, since we don't know when the next farm bill is going to be done, and in accordance with the budget resolution, was to obligate $2 billion of the $7.35 billion for next year to be spent in 2002. So the money is coming out of the $7.35 billion for fiscal year 2002. It is not being forward funded. There is no moving money from one fiscal year to the other. It was just a recognition that many of the problems that farmers face this fall, in November or December or January, are the result of the crop-year that came before it and the crop-years and the fiscal years do not coincide on the same date. I just say that to my friend.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Iowa.

A couple of comments:

No. 1, the President's advisers have advised the President to veto this bill

because of the obligation of this 2002 money and this additional $2 billion of obligations. We received this a few minutes ago. I will read it to you again.

The administration strongly opposes S. 1246 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, because spending authorized by the bill would exceed $5.5 billion, the amount provided in the budget resolution and the amount adopted by the House. If S. 1246 is presented to the President at a level higher than $5.5 billion, the President's senior advisers will recommend that he veto the bill.

I understand the idea of reaching forward and obligating money. The problem I have is we are now obligating money that is going to start to be spent October 1.

I have been around here long enough to know that we will be here next year, and we will have another emergency. And the $5 billion left over isn't going to be enough and we will either try to bump that up or reach for the next year and try to draw out some money.

If I can have assurances that this isn't just a continual practice—which I know it will be, if we allow this to occur and we will just in a sense begin reaching more and more into the following year to make up for it in this crop-year. That is not what the Budget Committee suggested. They said we want $5.5 billion. If we have a farm bill coming up next year, we have authorization for $7.3 billion, let's go through the working process of doing that in the fiscal year in which we intend to do it. But to reach and grab, if you want to obligate, why not obligate the whole $7.3 billion, if there is no big deal about it. The fact is, we have a responsibility under the farm bill to change farm policy. Use that $7.3 billion to implement that change. There will be some changes, as I am sure the Senator knows, in farm policy. What we have done now is to limit our ability to make that happen. I do not think that is wise. Whether I think it is wise or not is somewhat relevant in this body, but what is more relevant is the fact that the President's advisers will recommend that he veto this bill.

If we don't get aid to the farm country right now in this fiscal year, the best course of business is to scale this bill back and put the $5.5 billion out to the farm country. We either adopt the House bill or we pass $5.5 billion here in conference. There may be some policy differences that we may want to work out. That is the best way to do it.

There would be much more cooperation from many of us on this side of the aisle who would like to see some agricultural assistance. If I could read further from the Statement of Administration Policy, it says:

The budget resolution provides $5.5 billion for 2001, an amount that the Administration strongly believes is more than adequate for this crop year. Moreover, improvements in agricultural markets and stronger livestock and crop prices means that the need for additional federal assistance continues to diminish. An additional $5.5 billion in federal assistance will boast expected real U.S. farm net-cash income to $53.6 billion in 1996 dollars, a level of income significantly above the previous two years.

Having been on the Agriculture Committee, I remember when we had this discussion. Our objective was to keep net-cash farm income at the 1996 level of $45 billion.

I ask the Senator from Iowa if he remembers that also. But the number we had always targeted was $45 billion in net-cash farm income.

Here we are with this supplemental at $53.6 billion. We are talking about 20 percent above what we thought was the projected level of income that we wanted to set as a floor. Now above that we want to throw on another $2 billion.

All I am asking is when is enough enough? I think $5.5 billion is more than generous. It is not the way I would want to spend it. That is why I hope we can maybe do some amendments to this bill. Almost 99 percent of the $5.5 billion is spent this year on AMTA payments. I understand that is an easy way to get out the money. But it isn't necessarily a regionally fair way to get out the money.

I see the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Pennsylvania consider agriculture pretty important to our States. It is the No. 1 industry in my State. It is either No. 1 or No. 2 in his State. But I will guarantee that the level of AMTA payments in our State is probably a third or less of what it is in Iowa, and certainly North Dakota and a lot of other Midwestern row-crop States. Putting all of that money in AMTA doesn't help us much. It doesn't help the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Pennsylvania. It doesn't help the Senator from Massachusetts or anybody else who has farmers who aren't in the big row crops.

I suggest that we step back and try to put together a bill that is regionally fair and that meets the budget target we set out. Then we can get a bill that I think can pass in a bipartisan fashion that will be signed by this President and really do something about the need in some areas of farm country to help stabilize that economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I suggest the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I know our time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. How much time do we have before the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three and a half minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent to have a couple of minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to, again, respond to my friend from Pennsylvania and to a Statement of Administration Policy that we have just received. It is not from the President. I don't really know what to make of this letter. It said they opposed the bill that we have before us because spending authorized by the bill would exceed $5.5 billion, the amount provided in the budget resolution and the amount adopted by the House. It is the amount adopted by the House, but it is not the amount provided in the budget resolution. The budget resolution provided two amounts: $5.5 billion this year and $7.35 billion next year. We stayed within the $5.5 billion for this year. Then we had $7.35 billion for next year.

The administration is saying we can't spend what the budget resolution provides. The administration has nothing to do with this. This is something that is internal to the Congress.

If we are meeting our budget obligations, why should the administration care? Evidently, the administration must be opposed to how we are spending the money. How are we spending the money? In the next fiscal year we are spending money on a lot of our specialty crops such as apples.

I mentioned in my earlier talk about how our apple farmers are being hurt. We heard that the livestock sector is rebounding. But that doesn't mean the crop sector is rebounding. Far from it. We have specialty crops in peas and lentils. I mentioned apples. We have a lot of other specialty crops that are in dire need of assistance all over this country.

This bill is much fairer region to region than the House bill. The House bill focused on a few crops but not on the entire country. That is why I do not understand the administration's objection to this. They say the bill provides funding for a number of programs that have nothing to do with farmers' 2001 incomes. It sure as heck does. Ask all the apple farmers in Washington State, in Maine, in Pennsylvania, in New York, and in Massachusetts. It has a lot to do with the 2001 income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute 20 seconds.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I would like to address the point of the Senator from Iowa. At least three components of this bill have nothing to do with farm income. One establishes a scientific research unit in USDA. It provides additional funding for business and industry. It provides that U.S. cities with populations not exceeding 50,000 will be eligible for guaranteed community facility costs.

That has nothing to do with emergency farm income this year. This is just another vehicle to try to do some more agricultural authorization. I am

not against doing agricultural authorization. I loved being on the Agriculture Committee. But we should do it in a farm bill and not in an emergency supplemental bill for agriculture. No. 2, the fact is, I think the Senator has received letters from the White House and previous administrations where they said: Senior advisers will recommend that the President veto the bill. Unfortunately, we get those all too often around here.

I think it is very clear that the President and his advisers do not like the way this bill was constructed and would prefer to see us live within the requirements of the budget agreement for the year 2001. I think we can do that, and we should do that. It is the only way I believe we will actually get a bill done this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 102, S. 1246, a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American farmers:

Tom Harkin, Harry Reid, Jon S. Corzine, Max Baucus, Patty Murray, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Jeff Bingaman, Tim Johnson, Ted Kennedy, Jay Rockefeller, Daniel K. Akaka, Paul Wellstone, Mark Dayton, Maria Cantwell, Benjamin Nelson, Blanche Lincoln, Richard Durbin, Herb Kohl.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under the rule has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1246, a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American farmers, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Dorgan	Lugar
Allard	Durbin	McConnell
Allen	Edwards	Mikulski
Baucus	Enzi	Miller
Bayh	Feingold	Murkowski
Biden	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Graham	Nickles
Breaux	Gramm	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bunning	Hagel	Roberts
Burns	Harkin	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hatch	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hollings	Schumer
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Sessions
Carper	Hutchison	Shelby
Chafee	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Clinton	Jeffords	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson	Specter
Collins	Kennedy	Stabenow
Conrad	Kerry	Stevens
Corzine	Kohl	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Landrieu	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Voinovich
Dayton	Levin	Warner
DeWine	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dodd	Lincoln	Wyden
Domenici	Lott	

NAYS—2

Ensign	Gregg

NOT VOTING—3

Bennett	McCain	Torricelli

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 95, the nays are 2. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the motion to proceed to S. 1246 be adopted and the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that the Senate resume consideration of the Agriculture supplemental bill, S. 1246, at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 31, and that Senator LUGAR be recognized to offer an amendment, the text of the House-passed bill; further, that no cloture motion against the bill, or any amendments, be in order prior to Wednesday, August 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I simply thank the majority leader for this motion. It sets us off on a constructive path for consideration of this bill, and it offers an opportunity for me to present an amendment, which I am prepared to do. We look forward to working with him. I do not object.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, let me thank the distinguished ranking member and the chairman for their excellent work in getting the Senate to this point. I appreciate very much Senator LUGAR's interest in pursuing this amendment. We will have a good debate on it. We don't know how long the debate will last, but we will certainly leave it to him to make some decision in that regard tomorrow morning.

Tomorrow is Tuesday. We have 4 days within which to do a tremendous amount of work. I ask the cooperation of all of our colleagues. We need to finish this bill, and that will entail, of course, working through some very difficult questions not only with regard to the level of funding but also perhaps the dairy issue and other questions about which I know Senators are concerned. We also have to finish the Transportation bill, and of course, the Export Administration Act expires in August. The distinguished Presiding Officer addressed that point last week. We would like to do HUD–VA. There is a lot to be done.

Tomorrow night our Republican colleagues have an event and we will attempt to accommodate that event tomorrow night. I appreciate very much the minority leader's cooperation in allowing us to move to the bill as quickly as we have. That will at least accelerate the opportunity for debate and hopefully allow us to address some of these questions as quickly as possible. It will be a busy week.

I will say now, so there is no surprise if we are not finished at least with the Export Administration Act, the Transportation bill and the Agriculture supplemental bill by Friday, we will need the weekend and we will need additional days. That is an unfortunate but certainly accurate statement. I am hopeful that will not be necessary, but I want Senators who have traveling plans to take that into account because this work must be done. I thank all of my colleagues.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I seek recognition in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. This weekend, the New York Times Sunday edition had a front

page story on a proposal by two Members of the House of Representatives concerning the future of Social Security. It is an interesting proposal because the two, JIM KOLBE of Arizona and CHARLIE STENHOLM of Texas, a Republican and Democrat, support the notion of privatizing Social Security, giving people an opportunity to invest some part of their Social Security payroll deduction into some sort of private account.

It is interesting that the Kolbe-Stenholm proposal for privatization is the first complete package I have seen because in that package they have to tell you how they will pay for it. If they want to take 2 percent of the payroll deduction and put it into a private investment, it will have a dramatic impact. Two percent does not sound like much, but it turns out to be a substantial portion of the amount that is dedicated to Social Security. Since Social Security is a pay-as-you-go system, if you are going to dedicate the 2 percent to private investment, you run the risk, or at least have the opportunity to take a look at a lot of other things that need to be done in order to achieve this 2-percent privatization investment.

When you look at the Kolbe and Stenholm proposal and Social Security, a number of things come out very clearly. In order to achieve this privatization, they are calling for an increase in the payroll tax for Social Security, a reduction in the benefits paid for Social Security, an acceleration of the age of 67 years for retirement under Social Security, and a variety of other changes, which means that the Social Security system as we know it will be dramatically changed.

Some critics of the Democrats have said even though you are critical of this commission on Social Security, you have to accept the reality that Social Security is not going to last forever. That is true. Left untouched, Social Security is going to run out of funds. There is no doubt about it.

The report that was given by the President's commission suggests that Social Security would run out of funds in the year 2016. That is not accurate. The right year is 2038. The obvious question is, Should we be concerned today about a system that will run out of funds 37 years from now? I think the answer is yes. The answer is obvious because there are people paying into Social Security today who will need that system 37 years from now, and we should be making changes that we can realistically make, honestly make, that will save Social Security to make certain that it has a longer life.

Each of those changes will involve some pain. There is no doubt about it. But to make those changes today in anticipation of 2038 is a lot more sensible and I think would be more reasonable in terms of its approach. It is painful, too, I might add, politically. But to couple those changes to save and prolong Social Security with this idea of privatization is what forces my colleagues in the House, Mr. KOLBE and Mr. STENHOLM, to make some drastic changes. They are, as I said, raising the payroll tax on Social Security, reducing the benefits paid, saying to people they cannot claim their Social Security benefits until they reach the age of 67—at an earlier date, I might add—and reducing the cost-of-living adjustment which is given each year under Social Security.

I think what we need to do to go at this honestly is to separate the two issues. We should say to the American people: We are going to set a goal for the life of Social Security. We want to make certain it is adequately funded and solvent for so many years to come. Right now it is to the year 2038. The question is, What do we want to prolong it to—2057, 2058? What would it be? Pick that date, and then say to both the President's commission and those who would come at it from a different perspective: Tell us what you think it would take for us to make sure that Social Security is solvent that extra 20 years. Maybe that is our goal, 20 years beyond its current solvency. Then have each side make their proposal of what it would take to reach that.

Then if some want to come in and add the option of privatization of Social Security, let them also explain how they would pay for that. Where I think the President has made a mistake is creating a commission which is not designed and created to give a longer life to Social Security but is designed instead to create an item on the political agenda of privatization of Social Security.

It comes down to this as well. There is a difference of opinion as to what Social Security is all about. Some view it much like a retirement fund or an investment plan. It certainly has characteristics of that. But more than that, it is an insurance policy. It is known as the social insurance policy for Americans. That puts it in a different perspective. We pay premiums throughout our life for basic insurance. If we live to be 65, so long as we are alive, that payment, of course, gives us the safety net we need in our retirement. Some, though, think it should be viewed as a retirement fund. There have been times when you can make more money in the stock market than the Social Security fund has made, and in that respect they are asking for the privatization of the system. I think we ought to take care.

As appealing as it may be for us to consider the possibility of privatization, you run the very real risk, if the stock market takes a downturn at the time you want to retire, that everything you have saved for is not there when you need it. So the insurance policy aspect of that would be something you would welcome at that moment. Instead, you have been caught in a bad investment.

Many American families, probably most who are listening and following this debate, have had in the last year a bad experience in the stock market. There was a terrific good-time roll in our economy for about 9 or 10 years with the creation of 22 million new jobs, new housing starts, new businesses, low inflation, a dramatic increase in the Dow Jones index, and a great increase in personal savings from people who were putting money away for retirement. Then at the beginning of last year, a correction started to take place which we are still living through. During that correction, the retirement investment of a lot of people diminished. So if they were counting on this increase in the value of their investment because of the growing stock market, then they have had a rude awakening over the last year.

