Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on further consideration of the bill H.R. 4194, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts and other extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaHood). Pursuant to House Resolution 501 and rule XXIII, 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. 4194.

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. 4194), making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for other independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. COMBEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, July 17, 1998, the bill was open for amendment from page 52, line 3, to page 65, line 16.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

On page 59, before the period on line 12, insert:

"Provided further, That any limitation on funds for the Environmental Protection Agency or the Council on Environmental Quality in this Act shall not apply to conducting educational outreach or informational seminars.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to supersede language in the report on page 59 which states that the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality are thus directed to refrain from conducting educational outreach for informational seminars on policies underlying the Kyoto Protocol until or unless the protocol is ratified by the Senate. This amendment would allow such educational outreach and informational seminars to proceed.

I think most people would agree that there is considerable difference of opinion concerning the Kyoto Protocol and global warming and climate change. I think most would also agree that the only possible way to reach an understanding or potential compromise on such an emotionally charged issue is if there is a full and free exchange of information and ideas.

Having said that, though, there is truth in the statement in the committee report that there can be a fine line between education and advocacy on an issue. Assuming adoption of the amendment, I would encourage the EPA and the CEQ to pay close attention to the line between education and advocacy and stay on the right side of that line.

Now, as to what the amendment does not do, it does not change any of the statutory language in the bill regarding Kyoto. The limitation on page 58 of the bill still prohibits the use of funds to develop, propose or issue rules or regulations or decrees or orders for the purpose of imposing or in contemplation of the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. I am not fully satisfied with that language because I think it in fact may block some activities that it should not block, but I recognize the amendment imposes or in contemplation of rules or regulations or decrees until and unless the Kyoto Protocol is actually ratified.

Regardless of the outcome of the Kyoto Protocol, we all need to know much more about the issues of potential global warming and climate change. In order to have an informed public policy debate, the Congress should be encouraging, rather than stifling, education and outreach and informational dissemination activities.

This amendment does exactly that. It takes no position on the merits of Kyoto; it just allows for the educational process and the free flow of information to continue. I think that any objective person would recognize that there is nothing wrong with that, and I would urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I appreciate very much how much he has put into the efforts to come to an agreement on this issue. I am concerned about the issues of potential global warming and climate change. Whether or not the gentleman's amendment is approved today, I look forward to working with him and others to find common ground and clarify the intent of the language.

The Member from Wisconsin is bringing up the issue of preserving an open debate on environmental issues. Although he and I may disagree on how we get there, we both agree on the policy of an open and public debate. My concern is that the person would implement the Kyoto Protocol until we implement ratification specifically was to ensure that we do have the debate, that we do have the debate, as the U.S. Constitution requires, in the U.S. Senate with its advice and consent.

Since coming to Congress I have supported an open and public debate concerning environmental issues, including the issue of climate change, clean air, clean water, Superfund, environmental justice, and other important environmental issues. I will continue to work to make sure the EPA does not implement environmental policies through the back door, through regulatory tactics, especially when it does not have the legal authority to proceed forward.

There have been some who have claimed the language in this bill concerning the Kyoto Protocol would stifle the debate on climate change. As far as my personal goals on this issue, nothing could be further from the truth. I have been working to ensure that the Kyoto Protocol is not implemented until Senate ratification, as required by the U.S. Constitution. This protects the open debate on this issue so richly deserves.

Let us be clear. The language included in this bill does not do anything to interfere with valuable research, existing programs, or ongoing initiatives designed to carry out the United States' voluntary commitments under the 1992 Climate Change Convention.

And, education is another function conducted by the EPA. However, it should educate using balanced information without advocacy. The taxpayers richly deserve a balanced presentation of information. This is especially true when the EPA conducts educational outreach on climate change. I want to caution my colleagues. There is a very fine line between education and advocacy.

The EPA should never use taxpayer dollars to advocate their own agenda when it is not the official policy of the United States of America.

The EPA must be allowed to serve its primary purpose: To ensure that we have a clean, safe and healthy environment. We may have differing views on how to accomplish this goal, but we must be able to air those differences in the light of day. I will continue to work with my colleagues and fight for open debate on these important issues. I would challenge the EPA to join me in accomplishing this rather modest goal.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Obey amendment and in support of the language that has been put in this bill by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOllenberger). This entire effort is designed to protect the rights of the American people against an anti-American effort resulting from the Kyoto Treaty that has been proposed before the United States Senate. Thank goodness the American people have risen up and said we do not want this treaty to be passed and the Senate has actually listened to the American people.
It is anti-American because it imposes a lot of strict, costly penalties on Americans, while allowing many countries, many Third World countries to continue to pollute our environment at will. Frankly, I am mind-boggled as to how the administration could look at this as a positive thing for our people, and then after the people have said no, we do not want this to be implemented because it will cost us money and jobs, to then try to implement this through the back door, trying to go through the EPA to implement some of the rules and regulations, even though we do not want them.

This is a classic maneuver that the administration has used in recent years, and when the Congress and the people say no to something, they find agencies that are currently in existence to try to implement rules and regulations and circumvent the will of the United States Congress and the American people.

So I commend my colleague from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) for inserting this language to prohibit this back-door effort at costing the American people money and jobs to implement this anti-American treaty.

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

Mr. Chairman, over the last several months, I have participated in more than 20 hours of discussion during five hearinngs on the global warming issue. I am aware of the impact that the Kyoto Protocol may have on this country, but I am also aware of the possible consequences of global climate change.

When we look at this weather map from CNN of July 20, 1998, we can start seeing the dimensions of the problem where we have had some of the most unusual weather in this country that people have experienced ever.

All across this country, people are aware as they are sweating at home how different the weather is this year than any other year. And as scientists have looked at it, they have seen that indeed this weather has been unusually severe this summer.

We have had fires in Florida, floods in the Midwest, tornadoes destroying entire communities. And we look back at the temperature, last Wednesday the high temperature was 117 degrees in Phoenix. Today marks the 17th day in a row the temperatures are over 100 in Dallas.

Does anyone remember last winter? Not even a snowflake fell here in Washington. From January to June, average temperatures were the warmest on record. Temperatures in 1997 were the highest on record, and in 1998, so far it is even warmer.

Scientists predict that even more severe storms and unusual weather patterns will occur if we continue to pour greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, and we are no doubt seeing evidence of this right now.


When we look at just the news, what we have is evidence of rapid breaking warming trends. The 1990s have been the warmest years, according to scientists. It is not a political statement. The 1990s have been the warmest years in six centuries. 1997 is the warmest of these years ever recorded. This June, or this past June has been the hottest June since record keeping began over a century ago. July is on track to beat these records. All across this country, people are aware as they are sweating at home how different the weather is this year than any other year. And as scientists have looked at it, they have seen that indeed this weather has been unusually severe this summer.

We have had fires in Florida, floods in the Midwest, tornadoes destroying entire communities. And we look back at the temperature, last Wednesday the high temperature was 117 degrees in Phoenix. Today marks the 17th day in a row the temperatures are over 100 in Dallas.

Does anyone remember last winter? Not even a snowflake fell here in Washington. From January to June, average temperatures were the warmest on record. Temperatures in 1997 were the highest on record, and in 1998, so far it is even warmer.

Mr. Chairman, I agree, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has already said, that no rules, no regulations that relate directly to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocols should be done in any direct way prior to the ratification of that treaty. But all his amendment does is make certain that all activities that are presently authorized by law in various other places will not be banned on the basis of their having some implication for or some imagined implication for the Kyoto Protocols at some time.

Climate change and global warming are terms that we have been talking about a lot about recently. We know that there has been an enormous change in the ozone layer, a huge gap in the ozone layer that has left the whole continent of Australia in a position where they have to move heavy duty clothing in order at least they are advised to do so, because there is not that protection against radiation that has been with this planet for all of human existence.

Mr. Chairman, we also know, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KUCINICH) pointed out, that some of the hottest summers in the last six centuries have occurred. My figure might be slightly different, but I think at least six of the 10 hottest years in this century have been within the last six years. This is a trend that is going on as we speak.

National Geographic Magazine, in its last edition, had an article about extensive research by glaciologists in Antarctica. And they have now looked through the record of previous ice ages and seen that the whole west Antarctic ice shelf is in danger of collapsing, which could end up in a very short period of time, in a matter of months, in a matter of years. We have to think in terms of what is going to happen. We have to think in terms of what is going to happen 10 years and 20 years and 30 years down the road.

The Kyoto Protocols, from my point of view, clearly have flaws in them. They are too weak in many ways. They do not make certain that economic growth in emerging economies in the Third World is done with careful attention to how that energy is being used.

Were we to use energy in just one more nation, the Nation of China, at the current rate per capita and using, in the same way that our great economy uses energy, if we do not make the changes that will allow us to use energy much more efficiently, to produce much less in the way of greenhouse gases, if China produces and use energy in the same manner per capita as we do, we would have no chance, no chance whatsoever of turning this global warming around and getting control of it and stopping the rate at which human activity has affected the normal climate changes that this planet has gone through over a long period of time.
So, I would hope very much that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) would be adopted so that we make certain that we do not, in our “know-nothingism” here, that we do not end up refusing to take a position, to add whatever we may do, to do those activities already allowed by law so that we can use energy in a much more efficient manner. I do not believe the Kyoto Protocols are anti-American in any way whatsoever. They may be flawed but they are certainly not anti-American. They are pro-planet. I hope the Obey amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond a little bit about the issue of whether or not this is, in fact, the warmest June prior to the record. According to Dr. John Christy of the Earth System Science Laboratory at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, who raised questions after hearing reports by the Associated Press and the National Public Radio, Dr. Christy researched the local records just, for example, at the Alabama State University climatology office and found that there were 6 years, 1914, 1921, 1936, 1943, 1952 and 1953, with warmer June than 1998, all of which were in many previous decades prior to this.

He also went on to tell us that the National Weather Service in Birmingham, Alabama, admitted that its data only went back to the year 1968. So consequently, it is real hard to understand how the National Weather Service could possibly be speculating that this would be, in fact, the hottest June when its measures did not go back prior to that.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that we are discussing global warming. The Obey amendment addresses an important question, and that is whether or not EPA should be lobbying and should be pushing a treaty that has not been ratified by the United States Senate. I think that to allow EPA to do certain intelligence informational services that do not violate the particular treaty affects our good sense, but I think to allow them to go further makes very poor sense.

I want to commend the author of the language in the Committee Report and the bill for having done this. I do not know what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) would be doing if he did not know anything about climate change. I would, however, observe that I have been studying this question for a long time. I probably know about as much as anybody else in this Chamber who does not know anything about it either.

I would observe that I was over at Kyoto, and over there nobody knew anything about it at all either. Some of the scientists who came forward to talk about glacial warming just a few years ago were predicting a new age of glaciation in which the world was going to get colder. I guess they found that it is more profitable to be on the side of glacial warming that appears to be the more popular view.

I think that we ought to look at this from the standpoint, first of all, of the Constitution, of our proper responsibilities to see what the real situation happens to be, that everybody is going to be affected, and that until the Kyoto agreement is ratified, it does not mean anything.

It also ought to be observed that the Senate of the United States has told this administration, by a vote of 95 to nothing, that they are not going to ratify. By the way, that is bipartisan because there was nobody who voted against it; everybody voted for it. They made it very plain they are not going to ratify it until it is very clear that they are going to be bound by that, that every body and that the United States is not going to be the only nation in the world which is compelled to cut back as much as 30 percent on our use of energy, to sign a treaty which is going to bind nobody else the same way it binds us.

The Europeans say, well, we are going to be bound and the British are going to get out in some neat devices because they have gone to North Sea natural gas. Germans are going to point out they have not even ended a war. They may have the same problem of global warming. But the United States has a unique responsibility that rest of the world does not have.

The Soviet Union says, we will not be bound. Most of the former Soviet bloc countries say we will not be bound and we will not sign. Nobody in Africa and the developing countries will be signing, and they will not be bound.

It is interesting to note that India, which is one of the world’s biggest emitters of CO-2, is not going to be bound.

It is also interesting to note that our friends in China have told me, in a discussion I had with our delegates, that they will never be bound; they are always going to be a developing country. So that leaves Uncle Sap, the United States, which proposes to be bound by a treaty which is going to cause enormous economic hardship.

This is not going to be ratified by the Senate. We can just bet our bottom dollar on that particular point.

So, first of all, there should be lobbying by EPA. I do not take that view. The Obey amendment makes splendid good sense, and I would hope that everybody here who is interested in the well-being of our constituents and the continued economic development of the United States would take that same view.

But the hard fact of the matter is that EPA ought not and the administration ought not and the other agencies of the Federal Government ought not to be able to move forward to implement a treaty that the Senate of the United States is not going to ratify, because 95-to-0 they found it is not in the interest of the people of the United States or the economic and other welfare of the people of this country.

I want to commend the author of the amendment here. I think that it would be a tragedy if we were to decrease a debate which is without significance in the proceeding before us, about global warming, which has not yet been proven, and about adoption of a treaty, which is not going to be adopted, and I urge that we adopt the Obey amendment, see to it that we curtail lobbying and other activities, including implementing by regulatory or statutory action a treaty which is not in the interest of the United States and, B, which is not ratified and not going to be ratified.

That is the voice of good sense, and I hope that my colleagues will listen to it, not because it is me saying it, but simply because if my colleagues reflect on the interest of their country they will get out of this debate.

Mr. MCIJNTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and in reluctant opposition, because I have a great deal of respect for the previous speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and his work on this issue.

As I understand it, the Obey amendment would say educational activities would be allowed but advocacy activities would not. As I understand it, we would not even end up supporting this amendment. What I am concerned about, though, and was hoping to perhaps inquire of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on some of the boundary lines between those two concepts.

For example, in my home State, in Indiana, there was a conference held in the last month at which every single one of the speakers spoke about the urgent need to do something to end the problem of global warming. As I understand it, we urged support for the Kyoto Protocol. So there were no speakers providing an analysis of the cost, no speakers providing an alternative view of some of the science.

I wanted to ask the gentleman, if he would be so kind, how much leeway is there in the concept of educational activities versus activities that would be advocacy?

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

Mr. MCIJNTOSH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Frankly, there is, in the human situation, always a lot of leeway. The Congress does not have the ability to serve as a nanny in dealing with every agency of government who might get out of hand to do something illegitimate.

The language of this amendment is pretty clear. The agency is expected to provide educational activities and not advocacy. I would think that anyone that the agency engages in an activity which goes beyond the line of the objective of providing information, I would think not good.
Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been having this discussion with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. McIntosh) in committee for these last 6 months, and I rise in support of the Obey amendment. During the past 4 months, in the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs of the Committee on Government Oversight and Government Information, we have had at least five hearings. And what some have deemed to be the Clinton administration's back door of implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, we have been exposed and seen all kinds of frightening figures and numbers and portraits of devastating scenarios played out by a wide variety of witnesses on the possible effect the protocol would have on our economy and our jobs.

Let me assure this body, as we have assured the gentleman from Indiana and his committee, we have no intention of trying to implement the Kyoto Protocols before they have been thoroughly researched, thoroughly explained and thoroughly voted in the Senate. And we have taken a gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) makes this clear. But it is not sensible to prohibit the government agencies that should be doing research, that should be educating themselves and the public, from doing that.

As a result of the hearings in that subcommittee, two things have become clear: One is that some of my colleagues are under the mistaken impression, I think, that they are, in fact, Members of the other body and it is going to be this group that actually ratifies the Kyoto Protocol. And aside from that overly generous interpretation of their role, they are also convinced that the protocol is going to be ratified tomorrow.

I think we all know that nothing could be further from the truth. We all understand the Kyoto Protocol is not going to be ratified tomorrow. We all understand that there are serious issues and concerns with its content and its intent, and that we need to explore that thoroughly and that nothing should be done to implement that protocol until the Senate, if ever, should ratify it and move forward.

But the language contained in the committee report for this bill prohibits the use of the funding from being used to develop, support, or fund rules, regulations, decrees, orders for the purpose of implementing or in contemplation of implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. The report directs the Environmental Protection Agency to refrain from conducting any educational programs that promote polices that could be used to meet the emissions requirement called for in the protocol.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we all can agree that that is overly broad and potentially dangerous. Legitimate noncontroversial practices exist, or should exist, to improve energy efficiency and reduce emissions and pollution worldwide. We should all be committed to these goals. I am concerned, however, Mr. Chairman, that this language will stomp on our collective efforts.

Reliable estimates show that the annual global market for energy efficient products and services is now about $80 billion, and that amount is expected to increase to $125 billion by the year 2015. This new technology is rapidly becoming a new competitive advantage for companies that have seized the opportunity early. This new technology is one of our country's most effective generators of business, since small businesses can reap the benefits of available research and development assistance, such as the energy efficiency program supported by the Climate Change Technology Initiative and the Partnership for the New Generation of Vehicles.

That said, Mr. Chairman, access to advice and information on these programs and energy efficient products and services is imperative to create more small businesses and generate more jobs, which is something we should all be working to accomplish. Here is the catch, however, Mr. Chairman. The catch is some of these programs may fund programs which small businesses rely on to take advantage of energy efficient technologies.

How can some of our colleagues reconcile this disparity? How can we tell our small businesses that we have funded these programs to help them utilize and benefit from energy efficient technologies, but we are not going to give them the information on how to expedite those efforts through outreach and educational programs because they happen to also promote Kyoto Protocol policies?

The Obey amendment would clarify this disparity and allow the EPA to continue the educational outreach and informational seminars that are already authorized by law. But it should not allow any funding to be used solely for the purpose of implementing the Kyoto Protocol, and I think it does not do that. This will allow small businesses and other entities to continue to benefit from the advice and information on energy efficiency, which will help them expand and grow in the long run.

Adoption of the amendment is imperative if we are to assure that the current EPA programs that have benefited the economy and the environment are not jeopardized merely because they may also reduce greenhouse gases.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. TIERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.
Mr. LEWIS of California, I appreciate my colleague yielding, Mr. Chairman, and I asked for the yield simply because I agree very much with the gentleman’s statement. I was inclined to accept this amendment in the initial stage, but because some of my colleagues are concerned about what the language actually means, there is reservation.

Nonetheless, I do intend to vote for this amendment and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. TIERNEY. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman very much.

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

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

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me be very frank about this issue. I happen to believe that there is a severe problem with greenhouse gases, and if that trend is sustained, there is no question that our conifer forests, within a few generations, will no longer be in this country. They are already in Canada, and there is no question that if the trend continues the grain belt of tomorrow will turn into the dust belt of tomorrow.

The Kyoto conference was meant to try to discuss what the world ought to do about that. In my mind, the product that came out of Kyoto was flawed. And because it does not deal with what China and other major Third World polluters contribute to the problem, I have reason to believe that that protocol will not be ratified until it is changed.

That does not mean that we do not have an obligation to avoid extreme actions in the meantime.

I think when it comes to gaging the ability of the agency to even conduct educational seminars to provide not advocacy but explanation of the underlying issues, I think that is not only a right of the agency, I think they would be negligent if they did not. And I think that a Congress that did not allow them to do so would be in craven supplication to special interests in this country. So that is why I offered this amendment.

Those of my colleagues who know me know that a number of years ago I asked my friend Archie the cockroach. Archie was a poet who died and came back to life in the body of a cockroach. He lived in a newspaperman’s office. He would often write little messages which would appear in the newspaper the next day. He would sit in front of the carriage of the typewriter onto the keys and type his little messages and they would appear the next day.

He wrote something which I think appropriate to this entire debate. This is what he said: “America is a paradise of timberland and stream, but it is threatened because of the greed and money lust of a thousand little kings who slash the timber all to hell and it will not be controlled and change the climate and steal the rainfall from posterity.”

Now that really is what this issue is all about. My amendment does not seem to allow to lobby anyone. In fact, I would be offended if the agency did, because I do think that Kyoto Conference needs substantial repair before it is considered for modification.

But this Congress, which pretends it is interested in freedom of speech, when it protects the ability of big business or big labor to contribute hungrily thousands of dollars, indeed millions of dollars in independent expenditures to congressional campaigns, when they pretend that they are protecting freedom of speech because they will not put reasonable restrictions on ability of some to try to influence this House, for them to then pretend that somehow it is legitimate to say that an agency charged with the responsibility of dealing with the environment cannot even provide educational material and activities to its public, I think that is a real stretch. That is why I have offered this amendment, and any rational view of that amendment would require its adoption.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I support the Obey amendment and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

I rise in support of the Obey amendment. But more important than that, I would like to make a small contribution to the better understanding of global warming.

I have been involved in this question of global warming, believe it or not, for the last 20 years. I attended some of the first conferences amongst the scientists who thought that there were signs of global warming. They were looking, of course, at the rising percentage of CO-2 in the atmosphere, and other similar indicators which has been measured for over 100 years, and they were trying to correlate those indicators with the global temperature variations.

Now, this is not an easy thing to do, and anyone who tells us that there is absolute evidence that global warming is an established fact is probably misinformed or deliberately trying to deceive us. There have been occasions within the past few hundred years in which, because of other factors than human intervention, there was actually global cooling. There was an “little ice age” just a few hundred years ago, and we could conceivably have another “little ice age” in the future.

But most scientists accept the fact that we are in a situation where human intervention in the climate of the globe is causing some increases, and they want to understand those increases. If it is possible to quantify the degree of human impact and to understand how people can help to reverse it, if it is possible to have some effect on the changes they obviously would like to do so.

Nobody can exactly predict the effects of global warming. It may be that this wheat belt will move into Canada, and the Canadians will be tremendously benefited. It may be that the wheat production of central Asia, for example, and the former Russian Republic of Georgia, will move to Siberia. The Georgians may not want to move to Siberia, but the wheat production might remain the same. This is a very delicate and difficult problem to analyze, and I do not like to see us trying to do that on the floor of the House, because we pretend to understand.

What I do want to see us do is to better understand this problem, and take prudent steps to do whatever we can reasonably do to solve the problem. The prudent step probably reasonably takes to be more efficient in our use of energy. It makes our industry more competitive and more productive when we do that. It also slightly decreases the chances of global warming, the impact of global warming. If it is due to the inefficiencies of our industrial system. Generally speaking, the large production of CO-2 reflects inefficiency in the industrial system. So there are prudent things that we ought to do.

Now, I feel that we should not be trying to implement the Kyoto Protocols if we have not signed them. I agree with what has been said on both sides, with regard to such implementation. I think it would be highly imprudent to so curtail the agencies of the Government that they could not inform the public as to the facts of matters within their jurisdiction. If we move in that direction, we will get to the point where we will say do not do any more research on global warming, do not try to understand what is actually happening, even though, as I say, we have been doing such research for the last 20 years.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding.

I think I heard my comments earlier that the chair is going to support this amendment. But I must say that I do have some understanding of the reservations by some on both sides of the aisle, I assume because this is an agency that has a tendency to have a preestablished notion as to the way the thing is going to work, and when we talk about trying to make sure that everybody understands that they are right, and that is not exactly the way science works. So that is the reservation.
Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I presume that the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) is trying to hint to me so that I should not beat this subject to death so we can move on with his bill. But I am very deeply concerned that we progress in terms of understanding, if we do not always in terms of legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that Vice President Gore has demonstrated significant and important leadership on this topic that has far-reaching consequences for our generation, for future generations, for us not just as Americans but as citizens of this one planet. As I have listened to some of this debate, I have become convinced that perhaps this very debate and some of the comments that have been made during it make the strongest case for the Obey amendment that we really do need some location.

The Obey amendment is indeed a modest step forward. It does allow for some flexibility, and I would hope that it allows for more than just more talking on this subject. We do need to begin to start looking for some solutions to this problem, not just to talk about how severe the problem is but to actually begin to do something about it.

Where I come from down in Texas, it is at this point sizzling in the shade. We got our typical Texas August about the beginning of May this year, and it has stayed that way. Many regions in our State have had triple-digit temperatures now for almost 3 weeks in a row. Eighty people have already died from the heat just in the State of Texas. And we have a lot of other folks down there that are concerned that our fields will burn, they are already burning; that our cedar breaks will catch fire, just like the ones over in Florida. And I know also that more than most other parts of the country the severe impact of looking out at the sky at noon and not being unable to see the sun or anything else because of all the smoke that has filtered up as the rain forests of Mexico have burnt in some of the driest conditions that that area has ever faced.

Meanwhile, the scientific data is mounting that at least a significant contributing factor is changing climatic conditions or global warming, and the planet is getting hotter by the year.

What a very strange time for this Congress, as these conditions exist, to be enacting what would essentially be the “Mandatory Ignorance of Global Warming Act of 1998.” The language, as originally proposed, seemed to tell us that the folks that are involved in environmental protection for this country, “do not even think about global warming,” a little like those parking signs we see “do not even think about parking here.”

Well, the subject seems to be, do not even think about global warming or anything we can do about it. It goes far beyond the language necessary to have the very legitimate debate over the precise effect and cause of global warming that the gentleman from California just referred to.

Rather than much of this language, as originally proposed here on the floor of the Congress, seems more consistent with redesignating our national bird from the eagle to the ostrich. Because they really are proposing to bury our heads in the sand, as they were almost surrendering for a rise in temperature, instead of trying to look at solutions to this problem.

I have been interested to hear people suggest that we need to focus only on America and complain about these other countries that are not participating. Unfortunately, some of the same people who have tried to obstruct in every way how this country deals with the global warming challenge went over to China and to other countries and urge them not to participate on this entire problem.

So it is a little bit of a conflict that they say they want to deal with this whole global warming issue in a constructive way that everyone ought to be able to solve; that indeed every country should be a part of the solution, and yet at the same time they were trying to twist arms and influence opinion makers abroad to keep them out of a global solution with reference to this entire matter.

I do not believe that we have to wait until the glaciers melt or until the fields and the forests are burnt or until more and more people have skin cancer to begin to study and look for solutions to deal with this global warming challenge. There are many responsible corporations who feel that way, too. And without Government involvement to any significant extent, they are already out there working to try to find a way to reduce greenhouse gases. I believe the Government could provide them incentives, that we ought to encourage their activities to address this challenge, that recognizes that while we have 4 percent of the world’s people, we are producing 25 percent of the greenhouse gases. I believe we have some responsibility not just to be a world follower but to be a world leader. To be a world leader, we, at a minimum, need to continue to focus on educating our own people, on educating the world about the challenge and not following the path of “know-nothing-ism” that was originally proposed in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) has expired.

Mr. DOGGETT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, does he think we might get more votes for this amendment if we move this debate from the air-conditioned Chamber today to the steps of the Capitol?

Mr. DOGGETT. Reclaiming my time, well, we finally in the last couple of days have here in Washington the kind of weather that we have been told out in Texas and much of this country back in May, the kind that leaves people sweltering. And while we cannot say every bit of that is the result of global warming, we do not have to wait for Alaska to have the kind of weather that we are having out here on the lawn of the Capitol today or the kind that has disturbed the people of the South for the last several months before we begin to address this problem.

So I am pleased that my colleague, at least through this amendment, will allow a little education perhaps to the Members of this body and certainly the American people about the gravity of this problem. But I would hope that eventually, perhaps as we work through the process on this bill, that some of the other restrictions that have been placed in this particular appropriations act bill would also be altered, because we need the greatest flexibility to look at this problem and provide the leadership to resolve it.

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

The amendment before us is one that everyone ought to support. It is common sense. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) is saying that, whatever limitations we place on the Environmental Protection Agency or the Council for Environmental Quality, we should not say to them they cannot conduct educational outreach or informational seminars.

Can my colleagues imagine, in the face of a global warming potential that we would close down agencies that run our environmental policies, they cannot hold informational seminars, they cannot have educational outreach? That is absurd. That is absolutely absurd to have that kind of restriction. Yet that restriction is in the bill that is before us. And the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) is trying to reach that part of the bill.

But the bill before us is even more extreme than just that, because the bill before us would stop the Environmental Protection Agency and the CEQ from looking at how to deal with the problem or developing some proposals.

What those who supported the language known as the Knollenberg provisions say they were trying to do was that they were trying to stop the administration and any of these agencies from trying to implement a treaty on global warming: that the treaty has been ratified, as is required, under the Constitution by the Senate of the United States. I accept that. No one is
disputing that they should not implement a treaty that has not been ratified. But to say they cannot hold educational outreach, informational seminars or develop proposals is like telling them, “Don’t think about this issue. Put your head in the sand. Don’t even think about this issue. We don’t want you to do anything until we ratify the treaties, if we ever ratify a treaty.”

If that treaty came up, and I do not think it will be proposed in its present form, the administration has worked out a treaty on global warming, this is a threat to our planet, many nations must be involved in stopping this threat, and they wanted them to get ratification of an agreement. The first question any reasonable Senator would ask is, “How do you plan to implement this? What ideas do you have for dealing with the problem of greenhouse gases that cause global warming?” And if we do not change this bill, the EPA and the CEQ, the agencies that look at the threats that greenhouse gases have to our climate change problem. I think everybody will support this Obey amendment. Maybe a few people will vote against it. But do not feel that in adopting this amendment we have solved the problems that this legislation that is before us has created, because we must go further.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is going to offer an amendment shortly. That amendment would put the teeth of the federal agencies when they look at the global climate issues. As I understand his amendment, he will also agree not to allow any implementation, implementation or putting effect into any proposals until there is ratification of a treaty. But he would at least allow the agencies to think through the appropriate strategies.

I support the Obey amendment. I will support the Greenwood amendment. I think we need to strike out of these funding bills language that stops government from enforcing the laws on the books and developing strategies for a problem that none of us thought about maybe 5 years ago but are starting to worry about when we hear leading scientists in the country tell us that global warming is not some theory, it is a reality that we must take seriously.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
few moments to recognize the outstanding work of my good friend and the man who will always, in my mind's eye, be my chairman, Congressman Louis Stokes.

As most of my colleagues know, this will be the last VA-HUD bill the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes) and I will have the privilege of working on together. After 30 years in Congress and over 28 years on the Committee on Appropriations, Louis has decided to pursue other interests.

Louis Stokes clearly exemplifies everything that is good about the Congress of the United States and, indeed, everything that is great about this wonderful country in which we live.

From his early days growing up in public housing through his days of college and law school to his work as an attorney on some of the most important legal issues of our time to his service in the Congress which began in January 1969, Lou has served with courage, with honor, with dignity, and with compassion.

He has represented his district with the finest kind of service. I must tell my colleagues that my life has been enriched because of the friendship I have shared with Louis Stokes and his wonderful wife Jay, for this fine American has made all the difference for me in working in this House.

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

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) for providing this opportunity to pay tribute to our colleague and friend. Let me say the term "power" is frequently used, but for Louis Stokes, some sources are more real, more independent, and more indispensable than others. He has often said that the two most devastating kinds of power are economic and political, asserting that if you have one, if you have neither, you are afraid, but if you have both, you are feared.

Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge the friendship between Mr. Stokes and his wife Jay and my wife Carol that goes back 30 years. We came to this committee one day 30 years ago, along with Shirley Chisholm, and the three of us, who joined with six other African American Members, really made history that day, because that person to represent them.

I referred to my good friend Archie the other day, and I would simply refer to him again. There is a piece in this book that I think sums up Lou Stokes' service to this House. It says:

The lordly ones, the haughty ones, with supercilious heads held high;
The up stage stiff pretentious ones, miss much that my humble eye;
Not that I mean to disparage, but I'm too small to feel great pride;
And as the pompous world goes by, I see things from the under side.

I think Lou's entire career here demonstrates how I feel that. He understands there are millions of people in this country who are stuck with seeing life from the other side, and in a city of 1,200 suits, Lou has never forgotten the people who wear work clothes.

I think that he has also demonstrated an interest far beyond just the interest of the poor. In a me-first era, he has remembered the answer to the question of Cain: "Am I my brother's keeper?" This is very often not the case.

So I think in almost every way I can think of Lou Stokes' service here is a daily affirmation of the Judeo-Christian ethic which underlies our society. I want to say on behalf of every one of them and on behalf of every Member in this House for the way in which he has graced this House with his years of service.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey).

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

Let me say that people come and go, and they either add or subtract from the places in which they work, but now and then somebody comes to this place who does his work, learns his craft, who demonstrates total dedication and produces service that, indeed, is worthy to be remembered.

Louis Stokes has many achievements. He served as chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, he served as chairman of the Assassination Committee, after the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy; he served as chairman of the Iran Contra Committee, he served as a subcommittee chairman of this subcommittee, and I think his most valuable service has come on a subcommittee on which he has never been chair, and that is the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Education. It is there that I think the gentleman did the most to demonstrate that he had never forgotten his humble beginnings, unlike many other people that we often see in this society.

I referred to my good friend Archie the other day, and I would simply refer to him again. There is a piece in this book that I think sums up Lou Stokes' service to this House. It says:

The lordly ones, the haughty ones, with supercilious heads held high;
The up stage stiff pretentious ones, miss much that my humble eye;
Not that I mean to disparage, but I'm too small to feel great pride;
And as the pompous world goes by, I see things from the under side.

I think Lou's entire career here demonstrates how I feel that. He understands there are millions of people in this country who are stuck with seeing life from the other side, and in a city of 1,200 suits, Lou has never forgotten the people who wear work clothes.

I think that he has also demonstrated an interest far beyond just the interest of the poor. In a me-first era, he has remembered the answer to the question of Cain: "Am I my brother's keeper?" This is very often not the case.

So I think in almost every way I can think of Lou Stokes' service here is a daily affirmation of the Judeo-Christian ethic which underlies our society. I want to say on behalf of every one of them and on behalf of every Member in this House for the way in which he has graced this House with his years of service.
STOKES BROKE GROUP IN THE LEGAL FIELD BEFORE CONGRESS

In overcoming his impoverished beginnings, Stokes went on to excel in the Congress and in the legal field. He is held in high esteem by his associates in both professions. Before election to Congress, he was a celebrated practicing attorney in Cleveland, once arguing before the Supreme Court the landmark “stop and frisk” case of Terry vs. Ohio which is taught in every law school in the country.

STOKES AND THE USE OF POWER

The term “power” is frequently used loosely and without knowledge of its real significance. Seldom do users of the expression bother to contemplate that all sources of power are limited inasmuch as they are to some degree dependent upon sources of power. But for Lou Stokes, some sources are more real, more independent, and more indispensable than others. He has often said that the two most devastating kinds of power are economic and political, asserting that “if you have one, you are respected; if you have both, you are feared; but, if you have neither, you are ex- plorited.”

STOKES' CONTRIBUTION TO EDUCATION

While Stokes has vigorously pursued an agenda that respects and appreciates the vital needs of the nation, he has not ignored the critical problems hampering the growth and prosperity of the black community. He has implemented new ideas and promoted a new direction in the areas of legislation dealing with the education of the African-American population.

STOKES' SUPPORT FOR BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Stokes has manifested critical leadership in prodding the House Appropriations Committee to expand its funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Through his role as a seasoned member of the committee, he has used his authority with decisiveness in protecting financial securing of these institutions which are vitally important to higher education of the African American populace.

STOKES INFLUENCES FUNDING FOR HEALTH CARE

Congressman Stokes is a respected champion on the health care front. He has utilized his assignment on the House Appropriations Committee to sponsor critical health care issues. As a result of his strong leadership, funding for diabetes, cancer, heart disease, and AIDS has significantly increased.

Since 1977, Stokes has chaired the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust. This policy-making body has been effective in helping to define and to shape the nation’s health agenda. Under Stokes' leadership, the CBC braintrust has fought for improved health care delivery for minorities and under-served populations; enhanced education and outreach activities; and increased minority representation in the health professions, including biomedical research. He has been instrumental in promoting community health interests, increasing minority manpower in health care professions, and providing federal funds for the enhancement of programs at medical schools.

STOKES RECOGNITION FOR LEADERSHIP

Congressional leadership has bestowed sup- port on those leaders having named him to prominent and prestigious positions of heady responsibility. He was appointed by Speaker Thomas P. “Tip” O’Neill on March 8, 1977 to chair the committee investigating the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Speaker “Tip” O’Neill also named him to chair the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (Ethics Committee). And in February 1983, Stokes named by Speaker Jim Wright to chair the Select Committee on Intelligence.

STOKES' VISION IN FORMING CBC

The founding of the Congressional Black Caucus is demonstrative of the vision shown by Stokes almost immediately upon his arrival to Congress. He wasted no time seeking to establish a forum for articulating the concerns of Black Americans. He, along with several others, decided that because of the nearly equal ideological division in the House between liberal and conservatives—Democrats and Northern Republicans allied against Conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats—the nine black members of the House of Representatives comprised a voting bloc sufficient to constitute the balance of power. Members of the CBC were determined to seize the moment, to confront racial injustice, to fight for economic equity and to raise other issues long ignored and too little debated.

STOKES CHAIRED HEARINGS ON THE ASSASSINATIONS OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY AND DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Stokes’ objectivity is demonstrated by his leadership of the assassinations committee. The Committee identified four main issues to be investigated:

1. Who was or were the assassin(s) of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.? 
2. Did the assassin(s) have any aid or assistance either before or after the assassinations? 
3. Did the agencies and departments of the U.S. Government adequately perform their duties and functions in protecting the two slain leaders? 
4. Given the evidence the committee uncovered, is the amendment of existing legislation appropriate?

STOKES OVERSAW THE 18-MONTH INVESTIGATION WHICH ENDED IN DECEMBER 1978 WITH TWENTY-SEVEN VOLUMES OF HEARINGS AND A FINAL REPORT CONTAINING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REFORM. HE PERFORMED Admirably and impressively at the nationally televised committee hearings.
denied so much to so many people just because of their color, there came the GI Bill when the Federal Government said it doesn’t really make any difference what color you are, we will give you a chance to reach the height of your potential. I wish that we never would have had an educated Carl Stokes, we never would have had an educated LOU STOKES, unless those in the Congress that preceded us were saying why not help all Americans, because you have no idea as to the great resources and jewels that we have. And this is not that unusual when there are so many people who have given so much, but never have been given the chance that Lou had to give back.

LOU STOKES, you have been an example for people, white or black, Jew or gentile, in this great country of ours, because no matter what the subject is, you bring a sense of class that makes us all feel proud to be politicians, to be legislators, and to be Americans. And you have a legacy for all of us, those like me who respond sometimes in anger, to restrain if not just because it is the right thing to do, but because we owe it to the dignity of this great House to do it.

We are going to miss you, Lou Stokes, but you have set standards for all of us to follow on both sides of the aisle. Even though you only came here 2 years before I did, to me you are a giant and you remain one.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes), not only for his work on this bill, but for his achievements throughout an outstanding and successful career in Congress.

LOU STOKES has served the public for many, many years, and in this Congress, there is a lawyer, a veteran of the United States Army, he is a lecturer, he is a writer, he has been a chairman of many committees and a ranking member of many committees.

He has served when in the majority as chairman of the Select Committee on Assassinations, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the Committee on Intelligence, and chairman of the subcommittee of this particular bill. He served, as fate has dealt him, in the minority as well. In whatever capacity he has served, he has served honorably, with good humor, and with great trust for his fellow Members of his subcommittee or his committee, and in a bipartisan fashion.

Lou is an honorable man. He has left his mark on the committees in which he has served because he has done the hard work that was necessary to do honor to this institution. In his retirement, we all feel a void in our own hearts, and in this Congress, we hope that his family will gain what we lose: A gentle, solid, comfortable presence.

Over the years I have heard the term “soul” used, and I guess many would attribute their own meaning to the word. I guess if I had to give one concept to that term, I think I would attribute it to a person who enjoys life and loves this country.

Lou, I just want to tell you that from my very distant view, the one that has become closer over the years that I have had the honor and the pleasure to know and to work with you, you have a lot of soul.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise with my colleagues at this very special moment to pay tribute to the dean of the Ohio delegation, always to me our good friend Congressman LOU STOKES. For myself personally, and I know for every single other member of the Ohio delegation, from our great buckeye State, when we came to Congress, LOU STOKES was here. He has always been here. For us as Members, for his brilliance, for his strength, for his soul, LOU STOKES is to imagine an Ohio with a piece of its heart missing. And this particular moment of tribute is one of those moments in Congress that each of us who has had the pleasure of working and knowing this man will not forget.

Others have detailed the congressional service of our good friend, LOU STOKES, but perhaps it is important to remember that when he was elected to the Committee on Appropriations he was the first African-American ever to serve on this very, very important committee of cardinals rising to be a cardinal in his own right.

I think as a woman having had to overcome some of the barriers in my own life, I can somewhat identify, but certainly not completely, with what that must have felt like. I think what has always amazed me about LOU STOKES is what a gentleman he has been, the kind of elegance that causes his grandchildren to really smile at him with open eyes, is a quality that all of us truly admire and wish that we had ourselves.

I think if we look at all of the programs over which he has had jurisdiction within the Committee on Appropriations itself, whether it was the National Institutes of Health and the types of studies that are done there to recognize the types of illnesses that afflict all sorts of people, or whether we are talking about who should go on to college and who has the opportunity to become all they can be, or if we are talking about in fact the history of the U.S. military and the complete renovation of sections of Arlington Cemetery, long before the movie glory ever came out, LOU STOKES was there.

Certainly, people of Cleveland have every right to be proud that two of their sons have changed the history of this country.

Now, Lou and I share a great affection for our families, and particularly our mothers, and I guess my one regret in knowing Lou is I never got to know his mother and Carl’s mother. Because what a mother she must have been to raise those two boys in the shadow of inner city Cleveland. He took us by the arm over yesterday when we were touring Cleveland on a brownfield tour, and to imagine that that household, that home would have brought this man to Congress at the time that he came, the time that he came. The wounds in America of race will not heal over yesterday, but I know that I have met someone who has helped heal those wounds for our country.

As I have said in other venues and I will say here for the record, I think one of the memories that I will have of Lou that I never expected to have, came from one of our quiet subcommittee meetings one day in this particular committee, Veterans, HUD, NASA, NSF, EPA, when we were listening to a presentation from the Library of Congress who were bringing in the books, the ledgers of those who had served our country and were buried in Arlington, and they brought in these dusty volumes.

I remember opening them up, and I was sitting next to Chairman Stokes at that time, and he opened up to one of the pages and we began to read, and we looked in such-and-such a section and at this particular plot, at who was buried there and the legal name, but I knew that I have fought in the Civil War who for all of history had remained unnamed simply because they were people of color. Through his efforts, in fact, that section of Arlington has now been restored and we have recently witnessed a major statue unveiling in this city and all kinds of national programs and so forth, but LOU STOKES was there at the head of the queue long before the rest of the country did know that we know that in Ohio who have a history of trying to remember the underground railroad know that through his efforts here as we begin to save that history and enshrine that history for all time, the 21st century will in fact be different from the 20th and the 19th, and so as just one buckeye and one member of this great Congress, I want to say to my good friend, LOU STOKES of Cleveland, thank you. Thank you on behalf of this Congress; thank you on behalf of the people of the State of Ohio that you have done proud here. Thank you on behalf of your mother and your brother for serving our country when you could have done so many other things with the gifts that life has given you. It has been an honor to serve with you. You have taught me much. You will always be the Congress- man from the great City of Cleveland.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is work to be done tonight and we will get to it, but I think it is important that we take the time tonight to honor LOU STOKES.
I speak as a junior member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I speak tonight symbolically from the other side of the aisle to pay tribute to Lou Stokes and the wonderful way that he has worked with members of the majority party and minority parties in this House and the great example he has set, and to say that it has been a genuine pleasure to serve on the Appropriations Committee with Lou Stokes.

I have served on two subcommittees with Mr. Stokes, Labor-HHS and VA-HUD, and I have heard tributes at the subcommittee level, at the full committee level, and I have listened with interest and with admiration and with agreement. I have heard him called by many descriptions, Mr. Chairman, and I subscribe to them all: Mentor, role model, a worthy adversary from time to time, a champion for his State and for his district, and a champion in every sense of the word, a classic, and a friend.

But, Mr. Chairman, where I come from, one of the most supreme compliments that can be paid to a man is to call him a southern gentleman, and in thinking about this I spoke with Mr. Stokes’ other colleague (Mr. Kucinich), for Lou Stokes is a gentleman from Cleveland, and he decided that if one looks at the map just right, Lou Stokes comes from southern Cuyahoga County, and he indeed qualifies as a southern gentleman.

As a matter of fact, the gentlemanly conduct of Lou Stokes embodies those qualities that are universally admired, and that I have admired so much during the two terms that I have served with him on subcommittees. Lou Stokes never raises his voice. He never rails at individuals. He is effective. He gets the job done, and he has gotten the job done for his point of view, but always a gentleman in every sense of the word.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow said, “Lives of great men all remind us we can make our lives sublime, and departing, leave behind us footprints on the sands of time.”