What if this were all that you had? What if you had made your investment in your fund for retirement, the private investment of your Social Security funds, and the day came for your retirement and you were caught at a bad moment on the stock market, when things were low? That sort of thing worries me because this safety net is very basic. It is tough for a person to survive just on Social Security. To take even a small part of it and to put it into private investment is to run the risk that, while it may increase in value, it may decrease as well.

So I think the President's commission starts with a false assertion about the Social Security trust, its funds, and its solvency. But it also starts with the premise that you have to privatize it as part of giving a longer life to Social Security. My challenge to the commission and to those as well who do not agree with privatization, including myself, is to come up with a proposal to give a longer life to Social Security and put it on the table and say to the American people: This is what we need to do to give a longer life to Social Security. Let the President's commission do the same thing. Then, for those who want to privatize, want to take more money out of Social Security, let them then tell you what the add-on cost would be for privatization. Then let's make the political judgment.

Today we are in this swirl of misinformation, some of it coming from the commission and some of it coming from outside sources. There are some people, of course, who have never liked Social Security. They called it socialism when Franklin Roosevelt came up with this idea. But I think we would all agree—at least I hope we would—that it has been the single most successful social program in America, giving a lot of senior citizens an opportunity they would never have otherwise to retire with dignity and to have a life with their families, to live for a long time without fear they were going to be dependent on their children or the Government for some sort of dole or handout. I think this generation has to meet its obligation for the future of Social Security.

I concede changes must be made. The Democrats and Republicans should come together to make those changes. I think when we take a look at the add-on cost of privatization as Congressman KOLBE and Congressman STENHOLM say, and find out what it will cost in terms of reducing benefits and raising payroll taxes on Social Security, that it will be quickly rejected. I hope we will do this in an honest and bipartisan fashion and that we address it very quickly. It is never an easy issue to address, but it is certainly one we have an obligation to address as quickly as possible.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIRGINIA HOUSE OF BURGESSES

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, on July 30, 1619, in the church at Jamestown, VA, the colonial Governor of Virginia, George Yeardley, called into session a meeting of twenty-two citizens called burgesses, from each of the eleven boroughs subdivisions, of colonial Virginia.

According to one of the participants, Mr. John Pory, ''all the Burgesses took their places . . . till a prayer was said by Mr. Burke, the minister,'' who asked God to ''guide and sanctify'' the ''proceedings to his own glory.''

The Speaker then addressed the members of the assembly on their duties as participants. ''Our intent,'' wrote Mr. Pory, was ''to establish one equal and uniforme kinde of government over all Virginia.''

Thus began, 382 years ago this very day, the first representative, legislative body in American history, the Virginia House of Burgesses.

I do find it ironic that today, when there is so much talk about separation of church and state, that the very first legislative assembly in American history took place in a church. It seems very fitting that the legislative foundations of the world's greatest power, and the world's foremost proponent of liberty and, I might add, religious freedom began in a church.

What a momentous day July 30, 1619 was, not only in American history, but also in world history. Right there in that little church in Jamestown, VA, a colony still struggling to survive, a colony that had been decimated by plagues, disease, hunger, and war, a significant step was taken in the development of representative government.

Think about it, even with all the problems of simply staying alive, these men, driven by that eternal desire to be free and to rule themselves, to be free of the control of kings, emperors, czars, and other autocrats, had the intellect and the foresight to meet in that church and begin a journey that would eventually lead to the establishment of our republic.

Independence was still more than 150 years away, but the seeds of American democratic thought had been sown. It is probably no coincidence that from the House of Burgesses would come some of the most important champions of American liberty and greatest leaders of the American Revolution, including Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, John Marshall, and Patrick Henry.

For this reason, I want to recognize this very important, if overlooked, day in our American heritage.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred November 11, 1990 in Seattle, WA. A 23-year-old man was near death from head injuries suffered in an attack by members of a Seattle gang known as the United Blood Nation. The attackers had been targeting gay couples during the night.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, at the close of business Friday, July 27, 2001, the Federal debt stood at $5,736,703,126,894.92, five trillion, seven hundred thirty-six billion, seven hundred three million, one hundred twenty-six thousand, eight hundred ninety-four dollars and ninety-two cents.

One year ago, July 27, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,673,849,000,000, five trillion, six hundred seventy-three billion, eight hundred forty-nine million.

Twenty-five years ago, July 27, 1976, the Federal debt stood at $620,139,000,000, six hundred twenty billion, one hundred thirty-nine million, which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion, $5,116,564,126,894.92, five trillion, one hundred sixteen billion, five hundred sixty-four million, one hundred twenty-six thousand, eight hundred ninety-four dollars and ninety-two cents during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING SOUTH DAKOTA CONGRESSIONAL GOLD AWARD RECIPIENTS

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to publicly commend an outstanding group of young people from my home State of South Dakota. These fourteen extraordinary students were recently honored with the Congressional Gold Award, a prestigious award given to a very select group of dedicated young people from throughout the Nation.

The Congressional Award program was established by Congress in 1979 to recognize the initiative, achievement, and service of extraordinary young people from across the Nation. The Award was signed into law by President Jimmy Carter, and each president since Carter has renewed the authorizing legislation.

To qualify for the Congressional Gold Award, an individual aged 14 to 23 must complete at least 800 hours of goal-oriented work in four program areas: Volunteer Public Service, Personal Development, Physical Fitness, and Expedition/Exploration. These program areas emphasize each person's capacity to grow and develop as an individual, as well as how each person can selflessly contribute to the happiness and well-being of their community.

South Dakota Congressional Gold Award recipients chose to volunteer their time and talents in many different areas, where they made tremendous contributions. One recipient volunteered at the Veterans Affairs hospital in Ft. Meade, SD. Some awardees became mentors or Girl Scout leaders, while others volunteered at childcare centers, athletic associations, local schools, parks, and even in the South Dakota State Penitentiary. One individual actually established an annual volksmarch in their hometown.

For their outstanding commitment to physical fitness, personal development, exploration, and for committing their hearts and hands to volunteering in their communities, I would like to congratulate the following young South Dakotans for receiving the Congressional Gold Award: Kary Bullock of Ashton; Eric Davies of Whitewood; Nicole Hammer, Janelle Stahl, Kayla Stahl, and Michelle Jilek of Mellette; Ryun Haugaard and Norman Haugaard II of Milbank; Carrie Larson and Jessica Larson of Mitchell; Alexsis Malsam of Aberdeen; Andrea McComsey and Tracey Smith of Conde; and Betsy Valnes of Sioux Falls.

I thank these outstanding young people for their immeasurable contributions to their communities, the State of South Dakota, and our Nation. It is because of individuals like these that I have great faith in the continued success and prosperity of our great Nation. These individuals truly serve as an example for all young Americans.•

DR. CAROLYN REED

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Dr. Carolyn Reed, director of the Hollings Cancer Center at the Medical University of South Carolina. The Post and Courier newspaper in Charleston, SC recently published a profile of Dr. Reed in a special Remarkable Women section. I have the great pleasure of working with Dr. Reed and can attest to the remarkable job she has done since taking the reins as director last year. She is a talented and compassionate surgeon and effective administrator who easily blends these two roles in mapping the Cancer Center's future. Her commitment to offer all South Carolinians state-of-the-art cancer care is unwavering.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Post and Courier (SC), July 25, 2001]

SURGEON IS HEAD OF CANCER CENTER

(By Dottie Ashley)

You might think a pall would hang in the air when you enter the office of Dr. Carolyn Reed. She must deal daily with deadly disease in her dual roles as thoracic surgeon and director of the Hollings Cancer Center at MUSC.

But, instead, you can't help but smile.

Occupying one shelf, alongside a volume titled ''Thoracic Oncology,'' is a large green jar with the words ''Male Sensitivity Pills'' printed on the label.

''I doubt if that endears me to my male colleagues,'' says Reed with a laugh. Wearing her white doctor's coat over a lilac blouse, she buzzes around the office, filling it with energy and optimism, even when she is viewing results from radiology that reveal a patient has lung cancer.

The surgeon, now 50, who won a thoracic surgical oncology fellowship to the venerable Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, doesn't beat around the bush.

She's a straight-talking Maine Yankee, and, on this morning, speaking firmly into the telephone to a colleague, says, ''This is absurd; the system is making us do unnecessary procedures.''

Accustomed to changing the system and cracking glass ceilings, Reed is one of 4,000 practicing cardio-thoracic surgeons in the United States, of which only 2 percent are female.

And she is the only female thoracic surgeon practicing in South Carolina, according to state figures.

Although Reed, who is single, has cut back to a degree on the number of surgeries she performs since taking over as director of the Hollings Cancer Center last August, she is still very involved with her first love. She worries that more women don't enter the thoracic surgery arena.

''It's true more women are getting into medicine, but not really into surgery and especially thoracic surgery,'' she says, noting that when she graduated from the University of Rochester School of Medicine in 1977, only 10 percent of those in medical school residencies were women. Today, that figure is close to 50 percent. But she points out that only about 5 percent of the residents-in-training in the field of thoracic surgery are women.

''It's clearly a male-dominated field,'' she says. ''For example, I use the nurses' locker room at MUSC because there is no locker room for female surgeons. But it doesn't bother me a bit because I respect nurses and view them as colleagues, not as handmaidens.''

''The Heart is an Organ To Pump Blood to the Esophagus'' are the words mounted on a plaque in Reed's office, indicative of her fascination with the chest portion of the human body.

''I perform operations involving lung and esophageal cancer,'' says Reed, who assumed the position of professor of surgery at MUSC in 1985.

Always interested in science when attending high school in rural Maine, Reed became aware of the devastating effects of cancer when her father died of the disease when only in his 40s. At the time, she was a freshman at the University of Maine, where she graduated in 1972 as valedictorian of the class.

She then went on to the University of Rochester School of Medicine, where she received her medical degree in 1977, graduating with honors and distinction in research.

However, after working in research with her mentor who was a specialist in leukemia, she learned that she vastly preferred to work with patients than in a lab.

''I love my patients,'' she says. ''It has been said that doctors should keep a professional distance, but many of my patients have become my friends. The day that I don't cry in my car on the way home when I have lost a patient is the day I will quit.''

And in the past, she encountered some who encouraged her to quit.

When she was a resident in general surgery in 1982 at New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center in New York City, Reed was told by the center's leading teaching surgeon: ''Women only belong in the kitchen and the bedroom.''

''Do you think I liked operating with him after hearing that?'' she asked rhetorically. ''I told him I didn't agree with him, but then I went right ahead and learned every single thing I could from him, because he was a brilliant man.

''And I think I eventually earned his respect because I ended up being the chief resident that year.''

She also faced other adversities: When she first arrived at New York Hospital, someone referred to her as ''that poor intern,'' and she learned that was because normally the thoracic surgery floor has two interns, but this time it would have only one. She was expected to work every night, often going two nights straight without sleep.

But the only time she almost gave up was when she had returned to New York Hospital for two years of cardio-thoracic surgery after working at Memorial Sloan-Kettering. ''I lived across the street from the hospital where they had apartments for the staff, and after i had worked two days without sleep, I was finally sleeping in my scrubs. At 2 a.m. the phone rang. I had to get over there. When I ran out into that empty street I was crying because I thought I just can't do it. I just can't.

''But then I did it, and I saw what you can do when you are dedicated, when you really love what you do. And to see the immediate, positive results of surgery is my favorite thing in the world,'' she says on this rainy morning as she prepares to operate once more, hoping to give one more cancer patient a chance at life.•

AARP'S CELEBRATION OF MEDICARE'S 36TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join AARP, including South Dakota's nearly 85,000 members, today to celebrate the 36th anniversary of the Medicare program.

I want to applaud the efforts of Don Vogt, Deb Fleming, and all the volunteers of South Dakota AARP for the work they do in South Dakota and those AARP staff and volunteers around the country that provide important assistance to their over 34 million members nationwide.

As long as we are celebrating important dates in history, I want to also recognize and celebrate the 43rd anniversary of AARP this year. Since its inception, AARP has had a vision, ''to excel as a dynamic presence in every community, shaping and enriching the experience of aging for each member and for society.'' I think we can all agree that today's celebration is an example of making this vision a reality.

Most of us here today can remember what life was like prior to the Medicare program. While some people may reflect on the good old days of housecalls and town doctors, the reality for most seniors was that there was very little access to health care coverage. In fact, when the Medicare program was implemented in 1965, nearly 30 percent of elderly Americans lived below the poverty line and could not afford medical insurance coverage. As a result of Medicare's successes over the last 36 years, the decrease in individual expenditures on health are allowed many seniors to maintain their savings longer into their retirement years, leading to a dramatic drop in the poverty level of seniors to just over 10 percent in recent years. This stark contrast to the number of seniors living in poverty prior to the Medicare program is a testament to the program's long term success. In addition, elderly Americans now maintain healthy, active lives well past the average life expectancy of Americans during the first half of the 20th century.

I do, however, feel that no entitlement program is perfect and Medicare is no exception. While I believe that Medicare does an outstanding job of providing coverage for its nearly 44 million beneficiaries, I think it is possible to improve upon this highly effective program. To use a phrase that coincides with the theme of this year's Medicare birthday celebration, I believe it is possible to have our cake and eat it too.

Prescription drugs played an extremely small role in health care when Medicare was first implemented. Today, prescription drugs play an integral part in a wide variety of therapies for illnesses and diseases that affect aging populations. But while our Medicare beneficiaries' dependence on prescription drugs grows, so has the price of acquiring those important therapies. That is why I have introduced several pieces of legislation that provide common-sense solutions to the rising cost of prescription drugs. My Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors legislation would allow seniors to purchase their prescriptions at the same cost as is offered to senior citizens of other industrialized nations. Another version of the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors bill would require that seniors have access to the same prices that most favored purchasers like HMOs

have. I believe it is wrong that our Nation's seniors are forced to pay the highest prices in the world for their prescription drug needs, and both of my plans could provide immediate financial relief for the nearly 119,000 Medicare beneficiaries in South Dakota and the 39 million Medicare beneficiaries nationwide.