Well, Lou, you are departing this House, but I do not necessarily think you are departing the scene, and I certainly hope not. I have a feeling that there is much more service to this country, to society and to your fellow man, although I do hope perhaps you have a chance to spend a little more time with your family. I salute the gentleman from Ohio. I admire him. Lou, I wish you the best of luck, and Godspeed in your next endeavors.

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

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to pay special thanks to the chairman of our committee, the very distinguished and gracious gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis), for making available this time here tonight to pay special tribute to another very fine member of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay special tribute to the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of our subcommittee, its former chairman, and a true pillar in this House.

As other speakers have noted, this is the final VA-HUD bill that Mr. Stokes will help bring to this body. That saddens us all, because when Lou Stokes retired connected to the Congress, he after three decades of faithful service to the people of the Cleveland area, this institution will lose one of its most passionate and principled representatives.

Lou Stokes is a man of keen intelligence and solid integrity who has blazed many new trails and risen to key leadership positions in this House. As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus he dedicated himself to advancing policy issues critical to minority communities. As chairman of the House Select Committee on Assassinations he completed historic investigations into the deaths of President Kennedy and Dr. King. As chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct he handled the most delicate of cases with unfailing fairness.

As chairman of the Committee on Intelligence, he helped shape policies vital to our national defense. And as chairman and now ranking member of our VA-HUD subcommittee, he has exhibited a deep understanding of complex issues and has been extremely responsive to the interests and concerns of each department, each agency, each subcommittee member, each member of this House, and each constituency group within our jurisdiction. Clearly, Lou Stokes has been given a diverse group of special assignments.

But there is a common thread, Mr. Chairman. They all serve as a measure of the trust and respect, real respect, in which he is held by the Members of this body. He is held in equally high regard at home. The people of Cleveland feel a deep gratitude for Lou Stokes’ lifetime of service. They know that he has always fought for their best interests with great energy, skill, and far more often than not, success.

On a personal level, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful to have had the opportunity to work with Lou Stokes over the years.

In doing so, it has been my honor to carry on a family tradition. My father and Lou served together for many years in this House, and my father has always held him in the highest esteem.

So do I.

I deeply appreciate the counsel, support, and friendship that he has accorded me. Lou Stokes is a bright, skilled legislator, a hard-working representative, a great friend, and along with his wife Jay, a proud parent and grandparent.

In his words and deeds he is a complement, a tribute to this House and he will be missed, while at the same time his influence on this institution will be indisputable.

Best wishes to you and Jay, Lou, as you leave this House for other adventures.

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

Mr. Chairman, I may have the distinction of knowing Lou Stokes longer than any other Member of the Congress, one that I am proud of. I am from Cleveland, where he ought to have run. I should not say that I have stopped having them, because he still there and I am still there.

I am still there. LOU, this is a moment of joy and sadness for all of us. I remember the first day Lou got to the House and he made me feel real good. Not because I campaigned for him, which was not necessary at all, but because he told me the first bill he introduced was the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday bill. Then he said, “Do you think it has a chance of really passing?” And 15 years later we found out that it did.

Lou, I thank you for your steadfastness across the years. It has been a very pleasant friendship. We have worked together on any number of activities. But to me, the issues that you have raised in connection with health, with the minority health issues, have always stuck with me more than any of the outstanding things that you have done. You have pioneered the whole notion of us understanding that there was a different dimension of health needs for those who were not affluent or able to buy insurance.

The work that you did with the African-American medical universities should be lauded for many minutes more than I am just briefly referring to them. They all know what you have done. On those medical campuses, you were able to see they got the much-needed financing and support and resources and also building activity as well, so that they could continue to put African-American medical graduates into the general population.

I hope that we do not forget the work you did on the committees that investigated the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King and John F. Kennedy. That was incredibly sensitive, controversial work and your role there as the only African-American on those committees was very, very important to me.

Mr. Chairman, it should also be mentioned that Lou Stokes chaired the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for many years, and did great job. He was also Chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. And so I have been pleased to enjoy this close relationship.
with you and Jay, the family. I hope and know that it will continue.

Finally, if nobody has said it, Attorney LOU STOKES is one of the few Members that have argued before the United States Supreme Court in the very controversial civil liberties case of Terry and Ohio.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are losing a gifted, talented Member, a brother, and a person who understands government. And I am sure from whatever position he chooses to take, he will continue to send forth the lessons that he has learned, the principles that he has believed, fought for, and worked so hard over a period of 30 years throughout the land.

Lou, we love you and we will miss you.

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

Mr. Chairman, I played a little word association game and when I said "gentleman," the first person who came to mind in this Chamber was LOU STOKES. When I thought about "class," and how I would define class, I thought about LOU STOKES.

When I considered the concern that has been expressed in this Chamber by all of us about civility and the need we had to go to a special retreat in Hershey, Pennsylvania, I thought about myself, we did not need to go to Hershey, Pennsylvania, to learn about civility. All we had to do is watch LOU STOKES in action.

Then when I think about the humdrum life we all have. Washington, district, back and forth on the plane, traveling so much. So little time to really get involved in getting to know better some of our colleagues, which is a real shortcoming of this institution because it is made up of some of the finest people we will find in any place in the world, Republicans, Democrats, liberals or conservatives. But we are all just scrambling to run back home and make that next meeting.

I said to myself, we are disadvantaged in many respects, but I have been very fortunate because very early in my career I got to know LOU STOKES and I got to appreciate all that he represents.

George Bernard Shaw said, "Some men see things as they are and ask why. I dream things that never were and ask why not." That reminds me of Mr. Chairman, the only one with the courage and the attunement to reach across the aisle or to reach to the southern gentleman or to reach to the northern liberals. He has reached across all of those people and he has touched their hearts and he has sensitized them to the needs not only of the urban poor but the disadvantaged and the poor throughout this country.

Many of us on the House Committee on Appropriations look to LOU for guidance. We look to him especially because he taught us to let the world know that LOU STOKES does. He is a multidimensional man. It is hard to describe this man, because he has done everything. He has accomplished whatever he tried. He is a distinguished lawyer; has gone before the Supreme Court and won a civil rights bill; has been over ethics; has been over all of the things that we see people aspiring for here in this Congress. LOU STOKES has achieved it.

Mr. Chairman, he is still a humble man. He is still a man who is kind and thoughtful. He is still a man who wants to do the right thing for everyone. African-Americans throughout this country are doubly proud of this man. They know him throughout this country not only for his work in health care, but I am sure that the life extension of African Americans in this country, he has shortened many of the diseases that have killed minorities in the past. He has extended the life span of African-Americans because he took a focus and saw health as being an important facet of African-Americans because they were dying, they were not being tested in clinical trials, they were not educating their doctors.

LOU STOKES took a handle on this. He is still the most humble man in this Congress. He is outstanding as far as the Nation’s veterans are concerned. He is a scientist. He wants to see science advanced, technology and space, ethical research advanced.

Many people in this Congress may not be keenly aware of this multidimensional man, but today we stand to tell the world know that LOU STOKES is a cut above, a cut above most Congresspersons in that he has accomplished more and will do much more, even when he leaves this Congress.

It saddens me to see him leave because he has been a flagship for all of us. He is a flagship of this Congress, of the Members of Congress, of the Congressional Black Caucus, but for everyone who would aspire to be a good statesperson. LOU STOKES has been that flagship.

He has authored many things that help disadvantaged people, both black and white. He has paved the way for thousands of poor people, disadvantaged and minority young people, to pursue careers in the health professions. Doctors, nurses, scientific researchers, these young people would not have had the opportunity if it were not for LOU STOKES.

He is from Cleveland, Ohio, but his influence has spread not only in this country, but throughout the world. He has opened up access for accommodated people who could not reach there themselves. This man has raised the consciousness of this Congress since he has been here. The level of understanding of this Congress has been raised by LOU STOKES. He has done things for America’s most vulnerable citizens, those that do not have lobbyists here, those who do not have a voice here.

LOU STOKES has been that voice. Many times he has been the only voice, Mr. Chairman, the only one with the courage and the attunement to reach across the aisle or to reach to the southern gentleman or to reach to the northern liberals. He has reached across all of those people and he has touched their hearts and he has sensitized them to the needs not only of the urban poor but the disadvantaged and the poor throughout this country.

Many of us on the House Committee on Appropriations look to LOU for guidance. We look to him especially do, when I am about to do something rash, I look to LOU because LOU STOKES has that attunement, he can say, “Well, now, Carrie, this can be done, but this is the way it has to be done,” and it is extremely important to me, Mr. Chairman, and to other Members of this House.

He is what I call a crossover Congressperson, who works with the needs of both black and white in the Congress. Diversity is important to him. He has teamed up with our young white-haired leader of the Veterans and VA-HUD subcommittee. He teamed up with Mr. Lewis. I am sure he taught him a lot, because the two of them go hand-in-hand. They are just like Mutt and Jeff, because they work closely together. And I am very serious when I say to my colleagues that Mr. Lewis’ attunement, I am sure some of it came from LOU STOKES. And that, to me, means a lot.

And LOU STOKES didn’t do it by rabble-rousing. He didn’t do it by Bogarting. He did it because he is a statesman. He is a diplomat. He does not cringe or step back from anybody, but because of this intellectual prowess, he has been able to go in places that many others cannot.

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Health Braintrust resurrected the consciousness of America with respect to the need to address the disparities in minority health care, from AIDS, to diabetes, to cancer, to 1800...
lupus, to smoking-related illnesses. The list goes on and on, Mr. Chairman. As a result of Mr. STOKES’ efforts, Mr. Clinton, our President, included in the budget this year so many things. He sent to Congress an $80 million fund for the Head Start initiative on health. You know who stimulated that? Do you know who was the prime mover in that? LOU STOKES. To begin with, he has effectively closed this gap.

Lou, you took the path that is less traveled, you did it with grace, you did it with intellect, and now you leave the underground railroad to us.

I have heard you talk about your mother. You addressed people over in HUD one day. These were people who were trying to understand the needs. Lou, you gave to the world the best you had and the best has come back to you.

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

Mr. Chairman, we all have a frame of reference for LOU STOKES, and nobody could have a frame of reference as wonderful as Mrs. Carrie Meek’s frame of reference. What she was in high school and college the Stokes family, and particularly the Stokes brothers, came to my attention as political and civil rights leaders. But only on the television and in the newspapers did I get to know the Stokes family honestly. I never knew that I would have the privilege of serving with one of those Stokes brothers as a Member of Congress.

What an opportunity it has been for me to serve with a remarkable man, someone who, indeed, is a role model for everyone, black or white, rich or poor, an historical figure of the greatest note. And as he said the other day, as was true with Mr. Mollohan and Mr. Walsh, my father had an opportunity to serve with you in the late 1960s. I have been very lucky to have that privilege as the second generation of my family to serve with you.

Thank you for your friendship and for your assistance on the VA-HUD committee.

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

This is a bittersweet moment for me, because as someone who is relatively new to this Congress, I have had the privilege of knowing Lou Stokes for 30 years, but this is the first time I have had a chance to serve with him in the Congress. And I have to tell you, Lou, that I am so grateful that I have had this opportunity, even though I have only been here for a term with you.

Lou Stokes has shown that America’s progress as a Nation is measured not by what we do for the strong, but what we do for the weak; not by what we do for the haves, but what we do for the have-nots. LOU STOKES has shown that America’s progress as a Nation is measured in how we as a Nation have stood up for the rights of minorities, how we have met the test.

And throughout his career, we know that LOU STOKES has met the test in fighting for voting rights, civil rights, education rights, and housing rights. Lou, in doing that, you have helped lift up not only minorities, but you have helped to lift up all people. For instance, because you, LOU STOKES, have ennobled this Congress and this Nation with your public spirited consciousness, with your fight for the right, with your style and with your grace.

I am so glad to call you my friend and to be able to call you my colleague. LOU STOKES helped me get elected mayor of Cleveland 21 years ago and gave me the opportunity to follow in the footsteps of his dear brother, also my dear friend, Carl. And together you and I, Lou, were able to prove that in the big cities, and it has to be true in State and Federal Government as well, political power can, should and must be shared. It is essential in a democracy that political power be shared by all minorities.

Rudyard Kipling once wrote about someone who could walk with kings and never lose the common touch. We see in LOU STOKES’ career that he has walked with people, and I believe that just love him. All across our city, our people are looking for ways to honor his career, and all across our city, people who are aware of this moment, understand why Members of Congress from East to West, from North to South are standing up to sing LOU STOKES’ praises because we know LOU STOKES in Cleveland, and we love LOU STOKES because of what he has done for our city and what he has done for our country.

You know, Lou, there is a test that a lot of us from the inner city make not only of public officials but everybody we meet, and it is a test that is a spiritual test, and we have often heard it. It goes something like this: When I was hungry, did you feed me? LOU STOKES has always helped people in this country. When I was naked, did you clothe me? LOU STOKES has stood up for the dispossessed in this country. When I was homeless, did you shelter me? LOU STOKES has stood up for people when they needed housing. We love you, LOU STOKES, for the work that you have done for our people.

Somewhere in Cleveland today, you can bet on this, not only in Cleveland but in cities across this country, there will be a child living in adverse circumstances, maybe not even having a home. Maybe they are just sitting on a stoop marking the time, wondering if things are ever going to get better in their life, because things are pretty tough right now. Now, that person in America today could be black, could be brown, could be yellow, could be white. And when he or she is sitting there and feeling low, feeling down, wondering what is going to come and if things helped to lift up, beautifying their life, they could think about two young African American children who were born in poverty, who lived in public housing, who, through the grace of God and a mother who worked for them, were able to move through the ranks, come to power, reach the pinnacle, make American history, and they always remembered where they came from.

Children of America, look to LOU STOKES. Look to Carl Stokes. Historically, those are two of the greatest people in American history, and they are people who you can be proud to call Americans and we can be proud to call friends.

And I bless you, LOU STOKES. I love you and I am glad to be here to say this to the American people.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, and to my colleagues gathered here together as a part of the 105th Congress, it gives me a great deal of pleasure and pride and admiration to stand here in tribute to the honorable LOUIS STOKES from the State, from the Buckeye State of Ohio. And Congressman Stokes, my predecessor, Congressman Andrew Jacobs, sends his love. And he told me to remind you of the time you and him both had a date with the Supremes. Something like that. You would remember that. I hope you will understand that you are out with the Supremes, or perhaps where you were. But he said that was a night that he would always remember. I think it was because of LOUIS STOKES and not because of the Supremes, but with the Supremes.

I knew the honorable LOUIS STOKES prior to the time that I became a Member of Congress. LOUIS STOKES’ good works has, like it was said, has been able to shine from sea to shining sea. I have been a long admirer of the Stokes family; Mayor Carl Stokes, Congressman LOUIS STOKES, in particular. He reminded me of a poet in his hard work for the people across this Nation and in instilling pride and hope; that for every drop of rain that falls a flower grows, and nowhere in the darkest night a candle glows. And LOUIS STOKES was certainly that candle that glowed in the very darkest night for so many people who were reaching out for help across this country.

Throughout his life and career, he has courageously confronted very tough circumstances and assignments. He served in the segregated army during World War II, and earned a law degree when few, if any, law firms would consider hiring a man of LOUIS STOKES’ complexion.

He challenged Congressional district minds in Ohio, becoming the first African American Member to serve on the House Committee on Appropriations. He skillfully served in numerous leadership roles in the House, including chairman of the Select Committee on the Presidential Assassination, the Committee on Committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the VA-HUD subcommittee, and the Committee on Appropriations.
Mr. Chairman, the honorable Louis Stokes is widely admired throughout our Nation and our world, and certainly after his retirement the work that he has done for this country will endure. I admire, I appreciate, I am a beneficiary of his outstanding public service. And he reminds me of the psalmist that said that he shall be like a tree that is planted by the river’s water that brings forth fruit in its season. And even though I know that Mr. Stokes’ season has not ended, that all of the beautiful fruit that he has borne throughout his public service will continue to endure for many years to come.

I stand here in a great deal of humility, Congressman Stokes, to say thank you for all that you have done.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. The first thing I want to do is thank the people of Cleveland for sending LOUIS STOKES for those areas. There are very few Americans that cannot be impressed, that cannot be assured that you will never be forgotten here.

When I came, I left the Texas Senate, where we had battles through debate. But LOUIS STOKES has taught me that there is only the work that you do, and he has taught me that without ever saying a word to me on that issue, I simply had to watch him and that taught me.

When you go before the committee where LOUIS STOKES is, it is the most wonderful experience because of his partner, Congressman Lewis, so kind and respectful, that even when you don’t get what you go for, you can’t even get angry because they have been so nice.

But LOUIS STOKES has been steadfast. He has taken care of the very basics for everyone. When it comes to housing, when it comes to education, when it comes to health care, there has never been a time when he has not had his finger right on the mark.

Everyone in those areas throughout this country, notwithstanding their heritage or background or race, know LOUIS STOKES for those areas. There are very few Americans that cannot be very grateful for the many things that he has done. The veterans know about LOUIS STOKES and health care. And of course every single person and every African-American knows that LOUIS STOKES has spoken up for all of the persons who have not; and LOUIS has done it with class, dignity, integrity.

Within our Congressional Black Caucus, we have a little private joke when we talk about the romance between the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) and LOUIS STOKES. She got her before I did because she was on the same committee with him. We are going to miss that. We are going to miss you, Louis.

There has been a replacement for him. There is not a single Member of this body who could tell us about any harsh word that LOUIS STOKES has ever spoken. There is not a Member of this body who could tell us that he ever disrespected them. I do not think there is even a Member of this body, even when he could not deliver on that committee, who would tell us that he has ever hurt their feelings.

It is only during this lifetime that we have such a giant in a body like this. I am grateful for the opportunity to have served with him after admiring him for so many years. And for a committee that pleases so few people, they have discovered their greatest leaders, people that are kind and respectful, smiles on their faces. And I have a feeling that LOUIS STOKES helps to influence all of it.

We are grateful for you, Louis. We thank you. We love you.

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

Mr. DIXON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DIXON. LOUIS, first of all, I would like to thank you for your advice and counsel over the 20 years in which I have served in this House. In listening to the testimony today and the tribute to you, I recognize over those 20 years that I was part of that service and courtesy and friendship to many Members of this House on both sides of the aisle.

I am reminded, LOUS, of Lorraine Hansbury’s writing when she said that “If it is our privilege except for confrontation with the problem to be resolved.” And you and your brother Carl have been confronting and resolving problems for folks of this country for many, many years.

I cannot add much to what all of the Members have said about your fine service to this institution, whether it be on the Intelligence Committee or the House Ethics Committee. But I would like to single out something that I have noticed over the years that other Members have not addressed today, and that is your development of minority staff in this House.

Many Members of this House benefit from fine staff because you first gave them the opportunity, and there are people in government who received their first opportunities, men and women and minorities, because LOUIS STOKES gave them that first opportunity, and probably that will be one of your largest legacies.

I know that as you move on that you will continue the legacy of confronting and resolving problems because you are a man who lives a full life. And I firmly believe, as I think you do, that that is what life is really about.

You will be missed in this House. I know that we will all continue to have your friendship. This institution is better because you served here, and you can be assured that you will never be forgotten.

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

Mr. Chairman, next year the Chicago Bulls may be without their superstar, Michael Jordan. If so, that will be an irreplaceable loss. In the next Congress, we will be without our superstar, my friend, our colleague LOUIS STOKES. That will indeed be an irreplaceable loss.

I know the story of John Henry, the steel-driving man. He built the railroad with his bare hands. When all others and all else failed, John Henry performed. LOUIS STOKES is a modern-day John Henry. He has helped to build this institution, the Congress of the United States, with his bare hands. He has not used fancy gimmicks, high technology, nor futuristic gadgetry. LOUIS STOKES is not that kind of person.

Mr. Chairman, he has helped build this institution with good old-fashioned statesmanship, unblemished credibility, impeccable integrity, honest dealing, and a deep commitment to public service. While we lament the loss of Lou, we rejoice at the grand for his family, his lovely wife, his wonderful children and grandchildren, all of which grew up within the Congress and who he loves dearly.

This son of Cleveland has always been up to the challenge and prepared for the task. But most importantly, when all else failed, when the machines did not work and the mountain would not move, we could always count on Lou. LOUIS STOKES is a steel-driving man.

Born of humble means, throughout his life, Lou refused to accept mediocrity. He had hopes and dreams. He had goals. He had a vision. He dared to be different and determined to make a difference in this society. These qualities carried him through college, through law school, and these qualities compose him today.

But Lou will quickly tell us that, while motivation may have come from within, inspiration from his mother indeed was his mainstay. I am always moved by the account of how his mother struggled to provide a life for him and his brother, yet struggling, she never failed to push him forward, to urge him on, to make him believe in himself and what he could be and become. And he has done his mother proud. He has done us proud.

In more than two decades in Congress, LOUIS STOKES has distinguished himself, making his mark in many places, leaving his permanent imprint in the sands of time.

Tirelessly, he has been a role model for role models and a champion for all. Here he has been more than a Member of Congress. He has been the pulse of what is right, the heartbeat of the downtrodden, the standard bearer of the poor, the personification of the lifeblood for seniors and young people and women and the disenfranchised, the conscience of us all.

He has been especially vigilant in the area of health care, particularly in the minority community. When AIDS confounded most of us, there was one of us...
who confronted it. When disproportionate Federal spending in health care frustrated many of us, there was one among us who stood firm and strong.

When the disparity in mortality rates between majority and minority populations in this country was one of us who met the matter head on.

History, we are told, is a chronological record of significant events. A significant event is an event that is momentous, profound, pivotal, an event that has made a difference in the course of our lives.

I can tell my colleagues, Louis Stokes has been all of that. He has been momentous. He has been profound. And, indeed, he has made a difference in the lives of us who have served with him, a difference in the lives of America. He has made history.

He leaves us now not to quit but to fight another fight, to write another chapter, maybe another book or two, to run another race. We know, as the writer of the best book or two, yet been written, the best races have yet been run.

Yes, the Chicago Bulls will never be the same without Michael Jordan. And I can tell my colleagues, this Congress will not only be the same without superstar Congressman Louis Stokes. I am proud to serve with you.

Ms. MILLER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I stand, too, with my colleagues to say farewell to a giant. I never dreamt that I would be working with such a man, a man whom he has said came from humble beginnings and has stayed humble in spite of becoming a giant.