I have also introduced legislation that would guarantee greater access to generic pharmaceuticals, which play an integral role in keeping down the cost of pharmaceuticals. Many seniors have expressed to me that if they only had greater access to generics that they could get a better handle on their medication costs. This is another way we can immediately address the price of prescription drugs without additional bureaucratic red-tape.

There is no question, however, that a comprehensive Medicare prescription drug benefit would be a tremendous addition to the Medicare program. I have been an ardent supporter of efforts in recent years to push forward with a strong, voluntary prescription drug plan that gives seniors the option of prescription drugs through Medicare. I strongly believe that we must ensure that Medicare beneficiaries have access to needed drugs, access to their local pharmacy, and affordable premiums that make the program accessible to all. And, perhaps most importantly, any benefit must ensure rural beneficiaries, like many on Medicare in South Dakota, are assured that they have universal access wherever they live.

I was pleased to join in AARP's ''Medicare Monday'' celebration. Providing Medicare prescription drug benefits is a goal that I share with Medicare beneficiaries nationwide, and I will continue my fight for lower prescription drug costs until we reach that goal.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2601. An act to extend the Export Administration Act until November 20, 2001.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–3135. A communication from the Attorney General and the United States Trade Representative, transmitting jointly, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Repeal of 1916 Act''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3136. A communication from the Director of Headquarters and Executive Personnel Service, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3137. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Florida: Approval of Revisions to the Florida State Implementation Plan'' (FRL7022-3) received on July 27, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3138. A communication from the Employee Benefits Manager of the AgFirst Farm Credit Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Reports of Federal Pension Plans for calendar year 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3139. A communication from the White House Liaison of the Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position Assistant Secretary of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3140. A communication from the White House Liaison of the Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services Administration, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3141. A communication from the White House Liaison of the Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary for Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3142. A communication from the White House Liaison of the Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary of Adult and Vocational Education, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3143. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Change in Specifications for Gum or Wood Rosin Derivatives in Chewing Gum Base'' (Doc. No. 99F-2533) received on July 27, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3144. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program: Identification of Blended Beef, Pork, Poultry or Seafood Products'' received on July 27, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3145. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clomazone; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL6787-5) received on July 27, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3146. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Carfentrazone-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions'' (FRL6792-2) received on July 27, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3147. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Carfentrazone-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL6790-9) received on July 27, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3148. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions'' (FRL6792-5) received on July 27, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3149. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sulfentrazone; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions'' (FRL6793-1) received on July 27, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3150. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary, Financial Management and Comptroller, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3151. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary for Research, Development, and Acquisition, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3152. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary of Manpower and Reserve Affairs, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3153. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3154. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of General Counsel, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3155. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary, Financial Management and Comptroller, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3156. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Deputy Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3157. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Director

of Operational Test and Evaluation, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3158. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Deputy Under Secretary for Logistics and Material Readiness, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3159. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3160. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Under Secretary for Policy, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3161. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Assistant Secretary for Manpower, Residential Affairs, Installation and Environment, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3162. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Assistant Secretary for Space, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3163. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Assistant Secretary for Installations and Environment, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3164. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Director for Defense Research and Engineering, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3165. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3166. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the discontinuation of service in acting role for the position of Assistant Secretary for Research, Development and Acquisition, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3167. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Deputy Under Secretary for Policy, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3168. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of General Counsel, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3169. A communication from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position for Under Secretary, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3170. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3171. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Highly Enriched Uranium Agreement Assets Control Regulations Implementing Presidents'' received on July 18, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3172. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer Alternate, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conversion From Stock Form Depository Institution to Federal Stock Association'' (RIN1550–AB46) received on July 19, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3173. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer Alternate, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Liquidity'' (RIN1550–AB42) received on July 20, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3174. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer Alternate, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assessments and Fees'' (RIN1550–AB47) received on July 20, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3175. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration, received on July 23, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3176. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Chief Financial Officer, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3177. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of the Assistant Secretary of Housing and Federal Housing Commissioner, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3178. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3179. A communication from the General Counsel for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of General Counsel, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3180. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Deputy Secretary, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3181. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination confirmed for the position of Secretary, received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3182. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Improved Methods for Ballast Water Treatment and Management and Lake Champlain Canal Barrier Demonstration'' received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3183. A communication from the Chief of the Division of Endangered Species, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sea Turtle Conservation; Limitations on Incidental Takings During Fishing Activities'' (RIN0648–AP14) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3184. A communication from the Chief of the Division of Endangered Species, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions Applicable to Fishing and Scientific Research Activities'' (RIN0648–AN64) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3185. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska—Closes Sablefish Fishery Using Trawl Gear in the West Yakutat District, Gulf of Alaska'' received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3186. A communication from the Chief of the Division of Endangered Species, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions to Fishing Activities'' (RIN0648–AP34) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3187. A communication from the Chief of the Division of Endangered Species, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions to Shrimp Trawling Requirements'' (RIN0648–AO43) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3188. A communication from the Chief of the Division of Endangered Species, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions Applicable to Shrimp Trawl Activities; Leatherback Conservation Zone'' (RIN0648–AO22) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3189. A communication from the Chief of the Division of Endangered Species, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions to Fishing Activities''

(RIN0648–AO19) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3190. A communication from the Chief of the Division of Endangered Species, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sea Turtle Conservation; Shrimp Trawling Requirements'' (RIN0648–AP16) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3191. A communication from the Trial Attorney for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reporting the Sale or Lease of Defective or Noncompliant Tires'' (RIN2127–AI23) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3192. A communication from the Trial Attorney for the National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Criminal Penalty Safe Harbor Provision'' (RIN2127–AI24) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3193. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier Model DHC 8 102, 103, and 301 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0360)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3194. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes and Airbus Model A300 B4–600, B4–600R, and F4–600R Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0358)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3195. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier Model DHC 8 200 and 300 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0357)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3196. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–700 and 800 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0359)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3197. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767–200 Series Airplanes Modified by Supplemental Type Certificate STO9022AC–D'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0356)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3198. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747SP Series Airplanes; Modified by Supplemental Type Certificate ST09097AC–D'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0355)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3199. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747–400 Series Airplanes Modified by Supplemental Type Certificate SA8843SW'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0354)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3200. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–300, 400, and 500 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0353)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3201. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0352)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3202. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model DC 10 Series Airplanes; Model MD 10 Series Airplanes and Model MD 11 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0351)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3203. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Cessna Model 560XL Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0350)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3204. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A300 B2 and B4 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0349)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3205. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10 30 Series Airplanes Modified by Supplemental Type Certificate ST00054SE'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0348)) received on July 26, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1269. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to revise and simplify the transitional medical assistance (TMA) program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. 1270. A bill to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at 8th Avenue and Mill Street in Eugene, Oregon, as the ''Wayne Lyman Morse United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1271. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United states Code, for the purpose of facilitating compliance by small business concerns with certain Federal paperwork requirements, to establish a task force to examine the feasibility of streamlining paperwork requirements applicable to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 214

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 214, a bill to elevate the position of Director of the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services to Assistant Secretary for Indian Health, and for other purposes.

S. 367

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow as a deduction in determining adjusted gross income the deduction for expenses in connection with services as a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States, to allow employers a credit against income tax with respect to employees who participate in the military reserve components, and to allow a comparable credit for participating reserve component self-employed individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 627

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 627, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for qualified long-term care insurance premiums, use of such insurance under cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements, and a credit for individuals with long-term care needs.

S. 680

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 680, a bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize communities to use community development block grant funds for construction of tornado-safe shelters in manufactured home parks.

S. 744

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 744, a bill to amend section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate notification and return requirements for State and local candidate committees and avoid duplicate reporting by certain State and local political committees of information required to be reported and made publicly available under State law.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) were added as cosponsors of S. 805, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research with respect to various forms of muscular dystrophy, including Duchenne, Becker, limb girdle, congenital, facioscapulohumeral, myotonic, oculopharyngeal, distal, and emery-dreifuss muscular dystrophies.

S. 839

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of payment for inpatient hospital services under the medicare program and to freeze the reduction in payments to hospitals for indirect costs of medical education.

S. 1018

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, a bill to provide market loss assistance for apple producers.

S. 1036

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1036, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to establish an international food for education and child nutrition program.

S. 1116

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide increased foreign assistance for tuberculosis prevention, treatment, and control.

S. 1136

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to provide for mass transportation in certain Federally owned or managed areas that are open to the general public.

S. 1153

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1153, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to establish a grassland reserve program to assist owners in restoring and protecting grassland.

S. 1206

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1206, a bill to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to combat the trafficking, distribution, and abuse of Ecstasy (and other club drugs) in the United States.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996.

S. 1256

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1256, a bill to provide for the reauthorization of the breast cancer research special postage stamp, and for other purposes.

S. 1267

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1267, a bill to extend and improve conservation programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

S. CON. RES. 59

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 59, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there should be established a National Community Health Center Week to raise awareness of health services provided by community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers.

AMENDMENT NO. 1184

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1184 intendent to be proposed to H.R. 2299, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1271. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, for the purpose of facilitating compliance by small business concerns with certain Federal paperwork requirements, to establish a task force to examine the feasibility of streamlining paperwork requirements applicable to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, I rise today to introduce legislation, the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2001, that will help lift the burden of confusing regulation on small businesses by helping them to be better able to understand and comply with Federal paperwork mandates. I am pleased to be joined by my good friend Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN in putting forth this ''good government'' bill which continues congressional efforts to streamline and reduce paperwork burdens on small businesses.

Ask any small business owner and he or she will tell you that Federal paperwork requirements on small businesses are impeding America's entrepreneurial growth. Indeed, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has estimated that the Federal paperwork burden is 7.2 billion hours annually, at a cost of $190 billion a year. The Small Business Administration, SBA, estimates that the cost to small businesses are staggering $5,100 per employee.

While many paperwork requirements are important and necessary, the high costs of understanding them and complying with them can sometimes prevent small businesses from being able to expand, remain in business, or deter them from opening in the first place.

Helping ease the burdens of regulation on small business has long been an interest of mine. As governor of Ohio, I pushed for passage of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act on behalf of our state governments and was an original cosponsor of the Regulatory Improvement Act in the 106th Congress. Last year, I worked to help pass the Congressional Accountability for Regulatory Information Act and the Regulatory Right to Know Act. Senator LINCOLN and I introduced s. 1378, a bill similar to the one we introduce today, in the last Congress as well.

Many Federal regulations of business are important, since they help protect our environment, workers' safety and the health of our families. However, some of these regulations are unnecessarily difficult for our businesses, particularly small businesses without large legal staffs, to understand. Our bill will help business owners understand and comply with federal regulations.

The Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2001 would require each agency to establish a single point of contact to help answer questions and aid small business owners in complying with paperwork requirements. In addition, our bill requires the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, to publish annually in the Federal Register and on the Internet a list of each agency's Federal paperwork requirements applicable to their small businesses. Our bill also requires each agency to make further efforts to reduce paperwork requirements for small businesses with fewer

than 25 employees. Further, the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2001 establishes an interagency task force to study the streamlining of paperwork requirements for small businesses. Our legislation asks this task force to consider having each agency consolidate its reporting requirements for small businesses, resulting in reporting to the agency's single point of contact, in a single format or using a single electronic reporting system, and on one date.

Our bill also will help make government more accountable and aid congressional oversight of Federal agencies by requiring that each agency maintain information on the number of enforcement actions in which civil penalties were assessed; the number of such actions against small businesses; the number of such actions in which civil penalties were reduced or waived; and the monetary amount of these reductions or waivers.

I believe any resulting burden on Federal agencies would be minimal, and would certainly be offset by the benefits to small businesses.

Small businesses are vital to the health of our Nation's economy. They represent more than 90 percent of our Nation's employers, employ 53 percent of the private workforce and create about 75 percent of this country's new jobs. In my own State of Ohio, there are more than 300,000 full-time businesses. Of these, 96 percent employ fewer than 100 people, and 75 percent employ fewer than 10 individuals. The National Federation of Independent Business estimates that the majority of new jobs in the next decade in Ohio will be created by small businesses. Given the prevalence of small businesses in our Nation, I believe we should do all within our ability to ensure that small business owners are not unfairly burdened, or simply overwhelmed, by federal paperwork requirements.

Earlier this year, the House passed the companion bill, H.R. 327, unanimously, by a vote of 418–0, on March 15. I hope we can do the same in this body.

This bill has been endorsed by the following groups: American Farm Bureau Federation, National Federation of Independent Business, The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Convention Stores, American Feed Industry Association, National Association of Manufacturers, National Tooling & Machining Association, National Pest Management Association, Academy of General Dentistry, and American Road & Transportation Builders Association.

I encourage my colleagues to join Senator LINCOLN and me in our efforts to help lessen the burden on small businesses, while helping them to be able to comply with federal requirements, by cosponsoring and supporting the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2001.

I ask consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

S. 1271

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. FACILITATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL PAPERWORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE DIRECTOR OF OMB.—Section 3504(c) of title 44, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act''), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) publish in the Federal Register on an annual basis a list of the collections of information applicable to small-business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)), organized by North American Industrial Classification System code and industrial/sector description (as published by the Office of Management and Budget), with the first such publication occurring not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2001; and

''(7) make available on the Internet, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2001, the list of requirements described in paragraph (6).''.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF AGENCY POINT OF CONTACT.—Section 3506 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) In addition to the requirements described in subsection (c), each agency shall, with respect to the collection of information and the control of paperwork, establish 1 point of contact in the agency to act as a liaison between the agency and small-business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)).''.

(c) ADDITIONAL REDUCTION OF PAPERWORK FOR CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESSES.—Section 3506(c) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3)(J), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) in addition to the requirements of this chapter regarding the reduction of paperwork for small-business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)), make efforts to further reduce the paperwork burden for small-business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.''.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK FORCE TO STUDY STREAMLINING OF PAPERWORK REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL-BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 3520 as section 3521; and

(2) by inserting after section 3519 the following:

''§ 3520. Establishment of task force on feasibility of streamlining information collection requirements

''(a) There is established a task force to study the feasibility of streamlining requirements with respect to small-business concerns regarding collection of information (in this section referred to as the 'task force').

''(b) The members of the task force shall be appointed by the Director, and include—

''(1) not less than 2 representatives of the Department of Labor, including 1 representative of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and 1 representative of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration;

''(2) not less than 1 representative of the Environmental Protection Agency;

''(3) not less than 1 representative of the Department of Transportation;

''(4) not less than 1 representative of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration;

''(5) not less than 1 representative of each of two agencies other than the Department of Labor, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation, and the Small Business Administration; and

''(6) not less than 2 representatives of the Department of Health and Human Services, including one representative of the Health Care Financing Administration.

''(c) The task force shall—

''(1) recommend a system to clarify which small businesses within particular North American Industrial Classification System codes are subject to which information compliance requirements; and

''(2) examine the feasibility of requiring each agency to consolidate requirements regarding collections of information with respect to small-business concerns, in order that each small business concern may submit all information required by the agency—

''(A) to 1 point of contact in the agency;

''(B) in a single format, such as a single electronic reporting system, with respect to the agency; and

''(C) on the same date.

''(d) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2001, the task force shall submit a report of its findings under subsection (c) to the chairpersons and ranking minority members of the Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Small Business of the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

''(e) In this section, the term 'small business concern' has the meaning given under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 3520 and inserting the following:

''3520. Establishment of task force on feasibility of streamlining information collection requirements.

''3521. Authorization of appropriations.''.

SEC. 4. REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT REFORMS.

Section 223 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601 note) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting:

''(c) REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2001, and not later than every 2 years thereafter, each agency shall submit a report to the Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Small Business of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, that includes information with respect to the applicable 1-year period or 2-year period covered by the report on each of the following:

''(A) The number of enforcement actions in which a civil penalty is assessed or proposed to be assessed.

''(B) The number of enforcement actions in which a civil penalty is assessed or proposed to be assessed against a small entity.

''(C) The number of enforcement actions described under subparagraphs (A) and (B) in which the civil penalty is reduced or waived.

''(D) The total monetary amount of the reductions or waivers referred to under subparagraph (C).

''(2) DEFINITIONS IN REPORTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include definitions of the terms 'enforcement actions', 'reduction or waiver', and 'small entity' as used in the report.''.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. 1270. A bill to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at 8th Avenue and Mill Street in Eugene. Oregon, as the ''Wayne Lyman Morse United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I rise today to introduce legislation to name the Federal courthouse being built in downtown Eugene, OR after one of Oregon's greatest heroes, my friend and mentor, Senator Wayne Morse. Naming the Eugene courthouse in the city that Wayne Morse loved and called home would be an appropriate way to honor the independence and integrity of our former Senate colleague.

I find it especially fitting to be here today to honor one of the Senate's great independents. Without going into too much detail of the last few months of the Senate's history, the act of moving one's seat on the Senate floor is not a new concept, and Wayne Morse may have done it most famously.

In January 1953, Senator Morse walked into this very Chamber carrying a folding chair that he would place in the center of the aisle, thereby removing himself from either major party as an Independent. Again in 1956, he moved his chair to become a Democrat. He was subsequently overwhelmingly re-elected by the voters of Oregon. The independence displayed by Senator Morse throughout his 24-year service in the Senate was always rewarded by Oregonians who showed their continuing faith in his ability to truly represent their interests, no matter their party label.

It would benefit us all to follow the principles Wayne Morse lived by in politics today. Senator Morse would have had little sympathy for the world of the sound byte. Wayne Morse did not just talk; he worked on the issues that our citizens care about most: education; resources; health care; and justice for all. To paraphrase an old saying, he was ''unbought and unbossed.'' He, instead, set the bar for integrity and truly embodied the Oregon spirit. I can't imagine a better tribute to Senator Morse's independence and integrity than to name a United States courthouse to honor his legacy.

Senator Morse never forgot where he came from. He could never wait to return to his house in Eugene, at 595 Crest Drive, an address I remember well because I worked as a campaign aide for two of his Senate Campaigns. It was during this time that he got me interested in working with the elderly and started me in public service, which ultimately led me here to the Senate floor. I was given the high honor of being elected to serve in the Senate seat he had held more than 30 years after he was last reelected by the people of Oregon.

Known as the ''Tiger of the Senate'' for his eloquently outspoken and vigorously independent views, Senator Morse worked diligently on the behalf of the American family. He pushed the Senate to improve education and create a better future for American children by passing the New Frontier and Great Society bills, supporting federal aid to public schools and universities, and implementing scholarship programs for low-income students.

It is, therefore, only right that the Federal courthouse that we will build in Eugene, OR be named after Senator Morse. This courthouse will represent his respect for the law, his love for that city, and the future he envisaged for the people of his home State. Naming this courthouse after Senator Wayne Morse will promote and honor the legacy of Oregon's illustrious, maverick leader.

I am especially pleased to be joined by my colleague from Oregon, Senator SMITH, in introducing this bipartisan legislation to designate the new Eugene Federal courthouse as the Wayne Lyman Morse Federal Courthouse. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1189. Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1246, to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agricultural producers; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1189. Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1246, to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agricultural producers; which was ordered to lie on the table as follows:

On page 45, line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 604. EMERGENCY DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR ATLANTIC NORTHEAST MULTISPECIES FISHERMEN.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall use $10,000,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make payments to Atlantic Northeast multispecies fishermen adversely affected by commercial fishery failures in the Atlantic Northeast multispecies fishery.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The payments shall be made in support of a voluntary fishing capacity reduction program in the Atlantic Northeast multispecies fishery that is designed to achieve, by means of permanent revocation of multispecies, limited access fishing permits, the following objectives:

(1) To obtain the maximum sustained reduction in fishing capacity at the least cost and in the minimum period of time.

(2) To prevent the replacement of fishing capacity removed under the program.

(c) DETERMINATIONS OF COMMERCIAL FISHERY FAILURES.—The commercial fishery failures referred to in subsection (a) are those that are determined under section 308(b)(1) of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 (16 U.S.C. 4107(b)(1)) for the purposes of that section.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Monday, July 30, 2001, at 9:30 a.m. for a hearing regarding ''Ecstasy Use Rises: What More Needs to be Done by the Government to Combat the Problem?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Monday, July 30, 2001, at 1 p.m. in Hart 216, to consider Robert S. Mueller III, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALLING FOR UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE OF LI SHAOMIN AND ALL OTHER AMERICAN SCHOLARS OF CHINESE ANCESTRY

On July 24, 2001, the Senate amended and passed S. Res. 128, as follows:

S. RES. 128

Whereas in recent months the Government of the People's Republic of China has arrested and detained several scholars and intellectuals of Chinese ancestry with ties to the United States, including at least 2 United States citizens and 4 permanent residents of the United States;

Whereas according to the Department of State's 2000 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices in China, and international human rights organizations, the Government of the People's Republic of China ''has continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms'';

Whereas the harassment, arbitrary arrest, detention, and filing of criminal charges against scholars and intellectuals has created a chilling effect on freedom of expression in the People's Republic of China, in contravention of internationally accepted norms, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the People's Republic of China signed in October 1998;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China frequently uses torture and other human rights violations to produce coerced ''confessions'' from detainees;

Whereas the Department of State's 2000 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices in China has extensively documented that human rights abuses in the People's Republic of China ''included instances of extrajudicial killings, the use of torture, forced confessions, arbitrary arrest and detention, the mistreatment of prisoners, lengthy incommunicado detention, and denial of due process'', and also found that ''[p]olice and prosecutorial officials often ignore the due process provisions of the law and of the Constitution . . . [f]or example, police and prosecutors can subject prisoners to

severe psychological pressure to confess, and coerced confessions frequently are introduced as evidence'';

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has reported that some of the scholar detainees have ''confessed'' to their ''crimes'' of ''spying'', but it has yet to produce any evidence of spying, and has refused to permit the detainees to confer with their families or lawyers;

Whereas the Department of State's 2000 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices in China also found that ''police continue to hold individuals without granting access to family or a lawyer, and trials continue to be conducted in secret'';

Whereas Dr. Li Shaomin is a United States citizen and scholar who has been detained by the Government of the People's Republic of China for more than 100 days, was formally charged with spying for Taiwan on May 15, 2001, was tried and convicted on July 14, 2001, and is expected to be deported;

Whereas Dr. Li Shaomin has been deprived of his basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention, has not been allowed to contact his wife and child (both United States citizens), and was prevented from seeing his lawyer for an unacceptably long period of time;

Whereas Dr. Gao Zhan is a permanent resident of the United States and scholar who has been detained by the Government of the People's Republic of China for more than 114 days, and was formally charged with ''accepting money from a foreign intelligence agency'' on April 4, 2001;

Whereas Dr. Gao Zhan has been deprived of her basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention, has not been allowed to contact her husband and child (both United States citizens) or Department of State consular personnel in China, and was prevented from seeing her lawyer for an unacceptably long period of time;

Whereas Wu Jianmin is a United States citizen and author who has been detained by the Government of the People's Republic of China, has been deprived of his basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention, has been denied access to lawyers and family members, and has yet to be formally charged with any crimes;

Whereas Qin Guangguang is a permanent resident of the United States and researcher who has been detained by the Government of the People's Republic of China on suspicions of ''leaking state secrets'', has been deprived of his basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention, has been denied access to lawyers and family members, and has yet to be formally charged with any crimes;

Whereas Teng Chunyan is a permanent resident of the United States, Falun Gong practitioner, and researcher who has been sentenced to three years in prison for spying by the Government of the People's Republic of China, apparently for conducting research which documented violations of the human rights of Falun Gong adherents in China, has been deprived of her basic human rights by being placed on trial in secret, and her appeal to the Beijing Higher People's Court was denied on May 11, 2001;

Whereas Liu Yaping is a permanent resident of the United States and a businessman who was arrested and detained in Inner Mongolia in March 2001 by the Government of the People's Republic of China, has been deprived of his basic human rights by being denied any access to family members and by being denied regular access to lawyers, is reported to be suffering from severe health problems, was accused of tax evasion and other economic crimes, and has been denied his request for medical parole; and

Whereas the arbitrary imprisonment of United States citizens and residents by the Government of the People's Republic of China, and the continuing violations of their fundamental human rights, demands an immediate and forceful response by Congress and the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That

(1) the Senate—

(A) condemns and deplores the continued detention of Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, Teng Chunyan, and other scholars detained by the Government of the People's Republic of China, and calls for their immediate and unconditional release;

(B) condemns and deplores the lack of due process afforded to these detainees, and the probable coercion of confessions from some of them;

(C) condemns and deplores the ongoing and systematic pattern of human rights violations by the Government of the People's Republic of China, of which the unjust detentions of Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, and Teng Chunyan, are only important examples;

(D) strongly urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to consider carefully the implications to the broader United States-Chinese relationship of detaining and coercing confessions from United States citizens and permanent residents on unsubstantiated spying charges or suspicions;

(E) urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to consider releasing Liu Yaping on medical parole, as provided for under Chinese law; and

(F) believes that human rights violations inflicted on United States citizens and residents by the Government of the People's Republic of China will reduce opportunities for United States-Chinese cooperation on a wide range of issues; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that the President—

(A) should make the immediate release of Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, and Teng Chunyan a top priority of United States foreign policy with the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(B) should continue to make every effort to assist Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, and Teng Chunyan, and their families, while discussions of their release are ongoing;

(C) should make it clear to the Government of the People's Republic of China that the detention of United States citizens and residents, and the infliction of human rights violations upon United States citizens and residents, is not in the interests of the Government of the People's Republic of China because it will reduce opportunities for United States-Chinese cooperation on other matters; and

(D) should immediately send a special, high ranking representative to the Government of the People's Republic of China to reiterate the deep concern of the United States regarding the continued imprisonment of Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, Teng Chunyan, and Liu Yaping, and to discuss their legal status and immediate humanitarian needs.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate committees may file committee-reported Legislative and Executive Calendar matters on Tuesday, August 28, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., notwithstanding a recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 31, 2001

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 31. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday immediately following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of the Agriculture supplemental authorization bill; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party conferences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Senate is going to convene in the morning at 9:30 and resume consideration of the Agriculture supplemental authorization bill. Senator LUGAR is to be recognized to file the first amendment. He and Senator HARKIN have been asked to work out with the two leaders a time to vote on that.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:31 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 31, 2001, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO MR. ROBERT L. WILSON

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Mr. Robert L. Wilson, founder of Every Person Influences Children (EPIC).

Mr. Wilson founded EPIC in 1980, following the tragic death of his wife, Linda in 1977. Mrs. Wilson was murdered by a troubled 15-year-old boy that the Wilson family had befriended. EPIC was founded to work with youth to help ensure that this type of tragedy would not be repeated.

Despite its modest beginnings, the EPIC organization has emerged as one of our Nation's most successful parent/children's programs. The organization is devoted to helping children grow up to become responsible adults, and helps parents and teachers work more effectively with children, influence them in positive ways and guide them toward responsible, safe decision-making. In recognition of its worthy goals and many successes, our federal government has committed millions in grants to EPIC.

The overwhelming success of EPIC, its tremendous growth, and the strong impact it has had in our Western New York community is testimony to Mr. Wilson's leadership, commitment and integrity. I am truly thankful for his strong example of service.

As a community, our chief concern must always be our children. Mr. Wilson's focus on helping children become responsible adults must continue to be one of our highest priorities. I will continue to fight for this excellent program, and would encourage my colleagues to join with me in this effort.

EPIC is an outstanding program that helps kids everyday. Now, it is also a lasting legacy to a man whose vision and work inspires us all.

Mr. Speaker, today I join with the Western New York community, and communities all across America to honor Mr. Robert L. Wilson for his dedicated service and leadership. Mr. Wilson is survived by his wife, Sarah; four daughters, Linda Stephenson, Terry Vaughan, Margaret Kerr and Hope Hawkins; a sister, Margaret Dodd; fifteen grandchildren; and five great-grandchildren. I would like to convey to his family my deepest sympathies, and ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me in a moment of silence.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE TOBASH

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Steve Tobash, a fellow Pennsylvanian and good friend, who recently retired after forty years of faithful service as head golf professional at Army Navy Country Club in Arlington, Virginia.

Steve is the sixth of nine children born to Peter and Anna Tobash. He was raised in Schuykill Haven, Pennsylvania, where he attended and graduated from the public school system.

Steve developed a love for the game of golf early in life, first as a caddy and later working at a driving range. After apprenticeships in Florida and Baltimore, Maryland, he enlisted in the Army and was assigned to Ft. Meade. The Army quickly recognized his golf talent and placed him in charge of golf operations. After his discharge he remained at Ft. Meade as the golf professional and later became the head professional at Chartwell Country Club. In 1961, he was selected as Golf Professional at Army Navy Country Club.