We recognize that Lou Stokes has soared in terms of an extraordinary attorney, in terms of an extraordinary congressman, in terms of an extraordinary husband and father. Lou Stokes followed in his mother's footsteps. He ensured that his children would be educated. And now he has children who have made marks throughout this country in great ways. But then he did not stop there. Lou Stokes made sure that children of this country got the very best, and he saw to that through legislation.

When I came to this House, I came knowing that I would get the advice and the strength of this great man. He showed me how I could introduce legislation that would help my constituents in terms of AIDS, in terms of bone-marrow transplant, in terms of the myriad of diseases that perplex our communities. Louis Stokes helped me to recognize how I could move through committees and still be humble in my presentations and yet reach a level of success.

Louis Stokes, the man who has been at the Supreme Court in cases that were beside all of us. This is a giant. Mr. Chairman, one whom not only the Congressional Black Caucus has recognized, but by virtue of those who have been on this floor have recognized.

He has touched many hearts and many souls. He has shown us how to be a statesman, a gentleman's gentleman. I am just all the better because I served with him, and I thank him for all of the advice that he has given me.

I thank him for being part of this great body, being a great man. Thank you so much.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thank our friend and colleague, Congressman JERRY LEWIS, for asking me that we may join in a tribute to this very special person who has provided such a high standard of leadership to this House for more than 28 years, a great American, founding member and leader of the Congressional Black Caucus and chair of the Health Braintrust which he established, Congressman Louis Stokes.

As a physician, I had the privilege of nominating Congressman Stokes for the Dr. Nathan Davis Award of the American Medical Association. I am pleased to report that the AMA demonstrated its great astuteness and insight in accepting this nomination and naming him as the 1998 recipient of this prestigious and well-deserved award.

Although he has already received our highest honor in 1994, I also look forward to being present on August 1 in New Orleans, when the National Medical Association, of which I am a member, again honors Congressman Stokes for his years of exemplary service and unwavering commitment to this country.

For all his work, his service on the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, for the Underground Railroad, and especially to me for his service on the Pepper Economics, the Labor-Health Human Services-Education Subcommittee, and the Health Braintrust of the Congressional Black Caucus, he will leave a significant, far-reaching and enduring legacy. He served at the end of the 105th Congress, a legacy of legislation and programs which have served to elevate the level and the standard of health and health care not only for people of color but all Americans.

And, so, I am pleased to stand here to thank you, Congressman Stokes, for many reasons. As a newer Member, I want to thank you for your stellar example and unselfish willingness to teach and to guide as I and others assumed our places in this great body.

I thank you for your work on VA-HUD and especially for your contribution to our veterans. I thank you for your legacy of decency, compassion, candor, integrity, and fairness.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) for allowing us to pay homage to our colleague. It is important that I come on the floor today, Mr. Stokes, to say to you, when I think of Lou Stokes, I think of bravery, selflessness, of honesty, of character, of fight. A distinguished gentleman, a legislator extraordinaire and a man of principle and strength. It is important, Lou, that as you have heard and sat through this hour and a half, you know here, though you physically will leave here, what you have taught each of us in your integrity and strength will live.

As someone said before me, this body will be a better body. Lou Stokes put 30 years here. I watched you as I served in the Michigan legislature for 18 years. You certainly for me provided the insight and the intelligence that I needed to be a strong legislator, to speak up and to speak out, and to really represent those who sent us here.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know as I know your son Chuck and as he serves in our Detroit community, both he and Turkey that we see Lou Stokes in them, that in them and as we grow our children, all that we would want is that they too represent the intelligent and serve their God. Mr. Stokes, I am here to tell you that your son in Detroit does just that. And that as you leave this body, Mr. Stokes, health care, our veterans, our housing and those things that you fought for for nearly 30 years, we will continue the battle.

So go on, Mr. Chairman. Your wife deserves it, and certainly your grandchildren deserve it. And from the bottom of my heart, just that as you leave this body, Mr. Stokes, health care, our veterans, our housing and those things that you fought for for nearly 30 years, we will continue the battle.

I thank you especially on behalf of minority physicians, the poor and people of color for four decades. The hours, the couple of hours, has made an indelible mark on this institution. Throughout the years he has stood as a superior example for social advocates and activists.
In the heat of the civil rights movement, he triumphed as the first African-American from the State of Ohio to be elected to Congress.

When I was here as a staff member for my predecessor, this goes back to 1975, when you were then during those early years appointed to the House Select Committee on Assassinations where you served as chair and disclosed valuable information about the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Lou Stokes always sought the truth. I marveled at how he handled and chaired that committee. His invariable influence guided many of us to stand up for underrepresented Americans, young and old, poor, black, white, yellow and red. His work has torn down barriers to health care and has saved lives. Congressman Stokes opened doors that would have been closed and expanded access that otherwise would have been denied. He is really what Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. would have dreams of, for justice. He was a trailblazer of the Congressional Black Caucus's reform efforts to reform health care. His Underground Railroad Network Freedom Act, an act to establish a memorial for African-American slaves, finally bringing them the honor that is long overdue, is historic.

Last weekend I had the privilege to visit Seneca Falls and Rochester, New York with Congresswoman Louise Slaughter. This is an area whose many stops were on this underground railroad. Lou, I just want to thank you for your vision and your hard work. We all have got to ensure that this important history is preserved. Without your leadership, this institution would not be the same.

Congressman Stokes leaves a rich legacy that will bring lasting change which has made a tremendous difference in the lives of all Americans. Today I just stand here to say thank you, Lou Stokes, thank you on behalf of the 9th Congressional District. I want to thank you for your tireless service, for your mentoring, for your guidance, for your feedback, for all of your assistance that you have provided to me as a new Member of Congress.

Great challenges are ahead for all of us. But the ground that you have laid really provides a firm foundation from which we can meet those challenges. I wish you the best. I am confident that this journey of a life is going to be extremely exciting. God bless you.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I do want to buy time today. I was in my office, Congressman Stokes, and busy with paperwork, but I said, oh, this paperwork can wait. And so I rushed here hopefully to arrive in time to say a few things from the heart about Lou Stokes.

We all know this famous quote. If it has been repeated to this body earlier in the discussion, I apologize; but it bears repeating, because it applies so well to our colleague, Louis Stokes and we have all been expressing these same sentiments. It is the famous quote by one of your Democratic predecessors, Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota: "The moral test of government is how it treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; and those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly." That clearly depicts what Lou Stokes' life has been all about. You have contributed to that moral standard of government, Congressman. We are going to miss you terribly.

I must say that I did not have the privilege of working on the committee with Lou Stokes, but when I was ranking member on the Housing subcommittee, I knew that any of the good things we wanted to do in housing, we had to depend upon Lou Stokes' good word and courage and foresight to be able to implement those programs and programs from legislation into real action in real communities. I am sorry I could not work with you more directly, Lou, but I certainly was one of your admirers and one who appreciated everything you did in the housing area. But I want to repeat to you something that I think is more overshadowing of all that we do on a day-to-day basis, and, that is, how we as a Congress address the real needs of the American people and the manner in which we do it and the moral standards that we adhere to when we do it. I will repeat to you something that I just heard recently, not from a constituent of mine but someone I know from the Northeast who is a small businessman, has a construction company, and I have known him for many years, and his wife has a realty business. They are good, strong Republicans. Lou, but you would like them. This gentleman said to me recently when I asked him, over the fourth of July recess, the question of work and the children. Should I take back to those inside-the-Beltway types down in Washington? Without any hesitation, this conservative Republican said to me, "Well, Congresswoman, would you please go back and tell them that we should get rid of the bitter partisanship and return civility to our national government and the way we are conducting the people's business and deal with the issues that count for the American people." But having said all that and these accolades and these testimonial, being given to you, Lou, I thought that is exactly what this man meant. Lou Stokes is the kind of person that this businessman was talking about. Lou always stood on principles—you always have. Lou, and you adhere to when we deplore these qualities of civility and democracy and demonstrating your respect for everyone.

Lou, we need more people like you. We all need more Lou Stokess. We all need more Lou Stokess. We are going to miss you terribly. But I hope that in everyone's mind, the image of Lou Stokes as that kind of moral being who added stature to the business of government will be remembered. We will try to follow in your footsteps. God bless you and best wishes to you always, and to your family.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today and take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to an unusual human being. I am delighted to be a part of this tribute, because long before I came to the Congress of the United States of America, I knew who Lou Stokes was. But, of course, most African-Americans in this country not only knew who Lou Stokes was, they knew about Lou Stokes and Carl Stokes. Because Lou Stokes and his brother Carl were pioneers. They were in the forefront of African-Americans getting elected to important and high offices. Most of us who watched them from afar aspired to be like them. They let it be known that they were prepared to work hard, to do what was necessary to provide leadership to this Nation. And so they helped pave the way for us. We have watched and we have appreciated his work for many years.

He was a friend of my husband's long before I met my husband in Cleveland. My husband played for the Cleveland Browns. My husband as a football player had to have mentors and those that he looked up to. And, of course, it was Lou and Carl. They were the shining examples not only of what those who wanted to be elected officials would like to be but for all of the young men in America who were aspiring to realize their full potential. It was the Lou and the Carl Stokes of the world who helped them to understand what they could be, and what they should be.

And so I want you to know, when I came to the Congress of the United States, I came with full knowledge and appreciation for Lou Stokes. And as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I stepped into this role and this position behind many great individuals. Lou Stokes was one of those. He took over the chairmanship of the Caucus in 1972, and he served in 1972, 1973 and 1974 following the resignation of Mr. Diggs. And he set the tone. And he helped to make the rules. This was after he had helped to found the Congressional Black Caucus. They set the tone, they made the rules, and they determined where it was going to go, and what we should do, those of us coming behind the life of this National Congress of the United States of America.

And so in my work today, I have to ask myself almost on a daily basis, what would Lou Stokes do in this case, in this situation.

What must I do to follow in that tradition? How must I make decisions that will make him proud of me and my work? So I have to look at what he has done.

Let me just say for the Congressional Black Caucus, we look to him for guidance all the time. When we are going down the wrong path, we will get a
Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes, but I have long admired LOUIS STOKES. I remember many, many years ago when I was in grade school and I read about LOUIS STOKES. And he has been in public life when he had to struggle for LOU to be elected. It was the real struggle for LOU to do the things that he wanted to do.

I have got to tell you there is an old saying down home where I come from, when we live out in the country, and if you had a chance to get away for a weekend or go somewhere, there was always a neighbor around that you would look to and you would say I want to get them and come in and look after my things. And LOUIS STOKES is the kind of a guy that I would trust to come in and keep my house key and do up and look after my things. He is that kind of a man.

I cannot say enough good things about LOUIS STOKES. His legacy will live in this country and all over the world. A very dear friend of mine in North Carolina, he has passed on now, and he always said in closing his statements, and I will say this to LOU, LOU, I hope you live as long as you want and never want as long as you live. Thank you so much.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say thank you to a man who is a living legend, a gentleman, a man who is not only an African-American hero, but a true American hero. For surely I do not believe that I would be standing here today in this august body as a Member of the United States House of Representatives if it was not for the trailblazing work of Carl and LOUIS STOKES.

I remember, while in high school, maybe it was junior high school, when Carl and LOUIS STOKES began to run for the office of city council member. And as a young boy, I would scratch my head and say, why can we not do that in New York? That was the beginning of me having an opportunity to admire, look up to, having an idol, and having a hero and a role model in LOUIS STOKES.

I can recall attending the great Howard University School of Law; and while in evidence class, my professor was talking about the landmark case of George Washington and the Ohio, and as soon as you know that there is a man that works over in the Capitol that was one of the attorneys on this landmark case? That was LOUIS STOKES.

I can recall attending my first Congressional Black Caucus weekend. Sitting in the seat and watching Mr. STOKES move about and being in awe. Little did I know that, at that time, that I would be having the pleasure and the opportunity of saying that I served, though ever so briefly, with Louis STOKES.

I recall when Willie Mays was traded to the New York Mets, there was a rookie on the team at that time. In the newspapers, they were asking the rookie, when he took his first step at the plate, was he nervous? How did he feel? All he said was, I did not even think about stepping up to the plate. I just remember sitting next to Willie Mays.

Well, I can say that my first experience here, and being next to this giant man in LOUIS STOKES, I shall always remember for the rest of my life. But to have that privilege to be able to tell my children and my grandchildren, and, hopefully, they can tell their children, that their great grandfather had the opportunity to serve with an individual who changed the course of history in America is an opportunity that I could not pass.

I thank God for that opportunity. I thank God for the legend, for the man who epitomizes what a legislator should be, who talks the talk, walks the walk, and the main thing is gets results.

My predecessor, I asked him before I came, I said, you have been successful, what was he nervous? How did he feel? How would you able to accomplish such things? He said, "Well, LOUIS STOKES." He said, "Take advantage of all that you can while he is there."

The biggest loss to the House of Representatives that we will have is losing LOUIS STOKES. I say to my hero, may God continue to bless you. Keep walking on. I am so thankful I have had the opportunity to serve with you. Mr. CHAIRMAN, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to forget in the span of 30 years what 1968 was like. It was an extraordinary time in America. It was a time of great difficulty and great promise.

In Cleveland, Ohio, the great promise was the light that was lighted by the Stokes brothers. We have heard much said about that. It is a light that has been a beacon that has stretched across the span of 30 years.

But I would like to illuminate 1968 from a different point of view. 1968, the year that LOU STOKES was elected to Congress, the year that his brother
served in his first year as mayor of Cleveland was, indeed, a troubled time.

In some ways, it was more difficult than even some of the problems that we face today. That is not to minimize the problems that we face, but that was the time that I began to teach at Cleveland Central Junior High School across the street from the oldest public housing project in the United States, not far from where Louis and Carl Stokes grew up and established their roots and blossomed into the kind of leaders that they became.

But on that November morning in 1968, following the election of Louis Stokes to the United States Congress, in the first classes that I taught at Cleveland Central, the kids came into that class filled with conversation about what this meant in their lives. It was a vague sense, it was an unformed sense, but it was brightened by the hope and aspirations that were giving new meaning and new life even to those that had the problems that this Nation had endured since the Second World War. It was a vision of hope.

We have heard a great deal said today about the enormity of the model that Louis Stokes established for Cleveland, for the people all across the Nation in very large ways. But just let me say to my colleagues that those 600 kids that I had the privilege of teaching across the street from that housing project and who came in that classroom that morning and said yes, you know, he is from our neighborhood, the opportunities that have been given to them as a product of the model that Louis Stokes has represented is more than that.

It is not only the model and the example, it is the real world opportunity, not only to run for office but, as we have heard, to undertake careers unthought of before, careers in law, in medicine, in research, in science, and industry, as important careers as policemen and as firemen and working in places that they might a generation before never have had the opportunity to work.

That is not just a model. That is day-in and day-out effort to live in places of decency and cleanliness, to grow up in cities that are safe, to have access to what we speak frequently of as the finest health care delivery system in the world, means little if you do not have somewhere to live.

It has meant a time in which we have seen the life-span of Americans increase 10 years in the last 30 and even more than that for African-Americans. That is a contribution of enormous effort that saw its light bloom in the lives of hundreds of kids across the City of Cleveland as they came back to school that morning the first Wednesday after the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of 1968.

The lives that I began teaching in ways large and small, and they will change the lives of others in ways that will spread throughout a Nation. It has been because of the work of Lou Stokes and the example that he has set for so many others. It has been a privilege to serve with him, and we look forward to his guidance for years to come.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know Lou Stokes well enough to know that he now is very uncomfortable, and I am not going to take five minutes making him more uncomfortable, because the more amazing things we say about him, the more uncomfortable Lou will become, and I can see him squirming in his seat now with discomfort.

I met this man, and I am sure Lou does not remember this, before I came to Congress, in Charlotte, North Carolina, when he was visiting with friends there and visiting his daughter, who was an anchor person in Charlotte. Neither Lou nor I had any expectation that I would ever be a member of Congress. I remember going away that evening after having met him saying, "That is a really nice guy." I was not a colleague, I did not even know him. And I think it is that quality that people pick up on that says something about Lou Stokes.

It is easy to be nice to people that you know and respect as your equal, that you can relate to and feel comfortable, but it takes a special person, a humble person, to respect and be nice to everybody, and I have yet to ever see Lou Stokes not be nice to anybody.

It is that quality that I think I respect and love about Lou Stokes and that I will always remember, and that is a personal feeling that I have about it. That aspect of it I cannot ever get away from. Aside from all of the wonderful things he has accomplished, I just know that this man is humble enough and respects the views and respects other people enough to always be nice to them. I just want to tell him how much I have enjoyed his friendship and being in the same body with him. I will yield back, so as not to continue to make him more uncomfortable, and I am not going to take five minutes making him more uncomfortable.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to join the chorus of statements about our colleague and friend that this is not an ordinary member of Congress, when you see the number of people coming in to speak today.

I just want to say from my own memories, for people who are interested in the struggle for justice in America, in the second year of high school we learned who Lou Stokes was. Again, with great names like Mo Udall and others, he served in Congress. Like many of the people here, I never expected to have the privilege of serving with him.

I think my friend is correct, he is a little uncomfortable in this position and the time we are taking, but I would think that everyone recognizes the 30 year contribution, not just being here, but the contribution you have made to this government, to this country and its people, is well deserving of the praise. I am just privileged to have spent the last 38 years here serving this country. Like many others, I have admired your ability to fight hard, stay civil and stay committed to the things you believe in.

Thank you very much.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am also very pleased to rise in this tribute to my good and long time friend and colleague, Congressman Lou Stokes, who has really been an inspiration to me personally and such a hero to many people throughout this country, including myself.

At a time when public cynicism about elected officials runs so rampant, Congressman Stokes has been the embodiment of all that is good and positive about public service. During a political year marked by bitterness and animosity, Lou Stokes has remained a model of decorum, diligence, dignity and a fierce commitment to the task of improving the quality of life for millions of Americans.

He has been there to fight the good fight on behalf of better housing, access to quality education, a cleaner environment, the protection of benefits for veterans and for senior citizens, those who are the most vulnerable among us.

Even before my election to Congress, I had the pleasure of getting to know Congressman Stokes and his late brother, Carl, who served as Mayor of Cleveland and later Ambassador to the Seychelles.

As you know, it was Congressman Stokes who managed that election in the late sixties, and it was his skill and Carl's ability that made that election successful, the first major city in the eastern part of the United States to elect an African-American mayor, at a time when there was a tremendous amount of civil unrest. In my City of Newark, in 1967, there was a rebellion and 28 people were killed. So it was a time of great tenseness. But it took a combination of a Lou Stokes managing and a Carl Stokes, descendants of slaves, but opposing a descendant of a former president, if my facts are correct.

So Mr. Stokes has done so much. My brother Bill, who is now a New Jersey assemblyman, and I were fortunate to form a friendship and working relationship with Lou and Carl, and we certainly were deeply saddened by Carl's passing in 1996.

Congressman Stokes has been a true friend, going the extra mile, and never asking anything in return. When I decided to run for the prestigious and awesome position of Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus in 1993 to serve in the 104th Congress, I went to
Congressman Stokes and said I was interested and sought his approval. He simply gave me advice and encouraged me to move forward. He said, “It is going to be a tough election, but, more importantly, if you are successful, it is going to be a tough position, and if you are not ready, don’t seek it.” I assured him I was ready, and, once I was elected, I always looked to Mr. Stokes for guidance.

Recently on an occasion I had the privilege of a few months and for Mr. Stokes to visit my district. He was kind enough to accept an invitation to be a guest speaker at an event in my honor. Mr. Stokes is very punctual, and he got to my city about an hour early. I had to rush and speed up to meet him at the airport. We decided, since we were early, we had a few moments, and stopped by a local eatery in my district called Mrs. Dee’s.

Well, I go there often, but I never get the excitement that I got when Congress Stokes and I met in my district who did not know who I was ran up, and I said gee, I guess I am moving up in my recognition factor. And they all rushed right by me to grab Congressman Stokes and said, “We want to see you.” I looked around, and the place went by me to just shake the hand of Congressman Stokes. That is the type of person he is. We were so honored, because he is a man of humble beginnings.

Recently many of you may know he received an award for being one of the most prestigious “graduates,” I guess we could say, from public housing, and that was a great honor, to be recognized in this country as a person who really looked out for the little guy, for those struggling on a daily basis to hold their lives together, to provide for their children.

When I walk through my district, I see visible reminders of what Lou Stokes has done during his years in Congress. As a senior member of the House Committee on Appropriations, Congressman Stokes’ door was always open. When I sought his assistance for initiatives of importance to my constituents, because of his efforts, we have been able to make improvements in housing, to restore a public park known as Weequahic Park, to help abandoned infants and children stricken with HIV, to train students for health and science-related work at a site of the Illinois Science Park, to take a rundown and economically distressed area and turn it into a revitalized waterfront, and now we have a world class performing arts center.

Congressman Stokes has been a tireless defender of what is right and just. He has made an enormous contribution to the field of health care, notably minority health issues, which have been shortchanged for so many years.

Mr. Chairman, today as we honor our friend Lou Stokes and Jay, his wonderful wife, but we know that he will continue to use his talents and to voice his concerns long after he leaves this institution. We wish him well as he enters the next phase of his life, and we thank him for all he has done for this institution and for his country.

When this Congressional Record is printed tonight, when I receive my copy tomorrow, I am going to have copies sent to my local libraries, and we are going to have copies made to distribute to students in my district who feel shut out, who feel that they cannot make it. I am going to ask teachers to use this Congressional Record with the idea that they can understand how many great African American persons are still amongst us.

Mr. Rush, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening because I have Lou Stokes on my mind and Lou Stokes in my heart. I never met a man who exudes the kind of quiet leadership, the kind of quiet power, who has ever exuded the kind of excellence that Lou Stokes exudes on a day-to-day basis. Lou Stokes’ quiet leadership has endured throughout his tenure in this body. We have heard other Members talk about his soft-spokenness, but even that soft-spoken voice, his message has resounded beyond the halls of this Congress.