At Army Navy, Steve developed and maintained a people-oriented operation that served more than two thousand members. He has also been an excellent mentor for young aspiring golf professionals. The measure of his success is that many who got their start with Steve have risen to the top echelon at their respective clubs.

Steve loves the games and all those who play it, from the youngest toddler with a cut down seven iron to the super senior with his custom made golf clubs. All were guaranteed to be greeted by Steve with a big smile and ''Welcome to Army Navy.''

He is the Dean of Golf Professionals in the Mid-Atlantic and Washington Metropolitan Areas. We are truly going to miss his presence in the pro shop, on the golf course, and around the club. The membership can consider itself fortunate to have had Steve Tobash as their golf professional.

To Steve and Alma, his wife of forty-six years, I wish you God Speed.

JOSEPH RUDAWSKI HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the long history of service to the community by Joseph G. Rudawski, President of MMI Preparatory School, Freeland, Pennsylvania, who will be honored August 4 on the occasion of his retirement after more than 36 years of service to the school.

I have known Joe Rudawski for many years and can attest to his dedication to improving the lives of his students. He has been an extraordinary educator, and the entire MMI Prep community will miss his optimism, tenacity and leadership.

Born in Nanticoke, he is a 1959 graduate of Marymount High School in Wilkes-Barre and a 1963 graduate of King's College with a Bachelor of Arts degree in mathematics, minors in education and English. He earned a Master of Science degree in Counseling Psychology from the University of Scranton in 1967.

Mr. Rudawski began his service at MMI in September 1964 as a mathematics and psychology instructor and progressed to the positions of guidance director and dean of faculty before becoming president in 1973. During his time as president, he continued to directly serve the students as guidance director and later as college counselor.

During his tenure, thousands of students have passed through the white doors on Centre Street in Freeland and have gone on to achieve tremendous success. The school has undergone a remarkable transformation under his leadership. The small preparatory school expanded greatly, with a $1 million addition built in 1979, and a $1.1 million capital campaign in 1990–91. He also oversaw The Campaign for MMI, which raised more than $9 million for the school's endowment fund and the construction of a new science and technology wing and an athletics and drama complex.

Over the years, he has served the community in many capacities, including director of the Freeland YMCA, former division chairman of the United Way, director and member of the Freeland Rotary Club, a board member of Lutheran Welfare Services, a member of the PCTN-TV Community Advisory Board, director of the Eckley Miner's Village Association, and chairman and member of several committees at St. Casimir's Church and the Roman Catholic Community of Freeland. He is also a past president of the Luzerne County Counselor's Association.

He has received numerous awards for his academic and community achievements, including the Paul Harris Fellow Award from Rotary International, the Citizen of the Year award from the Freeland Sons of Erin, a Declaration of Achievement from the Pennsylvania Senate, the Community Award sponsored by the Freeland Veterans of Foreign Wars, and an Appreciation Award from the Eastern Pennsylvania Chapter of the Arthritis Foundation.

In May 2001, he announced his intentions to retire from the school so he could spend more time with his wife of 34 years, Jean, his four children—Joe Jr., Tamra Ann, Valerie, and Jeanne, all MMI graduates—and his grandchildren. He expects to continue volunteering in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the long and distinguished service of Joseph Rudawski to MMI Preparatory School and the community, and I wish him all the best.

TRIBUTE TO MIMI FARINA

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Ms. WOOLSEY Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mimi Farina of Mill Valley, California, an

accomplished folk singer, actor and social activist, whose work lives on today. Mimi Farina died July 18 of cancer at the age of 56, leaving a legacy of compassion and a commitment to healing through music.

Born Margarita Mimi Baez, she and her sister, Joan Baez, were part of the burgeoning folk revival in Cambridge, Massachusetts. When she married writer Richard Farina at age 18, she, her husband, Joan Baez and Bob Dylan led the Greenwich Village folk renaissance, creating music that inspired the peace and civil rights movements of the 60's. After her husband's tragic death when she was only 21, Farina joined the San Francisco satiric group The Committee.

Raised a Quaker and always a woman of conscience, she was arrested at a peace march in 1967 and held briefly in prison, giving her a first-hand view of life behind bars. In 1973 she observed the moving response of prisoners in Sing Sing to a performance by Joan Baez and blues immortal B.B. King. After singing in a halfway house shortly afterwards, she developed the idea for Bread and Roses, an organization whose goal is to bring music to people isolated in institutions. Founded in 1974, Bread and Roses sponsors live musical performance by well-known artists for people in prisons, hospitals, senior centers, juvenile facilities and other institutions. Last year, Bread and Roses provided more than 500 concerts in 82 facilities—concerts that provide music's healing power to listeners as well as powerful emotional experiences for performers. Inspired by Bread and Roses success, several similar organizations have sprung up around the country.

Back when Mimi and Richard Farina were a folk duo they sang:

If somehow you could pack up your sorrows
And send them all to me
You would lose them
I'd know how to use them
Send them all to me

Mimi Farina took the sorrows of forgotten people and turned them into life-affirming song. She was appreciated for her spirit, her talent, and her beauty . . . and she is already missed.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY L. ''HANK'' LACAYO

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend, Henry L. ''Hank'' Lacayo, an outstanding individual who has dedicated his life to public service and social activism. On august 5, 2001, the Destino 2000 Vision Committee and the Ventura County Community Foundation will celebrate Hank's 70th birthday and will honor him for his many years of service on behalf of the people of Ventura county, the State of California, and the Nation.

For more than 45 years, Hank has distinguished himself as a union representative for the United Auto Workers and as a recognized national labor leader throughout the United States. After serving in the Air force, he went to work at North American Aviation's Los Angeles Division.

I had the privilege of meeting Hank during the early 1960s when he was elected President of UAW Local 887 which represented more than 30,000 workers at North American Aviation. Although at that time we were on opposite sides of two political factions, in retrospect the differences that loomed large then now seem pointless. Throughout the years that followed, we worked well together on many important labor issues.

Hank was one of the early supporters of Cesar Chavez and helped convince the UAW to give the farm workers much needed financial assistance. In 1974, the UAW recognized Hank's excellent work and named him Administrative Assistant to then-UAW President Leonard Woodcock. He was later appointed National Director of the UAW's political and legislative department. Hank would later go on to serve within numerous presidential administrations, beginning with President Kennedy, as a labor relations advisor.

In addition to his work with labor unions, Hank has been active in the Latino community. He is a founder and National President Emeritus of the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement. Furthermore, Hank helped found the Mid-West-North-East Voter Education Project (today the US Hispanic Leadership Institute) and served as its first President and Chairman of the Board. He was also the first Latino to serve on the prestigious US Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Hank has been recognized on numerous occasions and has been the recipient of a number of prestigious awards. These include the Walter P. Reuther UAW Distinguished Award, the National Hero Award (US Hispanic Leadership Institute) and the Patriotic Service Award (US Department of Commerce). These accolades and the tribute from the Destino 2000 Vision Committee and Ventura County Community Foundation all recognize Hank's devotion and commitment to the plight of workers.

In addition to his many professional accomplishments, Hank and his wife Leah have raised four wonderful children. It is my distinct pleasure to ask my colleagues to join with me in wishing Henry L. ''Hank'' Lacayo a happy 70th birthday and in saluting him for his years of public service.

TRIBUTE TO MARY JO MALUSO AND RICK BLACKSON

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to congratulate Mary Jo Maluso and Rick Blackson on their marriage yesterday in Youngstown, Ohio. I have had the pleasure of knowing Mary Jo for many years and I consider her a good friend. I have also had the fortunate opportunity to get to know Rick a little better through Mary Jo, and I know that these two will have a happy and healthy union together.

This was one of the most beautiful and unusual weddings I have ever attended. Mary Jo and Rick are both excellent musical and theatrical talents, and they decided to use those talents to celebrate their wedding day. Their musical marriage celebration was titled ''It's All About Love'', costarring Mary Jo Maluso and Rick Blackson. Rick played piano, Mary Jo sang, and although these two have wowed audiences with their performances in the past, what I watched on this particular ''stage'' was very real and very well done. I congratulate Rick and Mary Jo for doing what they love to do while at the same time expressing their love for one another.

I want to wish them all the best as they embark on their new life together. In conclusion, I want to congratulate Rick on writing all of the music, including the lyrics. This original score may be used someday for other weddings because after all, ''it's all about love.''

HONORING RUTH QUACKENBUSH DODGE

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the passing of an Ohioan and American of note. Ruth Quackenbush Dodge died of heart failure earlier this year at her Maumee River Estate in Wood County's Middleton Township. Mrs. Dodge was 90 years old.

Ruth Quackenbush Dodge was born into one of New York State's founding Dutch dynasties, and spent her childhood in New York City, Vermont and Connecticut, where she was graduated from Miss Porter's school in Farmington. After then attending classes at the New York School of Social Work, Ruth joined the Junior League of New York City at age 18, thus beginning her long history of volunteerism.

A few years later, Miss Quackenbush met Henry Martin Dodge of Toledo. They were married shortly thereafter, and made their home at Elmbrook Farm in Perrysburg, making the new Mrs. Dodge, at age 22, the first member of her family to reside west of the Hudson River. In her new home, Mrs. Dodge continued her volunteer work, transferring to the Junior League of Toledo—for which she served as president from 1936 to 1938— and organizing, in 1948, the Volunteer Bureau of the Toledo Council of Social Agencies. This organization was the forerunner of today's Volunteer Action Center of the United Way of Greater Toledo, which dedicated the Ruth Q. Dodge Volunteer Garden on the grounds of One Stranahan Square in 1994. It was my honor at that time as well to praise Mrs. Dodge's accomplishments before this body.

Mrs. Dodge also pursued her passion for the environment, raising milk cows and soybeans in an environmentally responsible manner before the issue became mainstream, and helped further the exploration of Maumee River Valley history by opening her property for several archeological digs undertaken by the University of Toledo. A strong supporter of both the education and the arts, especially the Toledo Opera Association and the Toledo Museum of Art, Mrs. Dodge sat on the board of trustees of Miss Porter's school and served as president of the Country Garden Club from 1945 to 1946.

These few words cannot truly do justice to the outstanding life of this woman who was so dedicated to the ideals of civic service and

volunteerism. Remembered by her friend Mr. Lewis Heldt for ''all of her accomplishments over her long, active lifetime,'' as well as for her efforts in her role as Honorary Chairperson for the last Fallen Timbers Battlefield fund drive, Ruth Quackenbush Dodge and her good works will truly be missed. We extend to her son David, her five grandchildren, and her six great-grandchildren our deepest condolences. At the same time, we celebrate her remarkable accomplishments and honor her memory by trying to live by her exemplary pioneering and socially responsible spirit.

SUPPORTING RAILROAD FAMILIES

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of the Railroad Retirement and Survivors Improvement Act of 2001, I urge the House of Representatives to pass this legislation—it marks a vital opportunity to strengthen the retirement benefits for thousands of railroad families.

This legislation modernizes and strengthens the retirement system which has covered railroad workers for 65 years. It provides more secure benefits at lower costs to employers and employees, has the support of both rail management and labor, and provides the kind of solid retirement support we need for the 673,000 retirees and beneficiaries.

Among the key elements of this legislation we debate today are:

—provides for increased responsibility by the railroad industry for the financial health of the Railroad Retirement system

—the legislation improves the benefits for retirees and their families; in particular it makes major improvements in benefits for widows and widowers—a key in meeting today's high costs in areas like energy and health

—reduces the current early retirement age of 62 with 30 years of service to age 60 with 30 years of service

—tax rates are substantially reduced for employees

—and currently it takes 10 years to vest for retirement benefits, but this reduces it to 5–7 years, much more similar to other industries.

This reform legislation is the result of 2½ years of negotiations and it will build on the stability of the railroad retirement system, the fairness of retirement benefits, and the need to make adjustments to help retirees meet their needs.

This bi-partisan legislation is fair, is needed, and is long overdue. I urge the House of Representatives to overwhelmingly pass this legislation and the Senate to do likewise.

SHARK PROTECTION ACT OF 2001

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Shark Protection Act of 2001.

Last year Congress passed and President Clinton signed Public Law 106–557, the Shark Finning Prohibition Act. The goal of that law is to prohibit the activity known as shark finning—the catching of live sharks, removing their fins, and throwing the carcasses back into the water, retaining only the fins.

The practice of shark finning had been prohibited in all U.S. waters except in the Pacific Ocean. Last year's bill prohibited in the U.S. Pacific removal of shark fins and discarding of the carcasses, having custody of shark fins without the corresponding carcasses on board a fishing vessel, and the landing of shark fins without the corresponding carcasses by any vessel.

I had hoped to also prohibit vessels from being in U.S. waters with shark fins on board and the selling of shark fins without the corresponding carcasses in last year's bill, but that was not practical for two reasons. Article 17 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea grants all vessels a right of innocent passage through the territorial seas of other member states. A prohibition of the loading and unloading of shark fins without the corresponding carcasses is permissible under subsection (g) of Article 19 of the Convention, but it appears that any attempt to restrict passage of vessels solely transiting our waters would be in conflict with this international treaty to which the United States is a party.

I believe Congress can, however, prohibit the offering for sale, selling, and purchasing in interstate or foreign commerce of shark fins without the corresponding carcasses anywhere within our national jurisdiction, and that is what this bill does. This might arguably be included as a prohibited act under Section 301(1)(G) [16 U.S.C. 1857(1)(G)] of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which makes it unlawful for any person to ''ship, transport, offer for sale, sell, purchase, import, export, or have custody, control, or possession of, any fish taken or retained . . .''. I am concerned that the definition of ''fish'' found at Section 3(12) of Magnuson-Stevens [16 U.S.C. 1802(12)] includes only whole fish (including sharks), but not parts of fish. The bill I am introducing today would clarify this point by prohibiting the selling of shark fins without carcasses.

Mr. Speaker, the practice of shark finning is continuing to this day in the Pacific. Earlier this year, after passage of the Shark Finning Prohibition Act, a non-fishing vessel entered the port of American Samoa with shark fins on board. This ''cargo'' was not seized based on the ''innocent passage doctrine'' noted above. As long as shark fin soup is so popular in many parts of Asia that people are willing to pay $100 for a bowl of the soup, the problem will continue. We need an international ban on shark finning. Public Law 106–557 initiated a process to accomplish this, and I look forward to receiving from the Administration a report later this year on this important area, as required under that law.

I want to do all I can to stop the wasteful practice of shark finning, and I urge my colleagues to join me by supporting this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 286, 287, 288, and 289 I was unavoidably detained in the district while at Georgetown University on family educational business.

A TRIBUTE TO WALTER BURKS

HON. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I will be unable to attend the homegoing services for your husband, father, brother, and my friend, Walter Burks. Please accept this letter in my absence.

I observed Walter Burks from a far as a teen, working in the campaigns of the late Ambassador Carl Stokes, and the Honorable Congressman Louis Stokes. I came to admire this man some called the ''Silver Fox'' (silver for the hair color and fox for his leadership skills), as he lead the Department of Personnel of the City of Cleveland, in the cabinet of then Mayor Carl B. Stokes. My summer internship in the Department of Public Utilities gave me more opportunities to see him in action. He seldom raised his voice and understood the important roll he played in assuring that everyone had access to employment opportunities with the City of Cleveland.

As I matured and decided to run for public office, Walter was always there to support and encourage me. After public office, Walter, even in his private business continued to work to improve the lives of the people of his community. His housing developments are testament to that work.

My only regret is that I didn't have a chance to say goodbye. So Walter, since I know you are looking down upon us, Thank You, I Love You, and God Bless You. Rest well and if we do as you have done, we will meet again.

I join with the residents of the 11th Congressional District, who mourn the lost of a great civic leader, political activist, family man, and friend.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer]

WALTER BURKS, 77, WAS BUILDER, CIVIC LEADER, POLITICAL ACTIVIST

(By Richard M. Peery)

Plain Dealer Reporter

SHAKER HEIGHTS.—Walter Burks, 77, a developer and political activist who built more than 200 homes in Cleveland, died Thursday at University Hospitals.

Burks was a former trustee of Cleveland State University. He served on the Cuyahoga County Board of Elections and the State Board of Education. Mayor Carl B. Stokes appointed him personnel director and chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

In 1974, he formed Burks Electric Co. and participated in commercial and public building projects, including the rebuilding of the Regional Transit Authority's Shaker rapid line.

Burks was born in Cleveland. He attended East Technical High School and studied engineering at Fenn College.

Drafted into the Marine Corps during World War II, he was a sergeant in an engineers unit on Eniwetok and the Marshall Islands in the Pacific. After the war, he and his first wife, Cynthia, built a home on E. 147th St. in Mount Pleasant. Although banks refused to lend to nonwhites in that area, he obtained financing from a black insurance company. He later helped friends build homes nearby.

Burks worked as a mail clerk for Cleveland Municipal Court and was promoted to supervisor of the trustee division, but he spent evenings and weekends on construction projects. After he joined Stokes' staff in the 1960s, he put special effort into hiring and promoting minorities.

As a builder, Burks concentrated in the 1980s on converting former schools into apartments for the elderly. When he was accused of failing to follow complicated HUD regulations, he said the fault lay with the government. A jury cleared him.

In 1989, Burks undertook what was considered a high-risk project when he constructed Glenville Commons, the first new homes to be built in the area in more than 50 years. Its success was followed by a surge of home building in the city.

At the behest of Mayor Michael R. White, a former business partner, a park on Parkview Dr. in Glenville was named for him.

Burks and his wife, the former Charmaine Colwell, lived in Shaker Heights.

He also is survived by a son, Dr. David of Ann Arbor, Mich.; a daughter, Karen Bailey of Richmond Heights; three grandchildren; two sisters; and five brothers.

Services will be 10:30 a.m. at Antioch Baptist Church, 8869 Cedar Ave., Cleveland.

Arrangements are by E.F. Boyd & Son Funeral Home of Cleveland.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE STATE OF COLORADO ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. One hundred years after the United States became a Nation, Colorado became the 38th state in the Union. In recognition of this historic moment, I stand here to pay tribute to the great State of Colorado. I would like to share a little historical background, and some lesser known facts about the state in honor of this anniversary.

According to the state archives, when the Colorado Territory was populated by only approximately 100,000 people, thirty-nine members of the constitutional convention gathered for the purpose of preparing Colorado's constitution. President Grant declared Colorado a state on August 1, 1876, one week after the Governor's secretary, John Reigart, set off toward Washington, D.C. with a copy of the constitution and other necessary documents.

Since then, Colorado has continued to make history. The stunning view from Pikes Peak inspired Katherine Lee Bates to write one of our country's most popular patriotic songs, ''America the Beautiful.'' On a less serious note, Denver ''lays claim to the invention of the cheeseburger,'' according to 50states.com. Colorado is also home to some of America's greatest heroes. Pueblo, for instance, has held the honor of being the only city in the Nation with four living recipients of the Medal of Honor. In addition, Colorado Springs is home to the distinguished United States Air Force Academy.

Among its natural wonders, Colorado is home to the world's largest outdoor natural hot springs pool, which spans over two city blocks. The pool was visited by former president Teddy Roosevelt, and by ''Doc'' Holliday, who hoped the natural springs would cure his tuberculosis. Other geological marvels include Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument and the Great Sand Dunes, plus fifty-two mountain peaks over 14,000 feet high, and the headwaters of over 20 rivers. The Nation's highest city, Leadville, which boasts an elevation of 10,430 feet, also rests in Colorado. In addition, Colorado holds three quarters of the Nation's land area with an altitude over 10,000 feet, along with 222 state wildlife areas. With such a variety of natural beauty and resources, it is no wonder that Colorado provides agriculture, summer and winter recreation, and a pioneering spirit to millions of residents and visitors each year.

Mr. Speaker, there is no end to the wonder and greatness of this state. It is with great pride that I stand here today in honor of the 125th anniversary of the State of Colorado.

HONORING THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF CASEY AND JEAN BROWN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the 50th wedding anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. Casey and Jean Brown from Ignacio, Colorado. As family and friends will gather to celebrate this joyous occasion, I too would like to recognize them at this special time. Following their hearts throughout this 50-year journey has led to happiness and a loving life together.

Casey and Jean were married on August 5, 1951 in Hatch, New Mexico after meeting each other at New Mexico State University. Following a honeymoon in Mexico, the couple relocated to Laramie, Wyoming, where Casey received a Master's Degree in Sheep and Wool Production. After his schooling and a brief stint as a college professor, the couple joined Casey's father in his sheep business located in Aztec, California.

Casey and Jean decided to move one more time in 1958 to a small farm in La Plata, New Mexico. It is here that they raised their five children. Following suit with past experience, the family moved one more time to Ignacio in 1978. Jean had always dreamed of becoming a nurse, and this served as the catalyst to pursue her dreams. She was employed by Mercy Hospital in Durango until she retired. While Jean was a nurse, Casey once again started his own sheep business on their ranch. Even amidst all of their responsibilities, they found time to offer services to their community where they were involved in the Woolgrowers Auxiliary, the American Sheep Industry Commission and other organizations.

Love has flourished between these two hearts, but not without dedication and hard work. For this momentous occasion, Casey is treating his devoted wife to a trip to Scotland—her ancestral land. This celebration of 50 years is a remarkable accomplishment and is to be commended. Mr. Speaker, it is with excitement and admiration that I extend my congratulations to Casey and Jean and offer them my best wishes for many more years to come.

HONORING THE GRAND JUNCTION VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I would like to pay tribute to the Grand Junction Veterans Affairs Medical Center for receiving the 2001 President's Quality Award that highlights continued improvement and management of high caliber care to veterans who so diligently served our Nation.

This facility serves all veterans in an area of 50,000 square miles and 17 counties in Western Colorado and Eastern Utah. With the overarching goal of being ''the preferred health care system for all veterans,'' the Medical Center constantly strives to improve itself and help those in need of their services. The President's Quality Award highlights the Center's integration of their innovative management techniques, outstanding dedication to customer service and dynamic performance that will enhance the Center's capabilities in the new century. The Grand Junction Veterans Affairs Medical Center has implemented a ''virtual circle of care'' policy that involves every patient, and this program has inspired similar programs around the country. Not satisfied with just internal improvements, the Center has added new community outreach efforts that seek to build upon their primary, specialty and extended care. All of these continued efforts have resulted in consistently higher scores in patient care and satisfaction from the Department of Veterans Affairs and from external agencies and hospitals.

The Grand Junction Veterans Affairs Medical Center truly is an exemplary model of the care that our distinguished veterans deserve. While providing the highest care and improving their overall performance with an emphasis on customer satisfaction, the Center has worked very hard to become one of the finest facilities in the Nation. The invaluable services that Grand Junction Veterans Affairs Medical Center provides truly deserve the recognition of this body.

HONORING OTIS CHARTIER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I would like to recognize Mr. Otis Meril Chartier, who received the Bronze Star for his service during WWII. He served our country 56 years ago and just recently received this distinguished honor.

At a family picnic not too far from Parker, Colorado, Otis was awarded the Bronze Star in recognition of his courage in February of 1945. During WWII, he and another soldier took on a German machine gun haven where they disrupted its activity and eliminated two enemy soldiers. A howitzer shell then bombarded the nest and the area was neutralized. For this valorous effort, Otis was granted the Bronze Star. His courageous act was executed only 4 months before the end of the war.

After joining the Army in 1940, Otis was put in charge of the Victory Garden due to his background in farming, and was eventually sent to infantry school. This was followed by his deployment to France in December of 1944. In his first battlefield experience, his 12-member squad was sent ahead of the group to scout. This scouting effort lead to the group being ambushed, leaving only Otis alive as the other soldiers were killed in the line of duty. One other notable battlefield experience that caused his life to flash before his eyes happened as he and two other soldiers were rushing into town when a mortar shell hit immediately in front of them, causing permanent damage in his right ear.

On December 20, 1945, Otis returned home to find employment as a carpenter. Although this paid the bills, his true passion was music. He joined a band in 1946 called the Trailblazers and ventured to Montana to play for audiences for about three years, until his hearing would not permit him to continue anymore. Otis then returned to Colorado and was employed by Gates Rubber Company for 31 years. Today, he enjoys spending time with his family.

While much time has passed since the war, the importance and acknowledgement of the heroism that Otis Chartier exhibited shall not vanish with time. He was a part of the victorious effort to ensure peace across the globe. It is my pleasure to offer my congratulations and sincerest thanks to Otis for his dedicated service and patriotism.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. IRA JEFFREY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, in his forty years of working with cancer research and treatment, Dr. Ira Jaffrey has contributed to a movement that has saved many lives and has enhanced the quality and duration of many others and I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him. While his technical expertise has proven essential for providing professional and quality health care, his emotional understanding and support have made him a hero.

After working at Mount Sinai Hospital and School of Medicine in New York, Ira and his wife, Sandy, headed to the western slope of Colorado where they started Western Slope Oncology in Glenwood Springs, Colorado. Currently, Ira works with Valley View, Aspen Valley, Clagett Memorial and University hospitals, and the Vail Valley Medical Center. In addition, he is an assistant clinical professor at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center and a treasurer and state delegate for the Mount Sopris Medical Society. Sandy is a registered Physician's Assistant with extensive training and experience in oncology nursing. Between the two of them, they care for between 350 and 500 patients.

Ira and Sandy have personally experienced the challenges and destruction that cancer brings; Sandy is a breast cancer survivor, and Ira lost his sister to cancer in 1970. Perhaps because they grasp the understanding that can only come with experience, they give their patients the most dedicated care, such as encouraging their patients to call them at home. Ira explained to Heather McGregor of The Glenwood Post-Independent that he deals largely with people for whom cancer will ultimately prove fatal. ''My job is to eliminate pain and suffering, to improve their quality of life, and to increase their survival time,'' he told her. ''There are lots of ups and downs, and we have to be there for them.''

Mr. Speaker, for forty years, Dr. Ira Jaffrey has not only worked as a skilled and talented oncologist, but he has acted with compassion and sensitivity toward one of the most destructive diseases of our time. I would like to take this time to thank him for helping improve the quality of life for the many people today who suffer from cancer.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE U.S. MILITARY'S HUMANITARIAN WORK IN EAST TIMOR

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege to be in East Timor on July 2–5, 2001 to assess the current humanitarian situation and see first hand how American tax dollars are being spent. I was quite impressed with the work of the United States military and its ongoing humanitarian assistance in East Timor. This is a story which is not getting told to the American people. The U.S. military is doing incredible work at improving peoples' lives and generating good will towards the United States.

The U.S. military presence is coordinated through the United States Support Group in East Timor (USGET). Colonel Charles E. Cooke, U.S. Marine Corps, is Commander of USGET and is doing a superb job. Commanders for USGET have a three month rotation. USGET's purpose is to be a visible U.S. presence in East Timor and to plan/execute rotational humanitarian assistance missions. Since its inception in September 1999, USGET has conducted community relations and engineering projects, provided free medical and dental care, coordinated U.S. military ship visits, and repaired schools and medical clinics. For example, in April 2001, the USS *Boxer* visited East Timor. It was the largest effort in USGET history. The ship personnel provided medical assistance to 2,028 patients, completed five community relations projects, delivered 165 tons of humanitarian assistance by air and 86 tons of humanitarian assistance by sea. The ship crew also delivered $53,000 in direct donations from the United States.

My trip to East Timor coincided with the visit of USNS *Niagara Falls.* Thirty personnel from the ship were detailed to repair a school in Dili which was burned down by the militias in 1999. They rebuilt and painted the school, and installed a new electrical system while East Timorese children looked on, excited to get their school back, and thankful to the U.S. military. It was quite an impressive thing to see.

On the morning of July 4th, I traveled on a helicopter from the USNS *Niagara Falls* to observe food delivery to the city of Lospaios in the Lautem district. In June, flooding destroyed many homes in this district and washed out the main bridge which connected the area with East Timor's capitol city of Dili. The U.S. military, working with the World Food Programme, was ensuring that food and supplies were getting into the region.

I am extremely proud of these men and women in the U.S. military for their humanitarian work in East Timor. They represent the best which our great nation has to offer. I salute them for their work and hope it will continue into next year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I was not here to cast my vote on Roll Call Vote No. 289, Representative Menendez's amendment to H.R. 2620, last Friday. If I had been here, I would have voted ''yea'' on this amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that due to an airline delay, I was unavoidably detained arriving from my district in California, and missed three votes this evening (July 30, 2001).