When he speaks, his views contain a depth of knowledge and understanding and compassion that is unsurpassed. Lou Stokes has been an unwavering knight fighting on behalf of the underserved, those who have no voice, those who are outcast in this society. He has used a sword of public consciousness to slay the dragon of indifference. No matter what the issue is, whether it is housing, health care, civil rights, he has always remained at the roundtable of courage. Lou Stokes, Mr. Chairman, is an individual that you cannot help but love and respect.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that God almighty ordains us, calls us to different types of ministries, and I believe that God has called Lou Stokes to the ministry of public service. I know that Lou Stokes has answered that call, because I know that people who right now feel as though they have no friend at all in government, who feel as the government does not represent them, does not care about them, I know that they all feel a certain affinity and love and respect for Lou Stokes, because Lou Stokes goes against the grain.
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He stands up and represents those who are down, those who are dispossessed, those who are outcasts. I have such a profound respect for Lou Stokes, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot even express it in words. I have such a love for this man, for his quiet strength, for his quiet surety.

Mr. Chairman, he is like still water that runs deep. He is a man who has compassion and understanding. He serves as an example for us all, Mr. Chairman, and for all of those young men, poor young men who feel a certain hostility toward the world because the world has not shown any love and compassion to them. Lou Stokes serves as an example for those who are discriminated against and fighting for those who were victims of prejudice and biases. This young man joined an organization at that time, the Black Panther Party, that was a very controversial organization, and indeed, this organization stood for defending itself against one of the many issues that confronted people, police brutality, in the city of Chicago. This was in the late 1960s.

There was an altercation with members of the Chicago police department. Two members of this organization were killed and 7 members were wounded. Young people 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 years old who found themselves in this organization felt as though the world had turned upside down, the world had turned on them. The law enforcement agencies of this country had aimed their mass weaponry at these individuals. They did not know which way to turn, looking at the military might of the law enforcement agencies of this Nation. After Fred Hampton and Mark Clark were killed, chaos reigned, fear reigned.

Mr. Chairman, at a certain moment in time in Chicago, Illinois on the West Side, Lou Stokes led a contingency of black Congressmen into Chicago to find out what was going on, to expose the injustices that existed at that time, and, Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues today that his courage in leading that group of Congressmen into Chicago deflected the bullets that were aimed at those members of that organization.

I say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that this is only 2 members of that delegation that serve in the Congress today: The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Clay) and the gentleman from Cleveland (Mr. Stokes).

This 22-year-old young man who found himself as a member of that organization at that time, the Black Panther Party, now finds himself as a colleague of Lou Stokes in the United States Congress. And I know, Mr. Chairman, that if not for Lou Stokes, he would not have led here if Lou Stokes had not taken a moment out of his busy life to visit the West Side of Chicago to find out for himself what was going on.
That if, indeed, he had not armed himself with the shield of public consciousness and with a shield of public opinion to deflect those bullets, then I would not be here today.

Mr. Chairman, since I have become a member of Congress, and in one life I have led a pretty full life, I have seen all types of individuals who call themselves leaders, who want people to follow them wherever they may lead. But Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, there is only one kind of leader there is, that quality that means so much that people will follow, and that is the quality that Lou Stokes has.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, he is a quiet warrior, but a very, very effective warrior. He is not a flash in the pan, he is a person who endures. His example will be a beacon light for all of those who follow; his example will be a beacon light for all young men in America who want to rise above their conditions and become and assume the mantle of greatness.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just about a week or so ago, I told Congressman Stokes that I had brought remarks for this occasion. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Stokes, I really do not want to say goodbye, and that is the honest to God truth.

On the day that Congressman Stokes was born, February 23, 1925, there was no African-American representation in the United States Congress. In fact, there had not been for a quarter of a century since January 1 of 1901, when George White of South Carolina said that, “One day, Phoenix-like, we will be back.” There had been 22 African-Americans that had served in Congress between 1870 and 1901, the first Congressional Black Caucus, but we did not return until Oscar DePriest, a Republican, was elected to Congress from the Buckeye State of Ohio. I am or as the politics were known 130 years ago, the butternut State of Ohio. I am the 91st African-American ever elected to Congress. Congressman Stokes was elected to the 91st Congress and has served 15 consecutive terms 30 years since then. I was 3 years old when he came to this institution.

For perspective, there are been 11,544 Americans to serve in Congress, and only 103 African-Americans have ever had the privilege of serving in the Congress and in the Senate. Of the 103 African-Americans who have served in Congress, Lou Stokes, Mr. Stokes, is a world historical figure.

As a founding member of the second and current Congressional Black Caucus and as the Chairman of the CBC’s Brain Trust on Health, he is the leading African for addressing health care needs in African-American communities. To his leadership on the special Committee on Intelligence, investigating the possible consipiratorial deaths of Martin Luther King, Jr. and President John F. Kennedy, to his current role as the third ranking minority member, to Appropriations, to the ranking minority members of the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies, to his 11th ranking seniority among all members in his 30th ranking membership amongst all Democrats, to the recent passage on June 9, 1998 of H.R. 1633, the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Act, he has been a good man and an effective legislator.

With elections every 2 years for 435 Members of this body, some Members come and go having never left their mark or impacting the lives of their constituents. But as a result of his 10 tours is under the name ``Mr. Lou'' people can grow up with greater expectations and brighter futures, with more health care options, with better affordable housing options and more equal educational opportunities.

I am going to say thank you to Lou Stokes. Thank you because there have been in his 30 years no letdowns, no scandals, no public embarrassment, no funny money, nothing that has shamed us all. Nothing that is associated with the name ``Mr. Lou'' that brings a lack of dignity to those of us who long so hard for the opportunity to serve. So, I cannot honor Mr. Stokes enough.

When I first came to Congress all of my colleagues said, please call me by my first name because we are colleagues now. Chairman Lewis says, call me Jerry and Ray Lahood says, call me Ray, and Roemer says, call me Tim, and others want to be called by their Members. I always called Chairman Stokes Mr. Stokes. Why? Because I cannot thank him enough for all the health care that he has fought for, for all of the options that he has fought to open up America for more people; I cannot thank him for every affordable housing fight that he participated in. I cannot thank him for every dollar that he appropriated for historically black colleges. I cannot thank him enough for all that he has done for so many families, for people that do not even know his name, I cannot say thank you enough. So the only way that I have honored Mr. Stokes is by calling him Mr. Stokes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked the Chair to ascertain how many speakers remain so that we can divide the time? The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would request that all individuals wishing to speak so notify. Apparently 5, the Chair would like to name the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Five people, all right.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain to my colleagues. All we need is to know how many people want to speak and then we will divide the time equally so that everyone gets a fair shot at it.

The CHAIRMAN. The responsibility of counting has been left to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Well, I see 140.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I will get a list and I will yield to everyone 1 minute.

I could start by yielding 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Jefferon).
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Mr. Jefferon. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say something to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes) tonight. I will not have time enough to say all that I want to say, but it is time enough to bring an end, someone had to, a merciful end, to this line of tribute to the gentleman.

Lou, I want to say what has struck me most about you is your capability for love for all of your colleagues, for the institutions that has served us all so well, the Congressional Black Caucus and the many other institutions here, and for the institution of Congress itself. That you have a great and enduring sense of humor. You and I find time to laugh on this floor all the time, and you have proven you can have fun and get something done and that while we have serious business to conduct, we do not have to take ourselves too seriously.

You have been deeply concerned about affecting the lives of other people's lives, and you worked hard and actually did that.

The children who have lived in public housing over the years, and who live there now, people who are aspiring to get a house for the first time with the
help of your committee, and the veterans who have given so much to their country are benefiting from what you have done. Long after you are gone, not generally from this place but from this Earth, there will be folks whose lives have grown out of your life. You have made a difference from that respect.

Lou, you are the best example of a Congressman that I have encountered in this body and I hope that in some small way I could be an example for others who have been to all of this.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Stokes well knows, there is not one of us that did not want to come to the floor and share with him his life, his life history and his eloquence.

Mr. Stokes, you were elected to this Congress in 1968, the year of the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy. You also rose to the highest heights of arguing in the United States Supreme Court; you eloquently made the argument that just because of the color of your skin, you should not have to be discriminated against when it comes to streets and highways and byways of this Nation without any rhyme or reason. The Supreme Court agreed with you.

I thank you for who you are. You knew I claimed you long ago as a mentor. When I came to the Select Committee on Assassinations, it was your kindly demeanor that encouraged me as a young committee staff attorney to become involved in public service. You have no shame of being an African-American. I think the fact that we come here and say you are the first of this and the first of that, there is no shame because you have led the way.

On behalf of black institutions like Texas Southern University and other such schools in the Nation I thank you for being the father of traditionally black colleges. And all of America thanks you for helping the least of our brothers and sisters, whether they are in Appalachia or Cleveland or Houston or Los Angeles or New York. You made sure they were housed, you made sure they were fed, and you made sure they had good medical care.

To your wife, Jay, and the family, I say we love you and we believe that this Nation's fabric will be woven with your legacy.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis).

Mr. Davis of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to echo the sentiments that have already been expressed by all of my colleagues, that Lou Stokes has no peer when it comes to service, dedication, and generosity.

We have all heard of all of his accolades, I guess Kipling must have been thinking about him when he penned those words that said, "If you can walk with kings and not lose the common touch, if all men matters with you, but none too much." And finally Lou, "If you can feel the unforgotten moment with 60 seconds worth of distance run, yours will be the world and all that is in it. And what is more, you are sure so to protect it." And Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi).

Ms. Pelosi. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, although I have only had the privilege of serving with Mr. Stokes for the past 11 years, our families go way back. And so it is a personal as well as congressional privilege to rise and pay homage to him.

Since the time has been shortened, I will have to associate myself with the remarks of our colleagues who have gone before and just to say that the Stokes name is legendary in my family. My brother, Thomas D'Alesandro, III, and I, and my family in the late 1960s and 1970s, those difficult urban years. Carl Stokes was one of the first black mayors of a big American city, mayor of Cleveland.

And Lou Stokes, there are some people who were just born with a majestic grace and those of us who are fortunate to work with them know who they are. Every day that we come to work we learn from you. Every day that we come to work we are inspired by your fight for people with AIDS in the minority community, your fight for economic and social justice, the lessons you teach us on how to resolve conflict in a gracious manner.

I always say that the greatest tribute to Mr. Stokes, your mother, is the wonderful public life and private lives of Carl and Lou Stokes. Carl went on to be ambassador to the Seychelles. And now my daughter is a friend of young Carl Stokes in California, so the tradition goes on.

Mr. Chairman, although I have only had the privilege of serving with Mr. Stokes for the past 11 years, our family goes way back. And so it is a personal as well as congressional privilege to rise and pay homage to him.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Roemer).

Mr. Roemer. Mr. Stokes, I think you knew a lot about somebody by the company they keep and by the family and the service that they have provided to this country. You come from such a distinguished family. You are the brother Carl Stokes and you have been the epitome of a public servant.

I remember going before the Committee on Appropriations not too long ago as a freshman and testifying on Close-up and TRIO. It was a long day. You had heard probably 10 or 11 hours of testimony, but when somebody testified about helping kids and the underprivileged, you perked up. You asked all kinds of questions and you said, "We have to support those programs." That was the example that Lou Stokes showed to me.

You have also always stood up for the economically disenfranchised, for the emotionally discouraged, and you have lived Bobby Kennedy's slogan: When one of us prospers, we all prosper. When one of us fail so do we all.

You have ensured so much prospering on the part of the underprivileged and the underprivileged in our system. We all thank you and salute you.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. Towns).

Mr. Towns. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join my colleagues in expressing my views and my feelings about Lou Stokes.

Lou Stokes is a very interesting person. He has the ability to persuade. I remember some years ago when I was chair of the Congressional Black Caucus that a group in Cleveland had invited me to speak. I indicated to them on the phone that I could not do it. I sent them a later indicating that I could not do it, and then I had my staff to tell them that I could not do it. And I said, "I am from Cleveland." But I have a problem. I have already sent them a letter." And he said, "I am sure you could straighten that out."

Mr. Chairman, I must admit I sent them a letter saying it was a mistake. I would be coming. I want people to know that Lou Stokes is very interesting in a lot of ways.

Also, another thing I would like to comment about the gentleman, being around this body here now for 36 years and watching Members, Lou is special in another way. When you ask Lou for help, he does not do like a lot of Members in this body, call a press conference on you. Lou is not the kind of person that when you ask for help he calls a press conference and then when he indicates he is going to help you he calls a big process conference. And then if he does it, he calls a real big one.

He is not like that. Lou Stokes is the kind of guy that very quietly will do whatever he can to do to make life better for you as a Member and your constituents.

Lou, we will miss you in this body. In all the years that I have been here I would be coming. I want people to know that Lou Stokes is very special. What a man. What a man. We will miss you.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Waxman).

Mr. Waxman. Mr. Chairman, I have been in and out of the Chambers for the last several hours waiting for an opportunity to come in and say a few words. This has really been unprecedented to see so many Members want to come and pay tribute to their colleague. One minute is inadequate but so would 5 minutes be inadequate to say the kinds of things that Lou Stokes deserves to hear.
Different Members leave different imprints for their service. Few Members can match the difference that Lou Stokes has made in this country and in this institution.

First of all, as a colleague, he has always represented people. His leadership, his intelligence, his dedication to public service stand out and he will always be an inspiration to all of us. He has made a great difference to people not just in his district but all around the country when it comes to questions like education on health care and environmental questions. I think that it is important for us to pay tribute to him.

I want to take this moment to thank him for his friendship. He will always serve to me as a model for what a legislator ought to be.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Barrett of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly pay tribute to one of my heroes, too. Mr. Stokes is just a tremendous, tremendous person. Earlier this year I spoke, following Maxine Waters, and Congresswoman Stokes, to a group here in the Capitol that explained to the people, following Maxine Waters and Lou Stokes, you are the two people in this Capitol that are unique. One could heat this place up faster than anybody and the other could cool this place down faster than anybody. Those are both valuable tools and they are wonderful tools to have.

He is a man I have tremendous respect for, just tremendous respect, because he is a kind person and he treats people with respect. He treats issues with integrity and that to me is the most important thing a person can bring to this chamber.

So when you go home tonight, Lou, I want you to think about Sally Fields when she said that Oscar and you can say, you do not have to say it here but you can say it there, you can say they really liked me because, Lou, we really like you.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say I know that this has taken a long time tonight and I know that it has made some people nervous who want to get on with the business of the House. All I want to say is, with all of the matters that come before this House that divide us, I think it is good and crucial that from time to time we have moments of grace like this which make this place in the end a much better place for all of us to work in.

Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to pay tribute to a great friend and a valued colleague. Lou Stokes has been a trailblazer and, indeed, he blazed the trail for me and many others who have struggled against racism, prejudice and economics. Since 1968, Congressman Stokes has dedicated himself to fighting for economic and social justice for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, color or gender.

While he has been a steadfast champion for the rights and welfare of his constituents in Cleveland, he has been no less dedicated in his pursuit of equality and fairness for all of America—the world’s—disenfranchised, downtrodden and persecuted people. I looked to the House of Representatives for the first time in when I took my oath of office in 1979 and found I was a member of an underclass. I have relied on Mr. Stokes for advice and council, for guidance on how to increase my effectiveness as a representative of my constituents. He has always been unfailing helpful and generous with his time and support. Congressman Stokes possesses an amazing ability to bring clarity to debates, to cut to the heart of the issue that is being debated. He possesses an equally special talent for offering fair and equitable solutions to problems that seemingly are intractable. His knowledge, wisdom and leadership will be sorely missed in Congress by Democrats and Republicans.

In considering the sadness of Congressman Lou Stokes’ retirement from Congress, we should recognize that Lou is a true champion of standing up for these beliefs. I have the pleasure of working closely with Lou Stokes and his dedicated staff on the Underground Railroad legislation. This legislation will create the first link of sites connected to the Underground Railroad, many of which are in danger of being lost. During our three years of work on this legislation, I have seen the benefits of his guidance and counsel. Lou was willing to make this effort a completely bipartisan one. His commitment to the passage of the legislation never wavered, and President Clinton signed the bill this week.

Lou’s accomplishments are numerous. He successfully argued a landmark case before the U.S. Supreme Court. He served as Chairman of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, Chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and Chairman of the House Select Committee on Assassinations. Most importantly, he met the needs of his constituents as only a true public servant could do. I have seen firsthand the enormous respect Lou has both at home and interstate. All of us in Congress will greatly miss him.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Chairman, as we debate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999, I rise to pay tribute to Representative Lou Stokes for his twenty years of dedicated work on the subcommittee responsible for much of the work on this bill each year. Representative Stokes has always been a stout defender of the progressive and innovative efforts included in this legislation which seek to provide more Americans with the opportunity to fulfill their dreams.

Representative Stokes’ career on the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations has left a mark forever on this House, and most importantly, on the lives of countless American families. I wish him luck and Godspeed in his well-earned retirement.

Mr. Gilman. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues to pay tribute to a Member of this body who will soon be leaving us but who will long be remembered.

Lou Stokes first came to Congress in 1969. In many ways, America was a different nation and this chamber was a different body back then. The concept that all Americans, regardless of race, creed, color or background had an equal place at the national banquet table was still new to many in our society. While our nation had theoretically believed that “all men are created equal” in the eight years since we elected our first non-Protestant President, and the number of Afro-American Members of Congress, or for that matter, women, could be counted on one hand. Lou Stokes’ first election to Congress came only two years after the election of the first Black to the Senate since reconstruction.

Lou Stokes was in so many ways a pioneer and a trail blazer who by word and example inspired a generation of leaders who have come after him. We have admired Lou in many ways, I most value his active, enthusiastic participation in our U.S. Congress-Korean National Assembly Student Intern Exchange Program. He is the only one of my colleagues to have participated in this program since I initiated it in 1984. He encouraged young people from his own district to apply, and also welcomed Korean students to his own offices with open arms. Lou did this because he always believed in universal brotherhood. He contended that prejudice and bigotry are eradicated by knowledge and understanding, and he was a true champion of standing up for these beliefs. Although Lou has compiled an enviable record in this chamber, many of us believe he takes the greatest pride in the success of his
The CHAIRMAN. On this rollcall, 352 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time simply by way of saying that we have just been through one of the more phenomenal experiences I have ever experienced in the Congress, where spontaneously this body reflected upon their own reactions to one of our colleagues in a way that can only be the greatest of tributes to LOUIS STOKES and his family.

Mr. Chairman, for all the time I have served in the Congress, it has been my privilege to work with, get to know well, and now have as one of my finest friends—LOUIS STOKES. When I first met him, I knew immediately of the pride with which he looked to the work of his brother, Carl, in his great mayorship that really set a tone for the country.

Over the years, he has talked about others and the contributions they have made. Seldom, seldom could you even get a hint that he had any idea of the impact that he has had upon this body and upon the country.

So, it is my privilege at this time to yield to the colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, LOUIS STOKES.

Mr. STOKES. I want to thank my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) for yielding to me. Bob and I have enough to say that I want to thank you for providing me today the greatest day that I have ever experienced in the House of Representatives. JERRY, you and I have had a very special friendship and a very special relationship as colleagues. I have enjoyed working with you. You are someone for whom I have great respect and admiration not only for your hard and tireless work efforts in this House but because you are bright and because you are caring and you are sensitive, you are trustworthy, and you are loyal.

You have been my friend. My wife Jay and I had the privilege of enjoying the friendship of both you and your lovely and charming wife Arlene, and it is something that I would cherish for all of my life.

Along with you, I want to thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, DAVE OBEY, with whom I have served now almost 30 years, and on some committees we sat right next to each other for many, many years, worked together on many projects.

I have known a lot of people in the House over 30 years. There is none for whom I have greater respect and admiration and none whom I consider more of a legislative giant than the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Dave, I want you to know that I have enjoyed your friendship, I have appreciated it, I admire you for everything you stand for, and I appreciate all that you have represented to me and to your colleagues in this country. It has been a great honor serving also with you.

To BOB LIVINGSTON, our “big chairman,” as we refer to on the Committee on Appropriations, I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that you and I, too, have had an excellent working relationship over the years. I served under 6 chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations over the 30 years. Twenty-eight years I have served on that committee, and you were one of the best chairmen. You have not only been a friend to me, you have been someone who has always been courteous and fair and considerate. And all of us in this body have great respect and admiration for all that you stand for, not only this body but in this country, and I thank you for the privilege of serving with you.

To each of my colleagues who have spoken here this afternoon in what has been the greatest experience of my career, in the 30 years that I have served here, I have never seen the type of tribute that was accorded me this afternoon.
I have been touched and moved in a way that I would never forget. Your words today will linger on in my heart for the rest of my life. It will help me appreciate life in a new way. I have had the privilege of being here with those of you whom I consider to be the finest people in the world.

I have oftentimes, sitting on the floor or standing in this well, pinched myself and asked if I was really here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I was not destined to be here. I was not one who was destined to ever serve in the House of Representatives.

As you have heard this afternoon from many of the speakers, I was born in Cleveland, Ohio, born in a family where a young woman and a young man fell in love and got married and had two children. Then, when I was 3 years of age, my brother was a year old, our father died.

So my mother was left a young widow who had only an 8th grade education. She went back to school and through that, she found that she could not raise her two young boys, one 3 and one a year old, without working with her hands all of her life. She believed if these two black boys in the United States Congress, the rich, wealthy, white people’s homes, where she scrubbed their floors, served their dinners, took care of their children, washed their clothes, cleaned their windows for $8 a day and bus fare. And she found that she could not raise those two boys on $8 a day and bus fare, so she also went on welfare.

But during that period of time, she used to speak to both Carl and I and tell us to “grow up to be somebody.” She used to tell us to “get an education.” Her greatest dream was that those two boys would some day get a high school diploma. She knew that she could not send us to college. But in her dream, she wanted to see us both get a high school diploma. Because she had great faith in this country and she believed if these two black boys in Cleveland could just get a high school diploma that they could be somebody.

And she used to always tell us, “get something in your head so you do not have to work with your hands.” So I have worked with my hands all of my life.” And I never really understood what she meant when she said, “Get something in your head so you don’t have to work with your hands like I have worked with my hands all of my life.”

I went on to get my high school diploma and was drafted into service in World War II. My brother Carl dropped out of school at 16. Carl quit school, went out to Republic Steel to get a job, sweeping floors. Shortly after I was drafted, he too was drafted into the service.

When I came out of service, I realized that I needed an education. I wanted an education. Fortunately some people in the United States Congress whom I never saw, whom I never knew, had the vision to provide something called the GI Bill of Rights. And so I took advantage of that.

I went home one night and told my mother that I was going to go to college and she said, “Well, what would you do?” And I said, “I’ll get $95 a month.” And they gave me that. No matter what we have, this is the greatest country in the world. The story I have recited to you today of the Stokes brothers could only happen in America. Only in America, Mr. Chairman. Only in America.