Had I been present, I would have voted AYE on the following rolls:

Roll 290, H. Res. 212, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance presents a unique opportunity to address global discrimination.

Roll 291, H. Res. 191, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately transfer to the Israeli Government an unedited and uncensored videotape that contains images which could provide material evidence for the investigation into the incident on October 7, 2000, when Hezbollah forces abducted 3 Israeli Force soldiers, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad.

Roll 292, H. Con. Res. 190, supporting the goals and ideals of National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NURSING HOME QUALITY PROTECTION ACT

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Nursing Home Quality Protection Act. It is imperative that we do everything in our power to protect our most vulnerable citizens—the elderly and disabled who live in nursing homes. That is why I and my colleagues are introducing this legislation today—

to take a crucial first step towards ensuring that seniors in nursing homes are provided the care they deserve.

This legislation is a product of a series of investigations reports conducted by my staff into nursing home conditions. These reports have consistently found numerous violations of federal health and safety standards in nursing homes throughout the country. Many of the violations harmed residents. Common problems included untreated bedsores; inadequate medical care; malnutrition; dehydration; preventable accidents; and inadequate sanitation and hygiene.

Moreover, during the course of these investigations, we began to notice an unexpected and extremely disturbing trend. Many of the nursing homes we examined were being cited for physical, sexual, or verbal abuse of residents. I asked my staff to investigate whether these abuse cases were isolated occurrences—or whether they signaled a broader, nationwide problem. The report I released today presented the results of this investigation.

What we found was shocking. Within the last two years, nearly one-third of the nursing homes in the United States have been cited by state inspectors for an abuse violation. In over 1,600 nursing homes—approximately one out of every ten—these abuse violations were serious enough to cause actual harm to residents or to place them in immediate jeopardy of death or serious injury.

As documented in the report, we found examples of residents being punched, choked, or kicked by staff members or other residents. These attacks frequently caused serious injuries such as fractured bones and lacerations. And we found other examples of residents being groped or sexually molested.

We also found that the percentage of nursing homes cited for abuse violations has doubled since 1996. I hope that this is the result of better detection and enforcement. To its credit, the Clinton Administration launched an initiative in 1998 to reduce abuse in nursing homes, and this initiative may be responsible for some of the increase in reported cases of abuse.

But I am concerned that some of the increase in abuse cases may reflect an actual increase in abuse of residents. In 1997, Congress unwisely decided to repeal the Boren Amendment, which guaranteed that nursing homes receive adequate funding. Since then, federal funding has not kept pace with the costs of providing nursing care. As a result, it is harder and harder for nursing home operators to provide seniors the kind of care they need and deserve.

I know many operators of nursing homes who are dedicated to providing the best care possible. They would never knowingly tolerate abuse or other dangerous practices in their facilities. But unless we are willing to pay nursing homes enough to do their job, intolerable incidents of abuse and other types of mistreatment will continue to persist in too many nursing homes.

I do not want to suggest that most residents of nursing homes are being abused. The vast majority of nursing staff are dedicated and professional people who provide good care. In many instances, the only reason that abuse is even reported is because of the actions of conscientious staff members.

On a personal note, my mother-in-law is in a nursing home in Maryland. I've met with many of the people that care for her. They are good people, but they have difficult jobs. They work long hours in understaffed conditions, and they don't make a lot of money. Under such trying circumstances, it's not surprising that staff turnover is high and that facilities are forced to hire people who shouldn't be working in nursing homes.

But the bottom line is clear: Something clearly needs to be done to improve nursing home conditions. The senior citizens who live in nursing homes are frail and vulnerable. Frequently, they are defenseless and cannot even report problems to others. They deserve to be treated with respect and dignity—not to live in fear of abuse and mistreatment.

It would have been intolerable if we had found a hundred cases of abuse; it is unconscionable that we have found thousands upon thousands.

That's why I and many other members are introducing the Nursing Home Quality Protection Act later today. Our bill is a comprehensive approach to improving conditions in our nation's nursing homes. The bill would:

Increase resources to nursing homes so they can hire more staff;

Institute minimum nurse staffing requirements;

Impose tougher sanctions on poorly performing nursing homes;

Require criminal background checks on employees; and

Increase Internet disclosure of nursing home conditions.

This is a good piece of legislation that has been endorsed by organizations representing nursing home residents and workers. It will do much to improve the quality of care received by the one and a half million people who live in our country's nursing homes.

I want to assure all Americans who have a family member in a nursing home that we will do all we can to protect their aging loved ones. They helped our generation when we needed their help. And now it's our turn—and our obligation—to make sure they can live safely and without fear.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF OLDER AMERICANS ACT NUTRITION PROGRAMS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H. Con. Res. 199 that celebrates the 30th anniversary of the Older Americans Act Nutrition Programs to occur in March 2002. I wish to first commend the National Association of Nutrition and Aging Services Program (NANASP) and my good friend Bob Blancato for their work on behalf of this resolution. I hope all my colleagues and the many national, state and local aging organizations will join in support.

In 1972, Congress passed legislation authored by my friend and colleague, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, to establish for the first time a federal program to provide senior citizens with daily meals served either in congregate settings or in their home. It was viewed then as an important federal initiative to address the growing number of ''at risk'' seniors who faced hospitalization or time in a nursing home due to malnutrition and poor diet.

During these past 30 years Older Americans Act nutrition programs have done a marvelous job of serving millions of senior citizens with vital nutritional meals and also providing them equally valuable socialization opportunities.

We should also acknowledge those federal programs, which achieve and exceed their mission. The Older Americans Act nutrition programs so ably administered by the Administration on Aging, state and area agencies on aging and thousands of dedicated nutrition providers and volunteers, is one such program.

I hope during the 30th anniversary celebration, we can recommit ourselves to the cause of promoting good nutrition for our older Americans through the Older Americans Act nutrition programs and the many vital private sector programs that complement the public dollars. One such excellent program is City Meals on Wheels that operates in my home New York City. Each year City Meals on Wheels raised millions of dollars to provide senior citizens with weekend, holiday, and emergency meals.

I commend the dedicated men and women who work each day in our senior centers, community centers, schools and other congregate sites serving the meals under the Older Americans Act nutrition program. I also salute the many thousands of people who deliver meals to the homebound elderly. They are a vital link to these older Americans and often their work goes unheralded.

EAST END COOPERATIVE MINISTRY

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to let my colleagues know about an important milestone in the civic life of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

On September 22, 2001, the East End Cooperative Ministry will celebrate its thirtieth anniversary with a dinner at Freehof Hall of the Rodef Shalom Congregation in Pittsburgh.

The East End Cooperative Ministry, Incorporated, consists of 50 local religious institutions. For the past thirty years, the East End Cooperative Ministry has worked to provide food, shelter, training, and other assistance to needy members of our community.

This organization has operated a soup kitchen and provided homeless men and women with shelter. The East End Cooperative Ministry has also helped needy people move from crisis shelter to independent living, and it has provided employment training and life skills to a number of individuals.

The East End Cooperative Ministry has helped hundreds of elderly people with day-to-day tasks and delivered meals to frail and elderly households.

The East End Cooperative Ministry has also been active in providing recreation and developmental guidance to children. Among other activities, the East End Cooperative Ministry has operated a summer day camp for several hundred children, and it has provided leadership and conflict resolution training to more than 500 at-risk youth.

Over the last 30 years, the East End Cooperative Ministry has worked to ensure that the needs of many of the most vulnerable members of our community have been met. On behalf of the people of Pennsylvania's 14th Congressional District, I want to commend the East End Cooperative Ministry for its efforts to alleviate suffering and provide hope to the needy. Thank you.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 31, 2001 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

AUGUST 1

9 a.m.

Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine the business of environmental technology.

SR–428A

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Production and Price Competitiveness Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the status of export market shares.

SR–328A

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider energy policy legislation and other pending calendar business.

SD–366

Armed Services

To hold hearings on the nomination of Gen. John P. Jumper, USAF, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SD–106

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the impact of air emissions from the transportation sector on public health and the environment.

SD–406

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the status of current U.S trade agreements, focusing on the proposed benefits and the practical realities.

SR–253

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine stem cell ethical issues and intellectual property rights.

SD–192

10 a.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider proposed legislation entitled The Stroke Treatment and Ongoing Prevention (STOP STROKE) Act of 2001; the proposed Community Access to Emergency Defibrillation (Community AED) Act of 2001; the proposed Health Care Safety Net Amendments of 2001; S.543, to provide for equal coverage of mental health benefits with respect to health insurance coverage unless comparable limitations are imposed on medical and surgical benefits; and S.838, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve the safety and efficacy of pharmaceuticals for children.

SD–430

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to markup S.1254, to reauthorize the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997; the nomination of Linda Mysliwy Conlin, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Trade Development; the nomination of Michael J. Garcia, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement; the nomination of Melody H. Fennel, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations; and the nomination of Michael Minoru Fawn Liu, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for Public and Indian Housing and the nomination of Henrietta Holsman Fore, of Nevada, to be Director of the Mint, Department of the Treasury.

SD–538

Finance

To hold hearings to examine a balance between cybershopping and sales tax.

SD–215

Judiciary

Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S.989, to prohibit racial profiling.

SD–226

10:30 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S.367, to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; S.Res.126, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding observance of the Olympic Truce; and S.Con.Res.58, expressing support for the tenth annual meeting of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum.

SD–419

2 p.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S.1233, to provide penalties for certain unauthorized writing with respect to consumer products.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of John Arthur Hammerschmidt, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board; the nomination of Jeffrey William Runge, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation; and the nomination of Nancy Victory, to be Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, and the nomination of Otto Wolff, to be an Assistant Secretary and Chief Financial Officer, both of Virginia, both of the Department of Commerce.

SR–253

Appropriations

Military Construction Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for the fiscal year 2002 for Navy construction and Air Force construction.

SD–138

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.

SH–219

4 p.m.

Conferees

Meeting of conferees on H.R.1, to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.

SC–5, Capitol

AUGUST 2

9 a.m.

Rules and Administration

Business meeting to markup S.J.Res.19, providing for the reappointment of Anne d'Harnoncourt as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; S.J.Res.20, providing for the appointment of Roger W. Sant as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; S.829, to establish the National Museum of African American History and Culture within the Smithsonian Institution; S.565, to establish the Commission on Voting Rights and Procedures to study and make recommendations regarding election technology, voting, and election administration, to establish a grant program under which the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall provide assistance to States and localities in improving election technology and the administration of Federal elections, to require States to meet uniform and nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements for the 2004 Federal elections; an original resolution providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; and other legislative and administrative matters.

SR–301

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To resume hearings to examine the proposed federal farm bill, focusing on rural economic issues.

SR–328A

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider energy policy legislation.

SD–366

Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–342

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings on the nomination of John Lester Henshaw, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

SD–430

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Financial Institutions Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine responses to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation recommendations for reform, focusing on the comprehensive deposit insurance reform.
SD–538

Budget
To hold hearings to examine social security, focusing on budgetary tradeoffs and transition costs.
SD–608

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

2:15 p.m.
Armed Services
Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on installation programs, military construction programs, and family housing programs.
SR–232A

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold joint hearings to examine the National Academy of Sciences report on fuel economy, focusing on the effect of energy policies on consumers.
SH–216

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on the nomination of John A. Gauss, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Information and Technology; the nomination of Claude M. Kicklighter, of Georgia, to be Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Policy and Planning; to be followed by a business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SR–418

AUGUST 3

9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to examine the employment situation for July, 2001.
1334, Longworth Building

10 a.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Andean Trade Preferences Act.
SD–215

SEPTEMBER 19

2 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on S.702, for the relief of Gao Zhan.
SD–226

CANCELLATIONS

AUGUST 2

10 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S.212, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend such Act.
SR–485

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House passed H.R. 2620, VA/HUD Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S8371–S8401

Measures Introduced: Three bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1269–1271. **Page S8397**

Emergency Agriculture Assistance Act: Senate began consideration of S. 1246, to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agricultural producers. **Pages S8378, S8379–91**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 95 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 260), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1246 (listed above). **Page S8391**

Subsequently, by unanimous-consent, the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill was agreed to. **Page S8391**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, July 31, 2001, and that Senator Lugar be recognized to offer an amendment, the text of the House passed bill; further that no cloture motion against the bill, or any amendments, be in order prior to Wednesday, August 1, 2001. **Page S8391**

Authority for Committees: All committees were authorized to file legislative and executive reports on Tuesday, August 28, 2001, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., notwithstanding a recess/adjournment of the Senate.

Executive Communications: **Pages S8395–97**

Messages From the House: **Page S8395**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S8398–S8400**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S8397–98**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S8400**

Additional Statements: **Pages S8393–95**

Authority for Committees: **Page S8400**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—260) **Page S8391**

Adjournment: Senate met at 1 p.m., and adjourned at 6:31 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, July 31, 2001. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S8401.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on national missile defense and the Administration's consultation with Russia from Condoleezza Rice, National Security Advisor.

ECSTASY DRUG USE

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine the rising use of the drug ecstacy and coordinating efforts between Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies to combat the problem, after receiving testimony from Joseph D. Keefe, Chief of Operations, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice; Alan I. Leshner, Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; John C. Varrone, Assistant Commissioner of Customs, Office of Investigations, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury; Donald R. Vereen, Jr., Deputy Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Connecticut Chief State's Attorney John M. Bailey, Rocky Hill; Roy Rutland, Miami-Dade Police Department Narcotics Bureau, Miami, Florida; and Philip McCarthy and Dayna Moore, both on behalf of the Phoenix House, Long Island, New York.

SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services: Senators Akaka (Chairman), Levin, Torricelli, Cleland, Carper, Carnahan, Dayton, Cochran (Ranking Member), Stevens, Collins, Voinovich, Domenici, and Bennett.

Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia: Senators Durbin (Chairman), Akaka, Torricelli, Carper, Carnahan, Dayton, Voinovich (Ranking Member), Stevens, Collins, Domenici, and Cochran.

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations: Senators Levin (Chairman), Akaka, Durbin, Torricelli, Cleland, Carper, Carnahan, Dayton, Collins (Ranking Member), Stevens, Voinovich, Domenici, Cochran, Bennett, and Bunning.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee began hearings on the nomination of Robert S. Mueller III, of California, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, where the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 6 public bills, H.R. 2672–2677; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 204–205 and H. Res. 215, were introduced. **Pages H4862–63**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H. Res. 213, providing for consideration of H.R. 2647, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002 (H. Rept. 107–171).

H. Res. 214, providing for consideration of H.R. 2505, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning (H. Rept. 107–172);

H.R. 2510, to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (H. Rept. 107–173);

H.R. 2441, to amend the Public Health Service Act to redesignate a facility as the National Hansen's Disease Programs Center (H. Rept. 107–174); and

H.R. 2291, to extend the authorization of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program for an additional 5 years, to authorize a National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute, amended (H. Rept. 107–175 Pt. 1). **Page H4862**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Aderholt to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4781**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:59 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H4785**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Export Administration Act Extension: H.R. 2602, to extend the Export Administration Act until November 20, 2001; **Pages H4786–87**

World Conference Against Racism: H. Res. 212, amended, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance presents a unique opportunity to address global discrimination (agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 408 yeas to 3 nays with 3 voting "present," Roll No. 290); **Pages H4787–90, H4813**

Release of U.N. Videotape to Israeli Government: H. Res. 191, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately transfer to the Israeli Government an unedited and uncensored videotape that contains images which could provide material evidence for the investigation into the incident on October 7, 2000, when Hezbollah forces abducted 3 Israeli Defense Force soldiers, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad (agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 411 yeas to 4 nays with 1 voting "present," Roll No. 291); **Pages H4790–92, H4813–14**

National Mathematics and Science Partnerships Act: H.R. 1858, amended, to make improvements in mathematics and science education; **Pages H4792–H4802**

National Science Education Act: H.R. 100, amended, to establish and expand programs relating to science, mathematics, engineering, and technology education; **Pages H4802–07**

Retention of Frequent Flyer Miles for Personal Use: H.R. 2456, to provide that Federal employees

may retain for personal use promotional items received as a result of travel taken in the course of employment; **Pages H4807–08**

National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month: H. Con. Res. 190, supporting the goals and ideals of National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month (agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 418 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 292); and **Pages H4809–11, H4814–15**

Expanded Participation in District of Columbia Tuition Assistance Grant Program: H.R. 1499, to amend the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 to permit individuals who graduated from a secondary school prior to 1998 and individuals who enroll in an institution of higher education more than 3 years after graduating from a secondary school to participate in the tuition assistance programs under such Act. **Pages H4811–13**

VA/HUD Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002: The House passed H.R. 2620, 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, 2002 by a yea-and-nay vote of 336 yeas to 89 nays, Roll No. 297. The bill was considered on July 26, and 27. **Pages H4815–61**

Rejected the Boyd motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back with an amendment which increases funding for veterans medical care programs by an amount adequate to fund the full cost of all currently authorized services including those authorized by the Veterans Millennium Health Care Act by a recorded vote of 196 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 296. **Pages H4859–60**

Agreed To:

Jackson-Lee amendment No. 30 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26 that restores Corporation for National and Community Service programs; **Pages H4825–27**

Capps amendment No. 7 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25 that increases funding for EPA Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund by $7.2 million with offsets from EPA Environmental Programs and Management Account; **Pages H4827–28**

Pallone amendment No. 19 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25 that increases funding for EPA quality testing of beach water by $3 million with offsets from EPA State and Tribal Assistance Grants; **Pages H4828–29**

Pelosi amendment No. 37 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26, as modified, that increases funding for registering and accessing pesticides by $3 million, from $17 million to $20 million; **Pages H4832–33**

Bishop amendment No. 25 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25 that sought to establish the Minority Emergency Preparedness Demonstration program at FEMA; **Pages H4840–42**

Waxman amendment No. 41 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26 that prohibits the implementation of the April 2001 report concerning the development of a 25 year general use plan for the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Healthcare Center; **Page H4844**

Rangel amendment No. 38 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26 that eliminates the requirement for community service by public housing residents; **Pages H4844–45**

Traficant amendment No. 40 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26 that prohibits any funding to persons or entities that have been convicted of violating the Buy American Act; **Pages H4945–46**

Rejected:

Barcia amendment No. 24 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26 that sought to increase funding for the sewer overflow control grants program by $140 million with offsets from the EPA hazardous substance superfund program (rejected by a recorded vote of 99 ayes to 325 noes, Roll No. 293); **Pages H4829–32, H4855–56**

Capps amendment No. 6 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25 that sought to earmark $25 million from FEMA funding for Project Impact dealing with pre-disaster hazard mitigation (rejected by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 294); **Pages H4834–37, H4856**

Roemer amendment No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of July 24 that sought to cap funding for the International Space Station at $42 billion, the limitation established by section 202 of the NASA Authorization Act of 2000, and prohibit NASA from deferring or canceling funding for Habitation Module, Crew Return Vehicle, or Propulsion Module elements of the Space Station; and **Pages H4847–51**

Frank amendment that sought to prohibit the FHA from raising the multifamily housing mortgage insurance premium to an amount greater than the cost with offsets of $5 million from the HUD Operation Safe Home program (rejected by a recorded vote of 212 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 295). **Pages H4852–55, H4856–57**

Withdrawn:

Weldon of Pennsylvania amendment No. 42 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26 was offered but subsequently withdrawn that sought to increase FEMA Fire Assistance Grant program by

$50 million with offsets from HUD salaries and expenses account; **Pages H4816–20**

Jackson-Lee of Texas en bloc amendment consisting of amendments Nos. 31, 33, 34, and 35 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26 was offered but subsequently withdrawn that sought to increase funding for section 8 housing tenant assistance by $100 million, NASA Space Grant Program by $8.9 million, Minority University Research and Education Program by $58 million, and National Science Foundation funding for training young scientists and engineers by $662 million with offsets of $100 million from the Public Housing Capital Fund; **Pages H4821–23**

Roemer amendment No. 20 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25 was offered but subsequently withdrawn that sought to eliminate funding for the International Space Station; and **Page H4838**

Frelinghuysen amendment No. 12 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25 was offered but subsequently withdrawn that sought to prohibit any funding to implement or administer the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system. **Page H4842**

Points of Order Sustained:

Against Jackson-Lee amendment No. 36 printed in the Congressional Record of July 26 that sought to increase Community Planning and Development Block Grant program funding by $100 million for emergency assistance programs; **Pages H4823–25**

Against language on page 64 line 12 through 17 dealing with drinking water contaminants; and **Page H4832**

Against the Frank amendment that sought to prohibit the FHA from raising the multifamily housing mortgage insurance premium to an amount greater than the cost. **Pages H4852–52**

The House agreed to H. Res. 210, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill on July 26. Amendments were considered today pursuant to the unanimous consent order of July 27.

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H4781.

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H4863–64.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H4813, H4813–14, H4814–15, H4855–56, H4856, H4856–57, H4860, and H4860–61. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 12:10 a.m. on Tuesday, July 31.

Committee Meetings

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a Fiscal Year 2002 ArmBudget Overview. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Army: Thomas White, Secretary; and Gen. Eric Schinseki, USA, Chief of Staff.

The Subcommittee also met in executive session to hold a hearing on Ballistic Missile Defense. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, USAF, Director, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization; and Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary.

GOVERNMENT ISSUED CREDIT CARD ABUSE

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations held a hearing on ''The Use and Abuse of Government Purchase Cards: Is Anyone Watching.'' Testimony was heard from Senator Grassley; Gregory D. Kutz, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, GAO; Patricia Mead, Acting Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Office of Acquisition, Federal Supply Service, GSA; the following officials of the Department of Defense: Capt. John E. Surash, USN, Commanding Officer, Navy Public Works Center, San Diego; Capt. Ernest L. Valdes, USN, Commander, Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center, San Diego; Vice Adm. Keith W. Lippert, USN, Director, Defense Logistics Agency; Jerry Hinton, Director, Finance, Defense Finance and Accounting Services; and Deidra Lee, Director, Defense Procurement.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a structured rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 2647, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002. The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(c) of rule XIII (requiring the three-day availability of printed hearings on a general appropriations bill). The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill). The rule makes in order only the amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the rule, which may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent,

shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives LaHood and Moran of Virginia.

HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a structured rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 2505, Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendments recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The rule makes in order the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the rule, if offered by Representative Scott or a designee, which shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule makes in order, after disposition of the Scott amendment, the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report, if offered by Representative Greenwood or a designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Sensenbrenner and Representatives Greenwood, Scott, and Deutsch.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 31, 2001

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to resume hearings to examine the proposed federal farm bill, focusing on conservation on working lands issues, 9 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for the fiscal year 2002 for MILCON budget overview, defense agency, and Army construction, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings on the nomination of John P. Stenbit, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communication and Intelligence; the nomination of Ronald M. Sega, of Colorado, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering; the nomination of Michael L. Dominguez, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; the nomination of Michael Parker, of Mississippi, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; the nomination of Mario P. Fiori, of Georgia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment; the nomination of H. T. Johnson, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Environment; and the nomination of Nelson F. Gibbs, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations and Environment, all of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Subcommittee on SeaPower, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on Navy shipbuilding programs, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications, to hold hearings to examine the issues of spectrum management and 3rd generation wireless service, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, to hold hearings S. 689, to convey certain Federal properties on Governors Island, New York; S. 1175, to modify the boundary of Vicksburg National Military Park to include the property known as Pemberton's Headquarters; S. 1227, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Niagara River National Heritage Area in the State of New York; and H.R. 601, to ensure the continued access of hunters to those Federal lands included within the boundaries of the Craters of the Moon National Monument in the State of Idaho pursuant to Presidential Proclamation 7373 of November 9, 2000, and to continue the applicability of the Taylor Grazing Act to the disposition of grazing fees arising from the use of such lands, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings on the nomination of Robert C. Bonner, to be Commissioner of Customs, and Rosario Marin, to be Treasurer of the United States, both of California, both of the Department of the Treasury; the nomination of Jon M. Huntsman, Jr., of Utah, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative; and the nomination of Alex Azar II, of Maryland, to be General Counsel, and the nomination of Janet Rehnquist, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, both of the Department of Health and Human Services, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings on the nomination of Vincent Martin Battle, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lebanon; the nomination of Edward William Gnehm, Jr., of Georgia, to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; the nomination of Edmund James Hull, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Yemen; the nomination of Richard Henry Jones, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait; the nomination of Theodore H. Kattouf, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic; and the nomination of Maureen Quinn, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the State of Qatar, 11 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of R. Nicholas Burns, of Massachusetts, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; the nomination of Daniel R. Coats, of Indiana, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany; the nomination of Craig Roberts Stapleton, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic; the nomination of Johnny Young, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia;

the nomination of Richard J. Egan, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to Ireland; and the nomination of Nancy Goodman Brinker, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Hungary, 11 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of Carole Brookins, of Indiana, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; the nomination of Ross J. Connelly, of Maine, to be Executive Vice President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; the nomination of Jeanne L. Phillips, of Texas, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Utah, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund; and the nomination of Patrick M. Cronin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Administrator for Policy and Program Coordination, United States Agency for International Development, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of Robert Geers Loftis, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho; the nomination of Joseph Gerard Sullivan, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zimbabwe; and the nomination of Christopher William Dell, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola, 4 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Daniel R. Levinson, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine asbestos issues, 2 p.m., SD–430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider pending business items. Immediately following, committee will hold hearings on the implementation of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, focusing on urban Indian Health Care Programs, 10 a.m., SR–485.

Committee on the Judiciary: to continue hearings on the nomination of Robert S. Mueller III, of California, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, to mark up H.R. 2586, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Procurement, to mark up H.R. 2586, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, to mark up H.R. 2586, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Education Reform, hearing on the Dawn of Learning: What's Working in Early Childhood Education, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on H.R. 1602, Rewarding Performance in Compensation Act, 1:30 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, hearing on Current Issues Before the Financial Accounting Standards Board, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on "How Secure is Sensitive Commerce Department Data and Operations? A Review of the Department's Computer Security Policies and Practices," 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing on Analyzing the Analysts II: Additional Perspectives, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs, hearing on Air Travel-Customer Problems and Solutions, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy, hearing on "Public Service for the 21st Century: Innovative Solutions to the Federal Government's Technology Workforce Crisis," 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, hearing on A Discussion on the U.N. World Conference Against Racism, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, hearing on H.R. 2146, Two Strikes and You're Out Child Protection Act, and to mark up the following: H.R. 2146; and H.R. 2624, Law Enforcement Tribute Act, 4 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on the Implementation of the National Fire Plan, 3 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1456, Booker T. Washington National Monument Boundary Adjustment Act of 2001; H.R. 1814, Metacomet-Monadnock-Sunapee-Mattabesett Trail Study Act of 2001; H.R. 2114, National Monument Fairness Act of 2001; and H.R. 2385, Virgin River Dinosaur Footprint Preserve Act; 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider H.R. 4, Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001, 11 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Research, hearing on Innovation in Information Technology: Beyond Faster Computers and Higher Bandwidth, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, oversight hearing on Red Light Cameras, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on Social Security and Pension Reform: Lessons from Other Countries, 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, to receive a briefing on Fiscal Year 2002 Budget Overview, 3 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 31

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1246, Emergency Agriculture Assistance Act.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Tuesday, July 31

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of Suspensions:

1. H.R. 2540, Veterans Benefits Act of 2001; and

2. H.R. 2291, Five-year Extension of Drug-free Communities Support Program and Authorization for National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute;

Consideration of H.R. 2647, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (structured rule, one hour of debate); and

Consideration of H.R. 2505, Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001 (structured rule, one hour of debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baca, Joe, Calif., E1471
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E1468
Coyne, William J., Pa., E1472
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E1469
Hall, Tony P., Ohio, E1471
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs, Ohio, E1469
Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E1467
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1468
Kilpatrick, Carolyn C., Mich., E1471
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E1470, E1470, E1470, E1470, E1471
Murtha, John P., Pa., E1467, E1469
Quinn, Jack, N.Y., E1467, E1469
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1472
Traficant, James A., Jr., Ohio, E1468
Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E1471
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1467

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through GPO Access at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at (202) 512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or GPO Access can be directed to the GPO Access User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $197.00 for six months, $393.00 per year, or purchased for $4.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.