So I EMS of California, Mr. Chairman, I proudly yield back the balance of my time that Louis Stokes and I had together.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is open to amendment from page 52, line 3 to page 65, line 16.

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

As many Members know, I have submitted an amendment that would amend the language in the bill submitted by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLENBERG). The gentleman from Michigan’s language makes it clear that no funds appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency could be used in the implementation of the Kyoto protocol.

In discussion with the advocates for this language on both sides of the aisle, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLE), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and others, I have decided, Mr. Chairman, not to offer my amendment, but I would like to take this time to address the House as to why it is that I thought it was important to offer this amendment in the first place.

The issue of the Environmental Protection Agency’s activities with regard to greenhouse gases has created suspicion on both sides of the argument. Suspicion on the part of industry that the Environmental Protection Agency would take a backdoor approach to implementing Kyoto. That is a legitimate concern. In fact, the United States Congress, namely, the Senate, has not given the authority to the Environmental Protection Agency to implement Kyoto and it should not do that without the proper authorization. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the environmental advocates in this country...
are concerned and have a deep suspicion on the other side, and that is that the Knollenberg language would not be used simply to prevent EPA from implementing Kyoto but in fact would stand in the way of the Environmental Protection Agency’s legitimate role in studying greenhouse gas emissions and modeling CO₂ throughout the atmosphere and implementing voluntary reductions and promoting technology that would reduce carbon dioxide and in fact regulating other pollutants such as mercury in a way that has the least impact on the emissions of carbon dioxide.

Why is this important, Mr. Chairman? Why is it so important that we ensure that the Environmental Protection Agency is not stripped of these powers? Mr. Chairman, regardless of where one stands on the issues of climate change, there are certain facts that are absolutely beyond scientific dispute. First, that we are carbon-loading the atmosphere. We have been carbon-loading the atmosphere since the dawn of the Industrial Age. The percentage of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere is now 20 percent over what it was when the Industrial Age began. The biosphere in fact consumes carbon dioxide and turns it into oxygen. Some of my colleagues and others have said, “Well, that is the harmless and natural state of the planet.” Well, it is except that the human race in burning fossil fuels, coal, oil, gas, wood at an increasing and dizzying pace over the last 100 years has increased the carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere far more than they can be consumed by the biosphere, and the trends are known that this will get worse until we humans learn to build societies that can meet the needs of our people without unbalancing that thin and precious and delicate layer of the atmosphere that allows us to live in this thin band of temperatures in which humans and other life on this planet can live.

Mr. Chairman, we have to lead the world in research on global change, climate change. We have to lead the world in research on greenhouse gases. We cannot shrink from that. We cannot be in denial regardless of the interests that would have us do that. Some of my colleagues in the earlier debate this morning talked as if it were clear that we are succeeding in controlling global warming today. We cannot prove that, Mr. Chairman. We do not know that. What we do know is that this planet and its life is far, far too precious for us to be cavalier about this issue. Our children certainly will inherit a world that the young people who are growing up, in our generation, will not be long for time with regard to greenhouse gases.

Mr. Chairman, I will not offer this amendment this evening, but those of us who care passionately about this issue, the effects of the Knollenberg language. If the Knollenberg language does what its advocates purport it to do, and, that is, to simply prevent the implementation of Kyoto in ways that are unauthorized, then that will be fine and we will move on from there. But if this language, Mr. Chairman, is used to subvert EPA’s legitimate role in studying carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, then we will be back here next year and we will not withdraw amendments because we stand firm on the proposition that the Environmental Protection Agency must lead this Nation in the study of this phenomenon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) has expired.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to identify with the outstanding statement of my colleague from Pennsylvania who has been a leader in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the intent of the Greenwood amendment. While my colleague and other greenhouse gases, then one should behave as if the treaty has been ratified.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) if he wishes to comment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to commend him on his statement. I think the gentleman’s amendment is one that should be passed by the House, but I respect the fact that we are going to let the process move forward on this legislation.

I think 50 years from now, people would look back at the appropriations bill with dismay if it were to stay in its present form, because, as I read the bill that is before the committee, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality would be restricted from educating and conducting outreach and holding informational seminars on policies underlying the protocol relating to the Kyoto Conference. And not only that, it would be prevented from thinking through and developing proposals to deal with the global climate questions.

The amendment we just adopted a while ago, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REY), would have struck, did in fact strike the most egregious parts of the committee’s recommendation to us. I would hope that, as this bill moves forward, there will be other approaches that will assure those who are anxious about this matter that the treaty, if there is one, will not be implemented until it is ratified. We do not implement laws that have not been passed, and we do not allow executive branch agencies to adopt regulations to implement treaties that have not been ratified.

I think it is a mistaken notion for fear that that treaty would be implemented in any way to stop EPA and reduce emissions voluntarily. It would stop planning the other body has requested to help determine the costs of complying with Kyoto. I could go on and on.

Does it make sense to stop such defensible activities? What are the Knollenberg supporters so afraid of? It seems that they believe that the mere mention of climate change will weaken their case.

And remember, it’s not as if Congress is powerless to influence policy absent the Knollenberg language. If the Administration did something foolish, such as try to declare carbon dioxide a criteria pollutant under the Clean Air Act, Congress means to block such action without the Knollenberg rider.

So it comes down to this: regardless of how you feel about Kyoto, regardless of whether you can imagine some policy you might want to block, you need to support for Greenwood—that is, unless you disagree with the vast majority of scientists and believe that there is no chance at all that climate change is a threat.

Support for Greenwood is not necessarily support for Kyoto. Greenwood does not give the Administration carte blanche to Greenwood wishes to allow open, informed debate on climate change to continue. It represents the sensible middle ground. It has earned my colleagues’ support.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) if he wishes to comment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).
the CEQ from going forward and thinking about strategies and developing plans.

So I want to identify myself with your comments and to express the fact that we made a step in the right direction with the Obey amendment. I think we need to go much further on this issue when the bill moves into conference.

As I understand it, the Senate has a different approach. Even Senator BYRD has an entirely different approach than what is in this legislation. I would think it would be doing a disservice to the American people if we stopped everybody from looking at this problem because the problem is not going to go away.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy, but first I would like to thank the chairman for all of his hard work on a complicated and important appropriations bill which funds the Department of Veterans, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies. I would also like to commend his staff for diligently working with me on an important issue concerning my district.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the report language to H.R. 4194 indicates that the EPA should take no action concerning my district. This is the gentleman’s understanding as you have outlined and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of 1995, the House has produced a steady stream of assaults on the environment. Bills have been introduced to repeal the Clean Air Act, simply repeal it. Riders have been snuck in to block regulatory legislation, particularly appropriations bills, to cripple protection of endangered species, exempt oil refineries from air pollution laws, and block the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating arsenic levels in our drinking water.

Earlier this year, I had thought that the House would finally halt its war on our environment. I had hoped that the sneak attacks on the environment would cease, and I would hope that we would reject environmental extremism that is so out of touch with American values.

Unfortunately, it seems that, once again, our environment is being attacked. As in years past, the VA-HUD appropriations bill contains antienvironmental riders that block the cleanup of PCB-contaminated sediments, or (5) cleanup requirements for facilities licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; where such activities are authorized by law.

There is also language that would prevent EPA from requiring any dredging, leaving the local communities contaminated.

The report accompanying this bill also contains language which would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating or controlling the discharge of PCB-containing sediments into the environment. The CEQ from going forward and think...

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has expired.

(Permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes granted.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Knollenberg provisions are not affected in any way by this amendment. The riders my amendment addresses are contained in the report on this bill. Specifically, because those riders block any regulatory determinations regarding mercury air emissions for years.

The report accompanying this bill also contains language which could prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from requiring any dredging, leaving the local communities contaminated.

Many experts have called for removing this contamination through dredging, but the report language would prevent EPA from requiring any dredging, leaving the local communities contaminated.

We must allow this law to be implemented, not impede its implementation as the report would do. The goal of my amendment is simple: It would eliminate the antienvironmental riders.

Some of my colleagues urged me not to address global warming issues in this amendment, and I have modified my amendment so as not to address global warming issues, I believe it is essential to remove those extreme restrictions on the administration’s ability to deal with global warming, but in deference to my colleagues, the global warming riders are not being addressed in this amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Knollenberg provisions are not affected in any way by this amendment. The riders which are contained in the report on this bill. Specifically, because those riders are report language, they are not binding on the agencies, but that is only technical. It is, however, important to realize that these are a message to the agencies to not go forward with enforcing existing laws. That is, it is important to eliminate them in order to clarify that they should not affect the agencies in any way.

Mr. Chairman, Congress should be working to solve our environmental problems, not working so secretly to include antienvironmental provisions in appropriations bills at the request of many big polluters. Let us not roll...
back our environmental laws with these antienvironmental riders. I urge all Members to support this amendment and give us a clean VA-HUD appropriations bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, let me be candid.

Mr. Chairman, very reluctantly I rise in opposition to this amendment by my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN). As many of you know, HENRY WAXMAN and I have worked on many of the issues in the past that relate to the environment, and we have done things like sponsoring alternative fuels for clean air purposes. The gentleman knows of my work in connection with the clean air amendments in California.

But having said that, let me say that this amendment, together with some of the advertisements distributed by what can only be either misinformed or very extreme environmentalists within the community, is nothing less than a bizarre attempt to create controversy where none should exist at all.

To label the committee's direction to the EPA, direction that is contained solely within the report accompanying the bill, as somehow being a rider is about as far as I can stretch of imagination that I can fathom. These folks are really scraping the bottom of the barrel if their primary objections would somehow raise report language to the level of statutory law.

But let me just take a few moments to specifically address some of the concerns raised in the Waxman amendment. With respect to mercury, the committee report directs the agency to, first, complete an ongoing Federal-State study on mercury transport in Lake Superior; secondly, complete another ongoing study on fish consumption and mercury ingestion; and, thirdly, enter into a final study agreement with the National Academy of Sciences in order to rewrite recommendations on the appropriate level of a mercury exposure reference dose.

Mr. Chairman, these are not new issues. The committee is merely attempting to push the EPA to finish its research before issuing regulations.

With respect to utilizing dredging as a remediation tool for contaminated sediments, the committee last year asked EPA to contract with the NAS to conduct a thorough study of this methodology which was requested to be completed by April of 1999.

In part, this study was requested because EPA itself stated in a 1996 report that the preferred means of controlling sediment contamination risk is through national recovery. Subsequently, the committee has become aware of what may be a reversal of this policy. It occurred to us that maybe we should let the NAS report shed some light on this matter before we allow EPA to accept the number of cubic yards of contaminated sediments.

Regarding directions of the committee relative to the Food Quality Protection Act and the Regional Haze Program, the language merely suggests that the agency should follow both its spirit and the letter of the law in implementing these programs. The Regional Haze Program is a case in point.

The Clean Air Act sets up a regime for the coordination of visibility transport commissions in order to research and monitor visibility impairment. The law also requires EPA to report to Congress on visibility improvements achieved through implementation of other sections of the Clean Air Act.

These and other provisions of the law have been ignored by the agency, and the committee's language merely directs the EPA to get itself back on a firm statutory footing.

Finally, the committee's direction with respect to cleanup requirements for facilities licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would do nothing more than tell EPA to maintain the status quo with respect to regulatory oversight of nuclear facility clean up.

The Congress has given the authority to the NRC, not to the EPA. Not surprisingly, the EPA is trying to further enlarge its domain by claiming jurisdiction where they do not now have any. If the Congress in its wisdom wishes to give such authority to EPA, so be it. In the meantime, however, this body should not allow the Waxman amendment to circumvent the law and permit his favorite government agency to grow even larger.

Mr. Chairman, these and other directions of the committee as contained in the report accompanying H.R. 4194 are intended to put the EPA back on a path of following the law. None of these directions reinterpret the law in any way. None of these directions put a political or partisan spin on what EPA is expected to do for the life of me, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why anybody in this body would want the EPA to ignore the laws that Congress has passed. For the life of me, I cannot understand why anyone would want this agency to enlarge its domain through its interpretation of what the law means. Yet that is exactly what my colleague from California by way of this amendment would allow to happen.

I strongly urge that the gentleman withdraw his amendment, and, if not, that it be soundly defeated.

Mr. Knollenberg, Mr. Chairman, first let me point out that one of the items mentioned here, the regional haze regulations, are in fact one of the areas where we are concerned that EPA may be preceding to implement a global warming policy without first being ratified by the Senate. We have not definitively heard back from the agency on that because they have not yet complied with our request for information on the oversight hearing, but it is an area of great concern to us.

Let me also say, harking back to the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), which he withdrew, I appreciate his doing that. I think that it is going to be put into the Record following the discussion of that subject, including a list of all of the countries and whether or not they are covered by the treaty and in the state-by-state break-out of the economic costs.

Mr. Chairman, I would at this point yield to one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Peterson) the balance of my time for his remarks on that subject.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. McIntosh. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETE RSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, it has been interesting tonight as we have heard the discussion about some of these issues dealing with EPA, an agency that I find sometimes more troubling than the IRS. They have one of the most important jobs in this country. But if you ask your local communities, ask your state agencies, you ask anyone who deals with them, they are one of the most difficult.

One of the issues that was shared here tonight was the Knollenberg language was going to prevent the EPA from doing their job. This administration asked in this year's budget for $6.3 billion on the Kyoto treaty and global warming. Now, they claim they do not want to implement, but many Members have said they are going to implement and they have done many things that would start that process.

$6.3 billion is almost equal to the EPA budget. I guess that is beyond my imagination, that a government would ask for $6.3 billion to market a theory, "global warming."

When this issue started, I asked one of the top climatologists in America, who was having lunch with me downstairs, if there was global warming, because I wanted his opinion. Without any doubt he just looked at me and said, "There is no evidence, and I have been in this business all my life."

I want to share with you that climate researchers do not agree whether the earth will become warmer during the coming century. Seventeen thousand scientists have recently signed a petition stating that man-caused climate change does not exist, 17,000.

The petition states, in part, "We urge the United States Government to reject the global warming agreement and other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind."

"There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of greenhouse gases is causing or will cause
catastrophic heating of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produces some beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environment of the earth.

One of the reasons for such certainty and optimism about the future of these 17,000 scientists is that both written and oral history informs us that between 900 AD and 1300 AD, the Earth warmed by some 4 to 7 degrees, 4 to 7 degrees Fahrenheit, almost exactly what the current computer models now predict for the coming century.

Did we produce the catastrophe being sold to us by alarmists? It did not. The warming created one of the most favorable periods in human history. Crops were plentiful, death rates diminished, and trade and industry expanded, while art and architecture flourished. There was less hunger, as food production surged because winters were milder and growing seasons longer. Southern England developed the vineyard, and Viking settlers pastured cattle in Greenland on what is today frozen tundra. Soon after 1400, however, the good weather ended and the world dropped into what is called the Little Ice Age.

Recently Dr. Sallie Baliunas, an astrophysicist with Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics and one of the Nation's leading experts on global climate change, believes we may be nearing the end of a solar warming cycle, and that there is a strong possibility that the Earth will start cooling off in the early part of the 21st Century.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. McIntosh) has expired.

Mr. McIntosh. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the purpose of informing the gentleman that this amendment contains nothing on global warming. That was discussed as a possibility in this amendment, but, as I announced in my opening remarks, I withdrew that particular section from the amendment. So we are not dealing with the global warming question.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservations of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McIntosh. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Peterson).

Mr. Peterson of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it says we may be nearing the end of a global solar warming cycle, and that there is a strong possibility that the Earth will start cooling off in the early part of the 21st Century.

Still none of the global warming computer models, the foundations for nearly all the claims that warming is the result of man-made greenhouse gasses, account for solar variability, and none adequately account for the interaction between the oceans and the atmosphere, or the addition of a large portion of the very warm South Pacific to the worldwide grid of temperature reporting stations in the past half century. Also, satellites and weather balloons that have been tracking temperatures for the last 20 years show a slight cooling.

I would like to conclude my comments by saying we have 16 agencies being funded by the EPA to propose and sell the global warming advocacy. The Greenwood amendment, which was before us, in my view, if I was very pleased that he withdrew that, because it really cleverly destroyed the well-crafted Knollenberg language that was so vital.

The interesting thing I would like to say, in conclusion, the Kyoto treaty is so flawed, if all of the countries that have agreed to bring it to their governments for approval follow it to the hilt, the developing countries, the 132 which are the growth area of the world will more than make up for the savings. There will be no change.

It seems pretty flawed for Americans to take it in the neck and let the developing world steal our jobs. There are many who feel that as many as 1 million American jobs will move to Third World countries, where there will be no controls, where there will be no penalty paid by American workers.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleagues and I from Pennsylvania who preceded me, points out by example the reason we should not have the type of language in this bill. In fact, I know it is a time-honored tradition of the Committee on Appropriations to try and manage or administer the specifics of many laws, but the fact is, when I voted for these laws, that is what I meant. I meant that I wanted our Superfund dollars used to clean up the problems.

This bill prevents the use of the brownfields dollars to clean up. I wanted the mercury out of our air. That is what I wanted the EPA to do. This particular provision stops the EPA from implementing the guidelines of mercury and of necessary standards for utilities. I wanted the PCBs that are lining our rivers to be cleaned, and the same waters and riverways cleaned up so that it was not in our waters and riverways. This particular provision in the bill in this case Panama the EPA and says you cannot do that particular dredging.

When I voted for the Food Quality Protection Act, I wanted the pesticides out of our water. This is almost every other Member. And I do not want some staff member or other groups that are there making a contrary decision in appropriations report language, I want the EPA, the scientists and the other professionals, to set those pesticide standards so that I am not eating such pesticides, and so do the people I represent.

When we voted for the Clean Air Act, we wanted to in fact be able to see the canyon and the vistas that are on our American landscape; not putting this off and postponing it and frustrating the implementation of these laws.

Finally, of course, we do want our radioactive waste materials cleaned up. For my part, I think the Nuclear Regulatory Commission needs a challenge to the type of job they have done in the past, and I think the EPA is pursuing this. I do not want to strip them of some responsibility with regards to radioactive wastes.

So I hope my colleagues will look at this, and recognize the importance of letting the administrations and others that are supposed to administer and implement our laws do their job, and not be frustrated and hamstrung and limited by these inappropriate type of second-guessing that is going on here, and often I think with the type of scientific analysis I heard here on greenhouse gasses preceding me.

That is not the type of effort, that type of guessing, that type of unusual theories that seem to abound, that I think we are going to implement our laws. I want the EPA and the administration, and they are held accountable, incidentally, by courts and by results and regulations and open hearings. Once that process gets done, which is sometimes very, very long lengthy, takes a long time, I do not want the Appropriations Committee on Appropriations coming back and pulling the rug out from under them and then frustrating the implementation of the laws.

That is what is happening in this instance, and that is why we need to vote up the Waxman amendment or defeat this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very, very strong support of the Waxman amendment. I do so because passage of this amendment is critical to moving forward on a number of important environmental issues, including a matter close to the hearts of many New Yorkers, cleaning up the Hudson River.

Among the many egregious legislative riders tacked into this bill is a provision which would delay cleaning up PCB contaminated sites in the Hudson River, as well as the Housatonic River in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Thanks to 30 years of PCB discharges, the upper Hudson River has the distinction of being one of the Nation's largest Superfund sites. Not insignificantly, the upper Hudson River has also been designated as one of the most endangered rivers in the United States by
North America’s leading river conservation organization, American Rivers.

PCB contamination in the Hudson has taken a huge toll on the River’s economic recreational and environmental resources. Fish caught throughout 200 miles of the river are contaminated at unsafe levels. As a result, the river’s commercial fishery industry, valued at more than $40 million annually in 1976, has been almost completely closed down.

In addition, PCBs from the upper Hudson are responsible for about half of the sediment PCB contamination in New York Harbor. This contamination greatly increases the cost of dredging the harbor, which is so critical to the economic vitality of the New York metropolitan region.

Most troubling is the threat to public health posed by PCBs. These chemicals have long been regulated as human carcinogens, and scientific evidence continues to mount about PCBs’ impact on disease resistance, reproduction and cognitive development. For example, studies done in the Great Lakes region have shown startling effects on the birth weights, cognitive abilities and emotional stability of children exposed in utero.

The EPA has spent years examining the river’s PCB contamination in order to develop an appropriate cleanup plan. This process is already years behind schedule, and that is bad enough. We certainly do not need more delay, but that is just what this bill will do, and that is why I urge support for the Waxman amendment, so that the long awaited cleanup of the Hudson can move forward.

Mr. WAXMAN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) that the National Academy of Sciences issued this authoritative report on cleanup strategies for contamination. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has expired.

(On request of Mr. WAXMAN, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. LOWEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like again to say to my distinguished chairman that we understand the complexity of the Hudson. It has already been delayed an additional 18 months after many years, but it is my understanding from Carol Browner that there are areas, such as the Housatonic, which could move forward, could be an important demonstration, so we can make an appropriate decision as to what to do with the Hudson, understanding the complexities, and this report language would just delay further.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would yield further, in the Housatonic, I believe they are planning to dredge 12 miles of the river. I have no idea what they are going to do with that dredging material. But, in the meantime, it is amazing to me that my colleague from California would raise the statutory level, which is the Waxman amendment, simply trying to urge this agency to get back on track and follow the laws we have outlined.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would yield further, in the Housatonic, I believe they are planning to dredge 12 miles of the river. I have no idea what they are going to do with that dredging material. But, in the meantime, it is amazing to me that my colleague from California would raise the statutory level, which is the Waxman amendment, simply trying to urge this agency to get back on track and follow the laws we have outlined.
not think it is binding, but they feel a limitation when the committee that is appropriating their money to stay in existence tells them not to do anything until you get another study, and this additional study would keep them from doing the things like putting a cap on set-tlements of PCBs.

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

I oppose the Waxman amendment. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take a couple of seconds, as I was unable to be here when this House paid tribute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

This last month I heard four of the greatest speeches of my life: The speeches of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. J. JOHNSON); the gentlemen from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) today; and certainly the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

Cleveland would not have transformed into the great city it is without Mr. STOKES, who never got the credit for that politically. Without Lou STOKES, Cleveland would not be the city it is.

Mr. Chairman, we will be through our committee finding a building to name to pay tribute to our great distinguished leader from Ohio, and I would ask all of my colleagues to cosponsor that when the building is selected.

Today I heard one of the finest speeches I have ever heard from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), and we are very proud of him.

With that, I oppose the Waxman amendment. I think the Environmental Protection Agency has got into a little too much all over our country, and I think there is a balance between jobs and protection, and sometimes we have been a little zealous.

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

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Waxman amendment. This is the amendment that would allow the agencies covered by this bill to continue to carry out the laws of the land, as is their constitutional responsibility.

What we see in this legislation, whether it is in deliberative language or whether it is report language, is we see a continuation of an assault by the Republican Party of the environmental laws of this country, the very basic, basic fundamental laws of this country, clean air and clean water.

They tried it once in a frontal assault in 1995. They were turned back by the minority in the Congress, and they were turned back by the American public. Such that time they have been having day in and day out, every time they have recognized the African elephant, they have tried to recognize the Year of the Ocean, and they have had Tropical Rain Forest Week, all of which was to suggest that they were environmentalists.

They have issued instructions to the Republican majority to plant trees, invite the press, try to show up at environmental events, to give themselves a 'green' look. But when it comes to the hard ball legislation, they are right back at it.

In this bill, what they seek to do is to keep the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States of America from doing its job. What is its job? It is to protect the American public from the polluters who would pollute our air as it moves across all jurisdictions. It is a national problem. Emissions in one area cause cancer and in another area cause asthma and in another area cause children to have serious health disruptions.

That is what its job is, is to protect Americans. It is the Environmental Protection Agency. It is to make sure that in fact Americans have the ability to have a quality of life that they think that they are entitled to. Maybe the Republicans do not support the Environmental Protection Agency, but over 80 percent of the American public supports the Environmental Protection Agency, because they know that it is all that stands between them and the corporate greed of the polluters. The same polluters who have polluted our streams and polluted our water, the huge corporate farms that pollute the waters of the central valley or the waters of the Midwest now as they run huge hog operations, the same polluters who dump into the Chesapeake Bay. They were not turned back by voluntary action.

San Francisco Bay was cleaned up and is being cleaned up because of the EPA. The Great Lakes are being cleaned up because of the EPA. The air today is cleaner in California than it was 20 years ago because of the EPA.

Now they want to strip that? Why? Because we have a very effective and tough administrator. They have dragged her up here time and again in front of numerous committees to beat up on her, and most of them do not have the subject matter to ask a question. But they are going to continue to do it. It is a little disingenuous, unless one just showed up in Congress in the last week or two to say, well, this is just report language.

No, this is not just report language, this is a means by which, in a few months from now, if EPA does not do what they want to do, they will drag them up in front of the committees; they will carry out the will of the Congress; they will beat up on the administrator; they will beat up on the regional people; they will tell them they are exceeding their authority. Why? Because they are trying to get to the Election Day, when they think they can take over the presidency and get rid of EPA. So they want to delay all of these projects, the cleanup of the Hudson River, the brownfields, the cleanup of the Superfund sites, the mercury emission standards, and all of the rest of it. They are trying to delay that. Why? Because their corporate clients want them to delay that, because they think they will get a better shake after the next presidential election.

This is fundamental politics. This is about our environment. This is about whether our children have a safe home, a safe environment and a safe school, because nobody volunteered to clean it up. They had to be taken to court and they had to have regulations issued, and that has been the 30-year history of this agency. It is what has made America better, it is what has made our schools safe, it is what has given our children the chance to live in decent neighborhood and to breathe clean air, to reclaim the rivers that when I came to Congress were on fire, rivers we could not touch. When I came to Congress, they told us, "Don't touch the Potomac River." Today people water ski and they have crew races. That is because of the EPA.

Now, the oil companies do not like it, and the chemical companies do not like it, and the mining companies do not like it, and the big farmers do not like it. Who gives a damn? The American people like it. The American people like it, because they can see the tangible benefits.

So let us not pretend that this amendment somehow is only report language, that this is just an innocent effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER of California) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would caution the Member against the use of profanity.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an innocent effort. This is going around through the back door, because politically they are afraid to go through the front door because they were turned back by the American people. When the American people understood what the Republicans meant by regulatory reform, they overwhelmingly rejected it and it was abandoned.

The American people know a good deal when they see it, and the Environmental Protection Agency is a very, very good deal for the American public.

It is a very, very good deal for the health of the American public, and it is a very, very good deal for the health of the American environment.
Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) yielding to me. I asked him to yield to respond in part to questions made by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. Chairman, I must say that my colleague knows very well of my involvement, my personal involvement, in environmental matters over the years that I have been involved in public affairs. I wrote the law that created the toughest air quality management district in the country that others are trying to replicate— the South Coast Air Quality Management District. To suggest that we are not concerned about air and about these other matters, to say the least, extremism.

I further object to the gentleman from California suggesting that we would limit report language items in order to bring people before our committee and beat them over the head or otherwise. I do not know how the gentleman ran his committee when he was Chair, but we do not bring people into the hearing over the head.

We are in the business of responsibly developing public policy direction here, and to have that kind of frontal attack is not helpful, acceptable, or appreciate this House manner.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Waxman amendment and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for offering this amendment and allowing me to speak on this amendment and doing what he has done on his committee, to protect our environment.

This amendment would eliminate controversial anti-environmental riders that threaten the public health and safety of citizens from my State of Connecticut and from States across this Nation.

This amendment would override language that interferes with agency actions to protect our environment and clean up hazardous waste materials in our rivers and in contaminated industrial sites known as brownfields.

The Waxman amendment is particularly important in my home State of Connecticut, because it will allow the dredging of the Housatonic River to clean the riverbed that has been contaminated with PCBs. The Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection Agency has also stated that the prohibition on the use of dredging as a means to clean up the river poses a serious threat to the ability to take the next step to control immediate threats to public health.

Exposure to PCBs is dangerous and poses health risks to intellectual functions, the nervous system, the immune and reproductive system. We in Connecticut know that the Housatonic is unacceptably polluted. It is unacceptable for the House to tie the hands of the EPA in an effort to clean up contaminated sites like our river and others like it across the country.

I am also pleased that the Waxman amendment would allow the EPA to issue regulatory determinations for mercury emissions. Mercury is highly toxic and poses serious and irreversible neurologic damage. It is critical that we permit EPA to take steps to control mercury emission into the air and into the water.

According to the Toxic Action Center, there is a mercury advisory for every single lake in the State of Connecticut. We need to control the release of mercury. These regulations are an important step toward cleaner air, cleaner water, and a cleaner environment, I thank Mr. WAXMAN for offering this amendment this evening.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am in earnest support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) because it would remove dangerous anti-environmental riders from this legislation, as well as other aspects of the bill which would be very dangerous to the environment and very dangerous to public health.

There is report language, as has been discussed already, in the bill which directs EPA to take no action which would utilize dredging as a remediation tool until a referenced National Academy of Sciences study has been completed and distributed and analyzed by all interested parties. That is an issue which the committee’s direction. It implies that EPA’s own science has concluded that the GE so-called “natural recovery” method is the best way. It should be clear that EPA does not agree with this interpretation of the study.

EPA points out that there are different kinds of PCBs, different kinds of deposits, different kinds of rivers, and there is no one solution that applies to all. EPA has been studying the Hudson River situation for years, and many of us have been unhappy with the repeated delays because of EPA’s own painstaking review.

We do not want further delays, and we certainly do not want the public health and the river’s health left hanging while all interested parties are given more time to think about it.

I just today, new information has come out which reveal that the PCB deposits in the upper river of the Hudson are moving out. Forty percent of those deposits are moving out from where they are located, and 75 percent of those deposits that are moving out are becoming involved in the water column.

This information just out today tells us very clearly why all aquatic life in the Hudson River is now infected with PCBs. The PCBs in the Hudson River are ubiquitous. They are affecting all species of aquatic life and we know how dangerous and damaging PCBs are. They cause cancer in animals. They are a probable carcinogen in humans. They cause abortions and they cause nerve disorders and endocrine disorders in human beings.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious problem. The delay that is contained in this legislation only prolongs the period where these PCBs will remain in the river, remain in the aquatic life, contaminate the estuary and the river itself, and become involved with people’s lives and be damaging to public health.

That is why the Waxman amendment must be passed, because it deals forthrightly and directly with this problem and would remove this report language from the legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHHEY), and several others, have focused in on the Hudson River where I happen to live. I have lived there for 40 years. I have raised...
my family there and my six grandchildren and my five children.

We drink the Hudson River water, and we have done quite well drinking that Hudson River water. Not only does my family drink that Hudson River water, but we have an auxiliary emergency supply for 8 million people in a place called New York City, which is 200 miles downstream from where I live.

About 40 miles upstream are cities like Poughkeepsie, Poughkeepsie, Red Hook and Rhinebeck and Hudson and all the way up to where I live. And we take our drinking water directly out of the Hudson River.

It is approved by the Environmental Protection Agency. It is approved by the New York State Health Department and the New York State Environmental Conservation Department, two of the toughest regulatory agencies in America. They are so tough, that they even take precedent over the regulatory body about that.

I hear a lot of arguments about why these PCBs ought to be dredged.

First of all, I represent the twentieth largest dairy producing district in America.

Mr. Chairman, I know you represent a few cows, too. We represent a lot of corn growers and we represent a lot of apple growers. We live in the Rust Belt. From New York City to Albany, New York, is the Old Rust Belt. We have lost all of our jobs. They have all moved either to Maquiladora out in Mexico or they have moved overseas to China. We had that debate yesterday.

I have constituents who now are in their forties and fifties, I mentioned this yesterday, and they worked all their life at manufacturing and now the manufacturing jobs are gone. They do not want to move out of the beautiful Hudson Valley. That is where they live. That is where their kids grew up. Their grandchildren are, but they cannot find jobs.

So what do they do now? Some of those people that were now making $40,000 a year, they now work for McDonalds and maybe they take home $15,000 a year on that job but they carry a second job and maybe they make an extra $10,000 there, and that is about it. They have lost half of their earning capacity.

Why would Jerry Solomon stand up here and vote against dredging PCBs? Well, first of all, back in the early seventies and I was a town mayor and then a county supervisor and a State legislator and now a Congressman, and I have been there where the General Electric Company used to put PCB-laden water into the Hudson River.

You know why they did it and how they did it? They did it with a permit from the Federal Government and they did it with a permit from the New York State Environmental Conservation Department. They were forced to do that because before that they were using, in making capacitors, they were using a formula that created fire hazards and something had to be done about it. It was dangerous. So they switched at the request of the Federal Government and the State government.

It was all legal, whatever they were doing, maybe you want to call it polluting or putting PCB-laden water into the river.

All of a sudden, one of the public utilities, like you have in your community, decided they wanted to remove a dam just below these factories and the Federal Government gave them permission to remove this dam. Well, this dam had been there for 100 years. Guess what was behind that dam? You cannot believe what was behind the dam. All of the stuff that had come down from all of the papermaking industries, and that is the only jobs practically we have left now, but all of the chemicals had piled up behind this dam and some of the PCBs but, sure enough, when they were given permission to remove the move this stuff began to flow downstream for awhile.

Most of it just went on downstream 200 miles and went out into the Atlantic Ocean and that was the end of it, but the bit that did not were 40 hot spots which are stretched out over about a 40 mile area and those 40 hot spots have been silted over now for 30 years.

So what my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Hinchey) and others are talking about happened 30 years ago. You think that that happened just yesterday or last year or the year before. It happened 30 years ago. Those hot spots are silted over.

Now, why could we not just go in there and dredge those hot spots out? Let me tell you what would happen. We all know when we take a glass of water and we put some sand in it and then we take a spoon and stir up the sand, what happens? The whole glass of water has got sand all through it.

From New York City, to Alban, New York, we have a 34-foot deep water channel. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Solomon) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Solomon was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, we have a 34-foot deep water channel, as I was saying. It has to be dredged every year because the Hudson River, different from the ocean, the Hudson River is only an inch wide where I start, when you get down to New York City it is a mile wide or more, but Hudson River has to be dredged. It has a sandy bottom. So we can get our oil barges up and we can get our feed grain barges and we can get our food supplies up the Hudson River by barge, we have to keep it open. So the Army Corps of Engineers every year comes in and dredges a portion of this 150-mile long 34-foot deep water channel.

If we were to go ahead and dredge the PCBs, which are laying there dormant, buried and will not surface unless there is some major, major flood that has not taken place in 100 years, they will lay dormant.

But if we go in and dredge them, what happens? And this is what the scientists will tell us. And this is what the National Academy of Sciences is going to tell us in about 4 or 5 more months. If we dredge the PCBs upstream, it raises the level of PCBs all along the 200 mile long corridor. Then we have to dredge the channel every year.

Now, presently, when we dredge that channel, and my colleagues have seen a dredge barge come up and they throw the sand on the lower banks of a river and then it is above water level, just above water level, and that dredging material volatilizes, gets into the air, the crops and the cattle and the crops that are grown along there, and there is no problem. But when we raise the level of PCBs downstream, not only do we begin to affect the water supplies, which are healthy now, but there is no good way of any of these regulatory agencies about it, about the drinking water, now where are we going to put these dredge materials? If we throw it on those lower banks and it volatilizes, we are then putting PCBs over a 200-mile long stretch.

Now, what do we do? We either do not dredge the Hudson River or we encapsulate these dredgings about every 30 miles along the river, go up to where I live now. 57 municipalities representing about 700,000 people have come out with resolutions saying please do not dredge this Hudson River. Please do not do this. The New York State Farm Bureau, and the New York State Department of Agriculture have all come out and said do not dredge the Hudson River until we know for sure that there is not a better way.

The better way is contained in this report language, which is not law, as the gentleman from California (Mr. Jerry Lewis) has said. The report language simply says, and I would just say to my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Hinchey) and others, where were they last year when this language was ordered in the report? Not a word was raised on this floor about asking for this study that will be completed in about another 8 months. Not a word was raised on this floor.

Let me briefly just read the actual language so we all understand what we are voting on here. The language says, "The committee is aware of EPA's draft National Sediment Quality Survey issued in July of 1996 in which the agency concluded, listen to this, "the agency concluded, among other things, that the preferred means of controlling sedimentation contamination risk to human health and the environment is through natural recovery." Natural recovery.

"Despite this," this is continuing with the language, "Despite this conclusion, however, dredging is currently..."
Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman knows better than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will suspend. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) reclaims his time and may proceed.

Mr. SOLOMON. As I was about to say, Helen Browner and the EPA have entered into a quid pro quo where they will wait until the year 2001, until we know exactly what the results are, and then they will take some action.

Now, the only problem is we have these environmentalists that are stirring things up. They are trying to stir up the Hudson River, but they are stirring things up now and they are trying to get her to change her mind. So that is why we ought to defeat this amendment.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I would like to say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that the time he has used has been very valuable to the debate. It was a very articulate presentation of the real world, where the gentleman lives and works. It was a very helpful to the discussion and a very positive contribution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I invited all my colleagues to come up to my district and have a drink of water. They will love it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am here today in support of my colleagues from Maine and California and everywhere in between who are trying to ensure that the Environmental Protection Agency has the ability to make the regulatory determinations for mercury emissions from utilities.

The Committee report contains language that limits the ability of the EPA to issue rules on mercury emissions. We are working to make sure that such restrictions do not apply to activities authorized by law.

I would like to emphasize a few points. The health risks of mercury are proven and they are significant. They are threatening society’s most vulnerable: Pregnant women and young children.

Mercury has spread and accumulated far throughout the United States. Officials in a total of 39 States have warned their citizens about the danger of consuming fish caught in streams, rivers, ponds and lakes. The fish contain levels of mercury that trigger the warnings, in about a dozen States every single body of water is posted with a health advisory.

Earlier this year the EPA released a report to Congress in which it identified mercury as a hazardous air pollutant of greatest concern for public health, and EPA’s scientists offer additional monitoring of emissions from power plants.

The provisions in this bill and language in the report would prevent the EPA from even gathering that data; that information that is needed to better gauge the scope of the problem.

Last spring the Maine legislature passed and the governor signed landmark legislation that would slash emissions of mercury from in-State sources. We are taking care of our own. The people of the State of Maine are looking upwind to see what steps are being taken in the regions that produce the emissions.

Last month the governors of New England and the premiers of Eastern Canada called for, and I quote, “The elimination of discharges of mercury from human activity into the environment.”

One of the key components of their action plan was the recommendation for more research, more analysis and strategic monitoring. They saw the need to identify and to quantify sources of mercury deposition. They want to monitor deposition patterns and to develop ways of measuring and tracking progress.

The report would prevent the EPA from providing assistance in the cross-border effort. The report would prevent the EPA from taking the steps that are essential to protecting the health of young children and women of child-bearing age.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, it appears from this discussion that the only thing that Congress fears is fear itself. We are afraid of existing law because the existing law is feared by special interests. We fear the cleanup of licensed nuclear facilities. We fear the cleanup of the air in Yosemite and the Grand Canyon. The hazy air. We need to make Lysol manufacturers, who oppose the implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act. We fear, as we have heard, New York and New England industries who oppose the dredging as a remedial tool. We fear the utilities who oppose the regulatory determinations for mercury emissions. Most of all, we seem to fear our very own Environmental Protection Agency and the Council of Environmental Quality.

My colleagues, this fear can be conquered. It is very simple. It only requires that we vote in favor of the Waxman amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, for anyone who sacked out back in 1995 and pulled kind of a mini Rip Van Winkle and just woke up this week, we are right where they left off when it comes to clean air and clean water, because the same anti-environmental spirit that dominated this Congress back in 1995 is alive and well.

Now, most Americans remember 1995. They remember not the words of Democrats, perhaps, but the words uttered at
Let me tell my colleagues about these studies. They are being urged by the same group of people that when they heard from the Surgeon General in 1964 that tobacco causes lung cancer and emphysema, they are the same folks that are still studying it today, and not wanting to say anything about it on the floor of this Congress.

They are going to study it until time eternal rather than taking effective action to do something to protect our clean air and our clean water.

Then the other excuse that was advanced this evening was the suggestion that if we dealt with haze, the kind of haze we hear about down on the Rio Grande River or the kind of haze that sometimes lingers over the Grand Canyon, spoiling that wonderful vista, that if we dealt with haze in the air, that that might be because, and they do not know what is going to happen, they have contended, that might be some way that they are actually going to do something about global warming. Heaven forbid.

The very thought that the ostrich would take its head out of the sand, getting hotter all the time, and actually do something about global warming before the glaciers melt and the forests and the farms are burnt up. What a horrible thought that is that they might actually do something.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) has expired.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, so eager are they to thwart even the possibility that someone might study this growing danger of global warming, of the greenhouse effect, of the fact that a lot of this warming up is much warmer than this debate I must say, and the threat that that poses to health and safety of the future of all the people on this world, so eager are they to prevent even a study that they have come in and tried to limit a study of haze that relates to the ability to see the great national wonders in our national parks and forests across this land.

That is the same extreme position that led one of the Republican leaders to talk about our environmental law enforcers and to denigrate them as the Gestapo of America.

Then there is the issue of PCBs in our water. It was only a few decades ago that one of our Nation’s leaders said to actually documented about the Housatonic. There is no tonic quite like the Housatonic. Well, I do not think he had in mind a river that was full of PCBs. The EPA is talking about trying to do something about it. There is a fear that actually might go ahead and do something about it.

All this talk about things just being report language, when is it that we are going to see in a report that we want the Environmental Protection Agency to do a more vigorous job of enforcing our laws, cleaning up our water, cleaning up our air, protecting our natural resources so they will be there for our children in future generations?

The kind of report language I would like to see in this report instead of tying the hands and crippling the efforts of this agency to do its job. That is what is going to happen when we adopt the Waxman answer and reject the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman. This amendment would override several provisions of the VA-HUD report, and I would like to speak to two of them.

First, the amendment of the gentleman would roll back a much needed report on mercury emissions, language that would direct EPA to complete the scientific research needed to make informed regulatory decisions.

EPA recently settled a mercury-related lawsuit brought by the National Resources Defense Council. In that settlement, it promised to decide by November 15 of this year whether more stringent controls on mercury emissions are needed.

What is the problem with that settlement? The problem is that there are still many our Nation’s air and water enforcers and to denigrate them as the Gestapo of America.

Then there is the issue of PCBs in our water. It was only a few decades ago that one of our Nation’s leaders said to actually documented about the Housatonic. There is no tonic quite like the Housatonic. Well, I do not think he had in mind a river that was full of PCBs. The EPA is talking about trying to do something about it. There is a fear that actually might go ahead and do something about it.

All this talk about things just being report language, when is it that we are going to see in a report that we want the Environmental Protection Agency to do a more vigorous job of enforcing our laws, cleaning up our water, cleaning up our air, protecting our natural resources so they will be there for our children in future generations?

That is the kind of report language I would like to see in this report instead of tying the hands and crippling the efforts of this agency to do its job. That is what is going to happen when we adopt the Waxman answer and reject the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman. This amendment would override several provisions of the VA-HUD report, and I would like to speak to two of them.

First, the amendment of the gentleman would roll back a much needed report on mercury emissions, language that would direct EPA to complete the scientific research needed to make informed regulatory decisions.

EPA recently settled a mercury-related lawsuit brought by the National Resources Defense Council. In that settlement, it promised to decide by November 15 of this year whether more stringent controls on mercury emissions are needed.

What is the problem with that settlement? The problem is that there are still many our Nation’s air and water enforcers and to denigrate them as the Gestapo of America.

Then there is the issue of PCBs in our water. It was only a few decades ago that one of our Nation’s leaders said to actually documented about the Housatonic. There is no tonic quite like the Housatonic. Well, I do not think he had in mind a river that was full of PCBs. The EPA is talking about trying to do something about it. There is a fear that actually might go ahead and do something about it.

All this talk about things just being report language, when is it that we are going to see in a report that we want the Environmental Protection Agency to do a more vigorous job of enforcing our laws, cleaning up our water, cleaning up our air, protecting our natural resources so they will be there for our children in future generations?
My amendment would address the concern that report language accompanying this bill could be construed to reprioritize implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act away from priority implementation to meet public health protection and under-emphasis on new statutory safety standards established by the FQPA.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the report also directs the EPA to issue regulations governing emergency exemption tolerances which were statutorily required by the FQPA.

I assume that your amendment would not affect this language.

Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is correct. This rule is long overdue and should be issued immediately. Nothing in my amendment would prohibit the EPA from implementing any statutory requirement under the Food Quality Protection Act.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The report instructs the EPA to review and issue emergency exemptions in a manner which minimizes resource demands. Would the intent of your amendment affect this language?

Mr. WAXMAN. No, it would not. Obviously, for emergency exemptions to be effective, they need to be issued in a timely manner. Nothing in my amendment would undermine that goal.

I am aware that there is disagreement among stakeholders on what EPA’s priorities should be in the implementation of this law. It is my hope and expectation that the Tolerance Reassessment Advisory Committee, convened at the request of Vice President Gore, will help to bring consensus to implementation of our pesticide laws.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Finally, I would like to ask, as the report instructs the EPA to ensure the use of reliable data in calculating exposure to pesticide residues and to clearly explain the legal and scientific basis for any policy or recommendation. What is your position on this directive?

Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman is correct that EPA should clearly explain how it is reaching its decisions. I am aware that EPA is currently developing guidance to help in this regard, and my amendment would not interfere with this process.

I also agree that EPA should use reliable data when available. However, sometimes reliable data is unavailable, and reasonable assumptions in order to not ignore legitimate public health concerns. When these assumptions are not dictated by the statute, the agency has greater discretion.

I hope that the EPA’s guidance will help clarify issues regarding what information is required and how and when assumptions are used so that all stakeholders can understand how the law will be implemented.

Additionally, I expect the agency will fully consider any data it is provided.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and commend him for his leadership on this issue.

There has been recent misinformation on this issue, and I congratulate the gentleman for working towards a consensus approach.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who also has expressed concern about this matter.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from North Carolina in bringing this colloquy to clarify some of the misconceptions about the inability for farmers to provide in getting the protection they need under the Food Quality Protection Act. I think this means that we can have both an environment that is safe but also for the opportunity for farmers to move forward.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for his response and clarifying the record that this is not an anti-farmers provision.

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

Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I was not sure that I wanted to become engaged in this debate. But I do have some concerns about the Food Quality Protection Act; and since we have been discussing that in a very enlightening way, I thought that I would proceed with the remarks which I had prepared.

I am speaking as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and one who has been involved in working on pesticides for about the last 25 years. I thought that I was finally witnessing some substantive progress with the passage of the Food Quality Protection Act in the 104th Congress. I should have known it was too good to be true.

The committee report language appears to place pesticide decisions into two categories: the “please-go-faster” category includes registering new products and granting emergency exemptions.

I note that reregistration decisions are not included in this category, even though we have been promising the public and the farming community for over 25 years that all pesticides on the market today would be reviewed to ensure that they meet contemporary health and safety standards. We have yet to keep that promise.
In the “please-go-slow-if-you-go-at-all” category includes the implementa-
tion of the science policies and new metho-
dologies required to fulfill the mandate that Congress gave the a-
egencies 2 years ago to take account of the special impacts and children.

And we have had some serious public con-
troversy with regard to apples will recall; consider cumulative pathways of pesticide exposure; and to address group decisions which have a com-
motion of action.

All of these, after all, might lead to further restricting pesticide use or to the agency making a decision to cancel the older, riskier products that have been on the market for decades and whose continued presence acts as a dis-
centive for farmers and consumers to use newer and safer products.

I recognize a period of transition is inevitable with the passage of any new law. The need for a transition should not become an excuse for paralysis in decision-making at the agency. Many decisions will need to be made are long overdue and should not be de-
ferred indefinitely while we develop perfect scientific information or a con-
sensus of all interested groups. The days of politically safe and scientif-
cally nonsensical decisions will never ar-
ive. I can guarantee you that.

The Administration and the Congress promised the public a science-based food safety law that would ensure that safe pesticide products would be used in our homes, workplaces and to grow our food. We said we could accomplish this without hampering our farmers’ ability to grow the products we all need and enjoy. The colloquy that we just heard a few minutes ago confirms that. We should not be so afraid of changing the law that we cannot make good on the promises we make and move ahead to fur-
ther improve the safety of our food supply and the health of our environ-
ment. We should not get caught in the trap that has immobilized progress on this issue for the last quarter century.

I urge Members to vote for the Wax-
man amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chair-
man, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. One of the needs for this report language is that it would appear as though the agency is cherry-picking the way it will inter-
pret the very law that your committee wrote, and it is a comprehensive bill. Remember, Mr. Brown, that this is the same agency that has a hand in the problems in our own territory like the Delhi ever-loving sand fly and the San Bernadino kangaroo rat. The EPA needs more decision. That is all this report language does.

Mr. BROWN of California. Let me say to my good friend from my neighboring congressional district that I am well aware of the defects in the way the EPA operates. I have no objections to giving them some direction. I do not wish, however, to withdraw the direc-
tion that we may have already given them in which they are not fulfilling at the present time.

I think that this is the whole intent of the Waxman amendment. I cannot perceive why it should even be contro-
versial. I do not object to the direc-
tions coming from the Committee on Appropriations. I agree when they intrude on the prerogatives of the authorizing committee, but I even overlap that once in a while when I feel that the goal is worthwhile. But I think in this case, we may have gone too far in an effort to prevent the agen-
cy from doing the job that we have told it we want them to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN). I had planned today to offer my own amendment to nullify one of the antienvironmental riders attached to the Harmful Air Pollutants bill but instead my language will be included in this amendment and I want to thank the gentleman from California for his support and leadership on this matter.

The new language that I was going to offer that language that would seriously and un-
necessarily delay the EPA’s efforts to address the risk of exposure to mercury contamination from utility emissions. Let me be perfectly clear. The effect of this language is to say that EPA can issue no regulations with respect to utility emissions for 3 years. That is the effect of this language. It is signifi-
cant, and that is why those on the other side are fighting so hard to keep it in.

Mercury is a naturally occurring ele-
ment that has built up to dangerous levels in the environment due to re-
leases from coal-fired power plants, waste incinerators and other types of manufacturing.

After mercury is released into the air, it can travel great distances. It eventually settles in water, and, unlike other pollutants, it accumulates in the aquatic food chain and becomes more, not less, toxic over time in the tissue of fish. There in its most toxic form, methyl mercury, it contaminates hu-
mans who eat the fish.

The health risks related to mercury exposure are significant. The most vul-
erable to mercury contamination are pregnant women and children. Mercury poisoning can result in severe neurological damage to developing fetuses. Older children and adults can see effects such as paralysis, numbness in extremities and kidney disease.

In my home State of Maine, loons hold a special place in our hearts, but we also have one of the highest levels of mercury contamination. In this country, far higher than in States to the west.

The 1990 Clean Air Act did not ad-
dress mercury utility emissions but it did require the EPA to report to Con-
gress on the impacts, sources and con-
trol strategies for mercury. That long-
awaited report, and, I would say, de-
layed report finally was delivered to Congress this past week before it is. This is the executive summary of that EPA report to Congress. The whole report is huge.

Here is another report. The States are acting on their own. The north-
central and midwestern States and the Mar-
time provinces have all got together and done a study of mercury. We have studies. We have got plenty of studies on mercury.

We have heard statements tonight about the big, bad Federal agency, the EPA. Take a look at this. Thirty-nine States have water body advisories related to mercury contamination. Thirty-nine States. I ask those on the other side, take a good look at this map. Chances are your State is one of those States that has a mercury water body advisory. This is not the EPA. This is your State Department of Envi-
ronmental Protection, the biologists. To those that oppose the Waxman amendment, what I say is you are going to tell your State biologists, what are you going to tell the mothers and children in your States who are at risk of mercury contamination, and frankly many of them do not know that. Are you going to tell them that, won’t we, we ought to do nothing for 3 years?

I do not think that is an acceptable approach. These reports conclude that coal-fired power plants emit more mer-
cury into the air than any other source. Estimates are that they release 52 tons of mercury every year, one-
third of the annual emissions.

Now, what we are asking is for EPA to go to the utilities and gather infor-
mation about utility emissions. We do not want to stop that. We want that to continue because the public has a right to know. They have got a right to know this information.

Right now EPA is finalizing its infor-
mation request to utilities. We know the problem. We know the sources. And accurate monitoring data by the EPA is necessary. We need to know. The re-
port language would require several studies to address what are claimed to be current gaps in the scientific under-
standing of mercury. But the studies that we are waiting for, that those on the other side are fighting for, are not expected to be completed until 2002.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has expired.
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, waiting for duplicate studies before we act will only achieve further delay in the agen-
cy’s ability to address the risk from mercury
emissions from utilities until more
studies are done.

But studies have already been done. It is a fact that mercury gets deposited
in our soil and water. It is a fact that mercury accumulates in fish. It is a
fact that mercury works its way up
the food chain to people. Coal-fired util-
ities emit 52 tons of mercury each year
nationwide.

Mercury contamination is a serious
problem in Ohio. The National Wildlife
Federation has determined that coal-
burning utilities are responsible for 55
percent of the State’s total mercury
emissions. These utilities are respon-
sible for more than 9,000 pounds per
year of mercury released into the air.
The Ohio Department of Health has
issued a statewide fishing advisory for
the mercury levels in the Ohio.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentle-
man for yielding. I want to com-
 mend the gentleman for his leadership
on this issue. I know he had a similar
amendment which we have incor-
porated into our amendment. It is im-
portant that we deal with this issue. I
was pleased by the assurances from the
gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS)
that these report language provisions
do not need informing mistakes in the
agencies. But I fear that when we ask
them to do another report after they
have already done so much, as the
genleman so eloquently pointed out, that
it may be intimidating on them to go
forward. I think that is a reason why
we need to adopt this amendment.

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

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the
genleman from California (Mr. WAX-
MAN) is right. Report language does
state that the EPA not issue any regu-
latory action for mercury emissions from utilities until more
studies are done.

But studies have already been done. It is a fact that coal-burning utilities
emit mercury from their smokestacks.

It is a fact that mercury gets deposited
in our soil and water. It is a fact that
mercury accumulates in fish. It is a
fact that mercury works its way up
the food chain to people. Coal-fired util-
ities emit 52 tons of mercury each year
nationwide.

Mercury contamination is a serious
problem in Ohio. The National Wildlife
Federation has determined that coal-
burning utilities are responsible for 55
percent of the State’s total mercury
emissions. These utilities are respon-
sible for more than 9,000 pounds per
year of mercury released into the air.
The Ohio Department of Health has
issued a statewide fishing advisory for
the mercury levels in the Ohio.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, waiting for duplicate studies before we act will only achieve further delay in the agen-
cy’s ability to address the risk from mercury
emissions from utilities until more
studies are done.

But studies have already been done. It is a fact that mercury gets deposited
in our soil and water. It is a fact that mercury accumulates in fish. It is a
fact that mercury works its way up
the food chain to people. Coal-fired util-
ities emit 52 tons of mercury each year
nationwide.

Mercury contamination is a serious
problem in Ohio. The National Wildlife
Federation has determined that coal-
burning utilities are responsible for 55
percent of the State’s total mercury
emissions. These utilities are respon-
sible for more than 9,000 pounds per
year of mercury released into the air.
The Ohio Department of Health has
issued a statewide fishing advisory for
the mercury levels in the Ohio.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, waiting for duplicate studies before we act will only achieve further delay in the agen-
cy’s ability to address the risk from mercury
emissions from utilities until more
studies are done.

But studies have already been done. It is a fact that mercury gets deposited
in our soil and water. It is a fact that mercury accumulates in fish. It is a
fact that mercury works its way up
the food chain to people. Coal-fired util-
ities emit 52 tons of mercury each year
nationwide.
Mr. Olver. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, that river is completely outside the area that is represented by the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

The people in our area and the people in Connecticut and the governmental authorities in both Massachusetts and Connecticut are deeply concerned about making certain that this process is not slowed down, that it goes forward.

All the Environmental Protection Agencies in those States and the law enforcement agencies in those States are agreed upon that we can argue about the merits of a do-nothing Congress in the case of these ghost riders. I suspect that the American people would be very much served and very happy if we did exactly nothing in relation to such items that have been attached to the report language of the bill. So we should adopt and support the Waxman amendment in order to eliminate these ghost riders from this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise, obviously, to oppose the amendment and with some concern because I do not wish to discuss the amendment. I have had a lot of time to consider this amendment and several others in this bill. I do wish that we could conclude our debate and bring it to a close, because I think it is a very important bill that should be concluded tonight, and we can go on to other business.

I cannot for the life of me understand why we are dragging out the debate as long as we are. But since we are dragging it out, it has given me an opportunity to say a few things. When I arrived on Capitol Hill, I came from New Orleans. We have the Times-Picayune. Sometimes I read the Washington Times and even the Washington Post. I venture forth and sometimes I read the Wall Street Journal going all the way up to New York.

I picked up the first copy of the New York Times I have seen in months, perhaps years, it is a place I happen over to. It was there waiting for this debate to be over. For the life of me, when is it going to be over? It is no reflection on the author of the amendment. He means well. And all the opponents, they may well do a good job, and I am very happy, we just keep debating it.

So I am reading this lead editorial. It says, "The Firestorm Cometh." Mr. Chairman, I would like to take an opportunity to read it. Charles Libella, who has been leading the Justice Department's campaign finance investigation, has now advised Attorney General Janet Reno that under both the mandatory and discretionary provisions of the Independent Counsel Act she must appoint an outside prosecutor to take over his inquiry. The other important issue in this investigation is whether the Office of the Director Louis Freeh, has already recommended an independent counsel. Ms. Reno can give her usual runaround about being hard-headed, and undeterred from the meaning of this development.

The two people in the American Government that have been at the heart of this case, the lead prosecutor and the top investigator, are convinced that the trail of potentially illegal money leads so clearly toward the White House. They have had to ignore his advice. Labella was hand-picked by Ms. Reno on the basis of his experience and skill to run this investigation. Either she has to come forward and make the impossible argument that they are incompetent or bow to the law's requirements.

I got to the last paragraph, and I had to stop. I saw the New York Times. Certainly it is the Washington Times or maybe the Times-Picayune. But I checked the headline. No, it is the New York Times, right out of New York City. It is the lead editorial. This is the last paragraph. It says, "Ms. Reno may grumble about leaks of supposedly confidential advice, but the fact is that the American people need to know that the top two law enforcement officers believe the Attorney General is derelict."


Moreover, Freeh and Libella are right to separate themselves from Ms. Reno, because if her attempt to protect herself continues to raise from investigation continues, it will go down as a black mark against Justice every bit as historic as J. Edgar Hoover's. "It's a viciousmare," is a word in Congress, but if Ms. Reno does not make the appointment, the Republican Senate leadership ought to ignite one, today.

I think the gentleman's amendment ought to be rejected, but this is something to consider. I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I will not use the 5 minutes.
us on the Democratic side stood up tonight and pointed out that this continued assault on the environment will not continue to take place in this House as long as we are around here and able to express ourselves.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN of California. This amendment would eliminate controversial, anti-environmental riders attached to the bill at the last minute. This amendment would override language which interferes with agency actions to protect the environment and public health authorized by existing statutory authority. Specifically, the amendment would override provisions in this bill which would significantly delay efforts to clean the PCB contaminated Housatonic River in my home state of Connecticut. The Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection has contacted me in opposition of these provisions and the Environmental Protection Agency has indicated that these provisions pose a serious threat to our children from exposure to environmental contaminants from this dangerous chemical. This amendment would also correct language which would delay the cleanup of contaminated sites with mercury, exposure to which can cause serious neurological damage.

We must act immediately to clean up these contaminated sites and reduce the possibility of exposure to these dangerous chemicals. This amendment is supported by the National Environmental Trust, the National Resources Defense Council, the Public Interest Research Group and the Sierra Club, and several other environmental groups. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment and protect our children from exposure to environmental hazards.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN). The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 176, noes 243, 66 not voting, as follows:

AYES—176

Abercrombie (HI)  Delahunt (MA)
Ackerman (NY)  Deleo (MA)
Allen (GA)  Delau (DE)
Andrews (MD)  Derwinski (MA)
Baldacci (MA)  Dixon (CA)
Barrett (WI)  Doggett (TX)
Becker (NY)  Doggett (NY)
Bentsen (TX)  Ehlers (TX)
Berman (NJ)  Engel (NY)
Bill Bradley (NJ)  Ensign (CA)
Blagojevic (IL)  Eshoo (NY)
Blumenauer (OR)  Evans (NY)
Boehlert (NY)  Fantasy (OH)
Bonior (NJ)  Fattah (PA)
Bosko (NY)  Fazio (NY)
Brown (CA)  Faso (NY)
Brown (FL)  Forbes (NY)

NOES—243

Adler (NJ)  Danner (OR)
Aderholt (AL)  Davis (VA)
Archer (NY)  DeLauro (CT)
Bachus (ID)  Delahunt (MA)
Baker (CA)  DeLauro (CT)
Balitner (WV)  DeLauro (CT)
Barbaro (CA)  Delahunt (MA)
Barrett (NE)  DeLauro (CT)
Bartlett (CT)  Delahunt (MA)
Bash (PA)  DeLauro (CT)
Bateeman (PA)  Delahunt (MA)
Beatrice (CA)  Delahunt (MA)
Berkley (CA)  Delahunt (MA)
Biaggi (NY)  Delahunt (MA)
Bilirakis (FL)  Delahunt (MA)
Bishop (GA)  Delahunt (MA)
Bilirakis (FL)  Delahunt (MA)
Blair (RI)  Delahunt (MA)
Blanks (AL)  Delahunt (MA)
Blauvelt (PA)  Delahunt (MA)
Boucher (MA)  Delahunt (MA)
Boe (HI)  Delahunt (MA)
Bosworth (MA)  Delahunt (MA)
Boulter (IN)  Delahunt (MA)
Boutin (ME)  Delahunt (MA)
Bourgeois (LA)  Delahunt (MA)
Bowman (SC)  Delahunt (MA)
Brooks (GA)  Delahunt (MA)
Browne (NJ)  Delahunt (MA)
Brown (IL)  Delahunt (MA)
Brown (OH)  Delahunt (MA)
Brown (FL)  Delahunt (MA)

Vote was 176 aye, 243 no, 66 not voting.
I rise today to seek the assurance of the gentleman from California that if EPA does not move expeditiously to resolve this important matter prior to conference, that he will work with me in the context to reach a resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with my colleague from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS). In May, I joined the gentleman in sending a letter to EPA attempting to resolve this important issue. I am disappointed in the response we have received and hope that the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) will work with us in conference, should congressional action be necessary.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my field ask if the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) can help us in this endeavor.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and would like to offer my assurance that should EPA not work to resolve this issue prior to conference, that I will work with the gentleman on language addressing this issue at that time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis), chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, in 1995, in a bipartisan effort the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act, Public Law 104-55, was signed into law. This law required the Federal Government to differentiate between edible oils and other oils, such as petroleum, when issuing or enforcing any regulations relating to the transportation, discharge, emission or disposal of oils under Federal law.

Unfortunately, the EPA has yet to provide for differentiation treatment of these oils, despite common sense industry positions favoring the agency’s rules into compliance with the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act.

The animal fats and vegetable oil industry has been working with the Congress and the Federal Government on this issue for more than 6 years. The Congress expressed its will when it passed the legislation in the 104th Congress.

It is time to bring this issue to conclusion and stop the bureaucratic red tape. The Senate has included an amendment to the EPA appropriations that requires the EPA to promulgate a rule by March 31, 1999, that will bring this issue to closure and provide for a regulation that is in compliance with the law that this body passed by unanimous consent in 1995.

The House Committee on Appropriations has included report language also calling for closure to this issue by March 31, 1999.

I would urge the Members to include the Senate language in the final version of this legislation as it makes its way out of conference. I hope the Members would agree that the EPA should move forward with common sense and balanced regulations for edible animal fats and vegetable oils.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, for bringing this matter to our attention. I certainly agree that the EPA should move forward in this matter and we will work closely with our Senate counterparts in conference to see that the Agency does so.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage our distinguished Chairman of the Sub-committee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, in a colloquy.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be happy to join in a colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, as you know, I am a former home builder and very familiar with the role of home mortgages in the country. We have about 23,000 mortgage brokers that originate half of all home mortgages throughout the country. These are small businessmen and women who provide a convenient and valuable service to both wholesale lenders and home buyers.

Sometimes the lender pays the mortgage broker for their services which allows lower upfront costs to the home buyer. These payments are known as lender paid mortgage broker fees or yield spread premiums.

Confusion has arisen over the legality of lender paid broker fees. Nearly everybody agrees that Federal law does not make lender paid mortgage broker fees automatically illegal. Yet, HUD has difficulty in fully clarifying this point.

Although the bill does not help HUD clarify this issue, I know the gentleman shares my concern and I appreciate his efforts during the committee markup.

Is it the Chairman’s intention to address the lender paid mortgage broker fees in the conference committee?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, first, let me say to my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLiley), and the EPA as we go to conference and over the next year to resolve this very important issue.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for his work on this important issue. The committee encourages EPA, States, and localities to work together in finding better solutions to protect our environment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to work together with the gentleman and the Committee on Commerce over the next year in resolving the problems facing the gentleman’s district and the Nation. Presently, the Committee on Commerce is considering the proposal, and I will work with that committee and the gentleman from New York as we move toward conference and over the next year.
Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his encouraging words and look forward to working with him and the gentleman from Virginia and the EPA over the next year to find a way to afford my community and others greater flexibility in their efforts to offer Americans the clearest water possible.

Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from California’s reassurances at this time, I will not offer my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis), the ranking member, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes), the chairman, for engaging in this colloquy with me and with the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Allen). I appreciate their work on this very important legislation.

We rise to discuss the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation, or VERA system. My colleague from Maine and I have been confronting a very difficult situation in our State of Maine, which is part of Veterans Integrated Service Networks, or VISN 1. Under the VERA system, VISN 1 has lost funding in the past, and is expected to lose additional funding this year. We are concerned about the level of care that our veterans are receiving.

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

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Togus, Maine VA Medical Center has been recognized in the past as a center of excellence. Now, however, the Maine delegation is hearing continual complaints from veterans that they are having to wait longer for appointments; that they are being asked to travel out of Maine to receive services; and that their doctors do not have time enough to spend with them. I am concerned that VISN 1 is not receiving adequate resources under the VERA system to serve Maine’s veterans.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new concern. Last year the House VA-HUD conference report requested the GAO to study how the VERA system affects the VISNs. We had expected this report to be concluded by this point so we could have the information before voting on another appropriations bill. It is now my understanding that the VERA report has been significantly delayed and is not yet available.

I would ask the chairman and ranking member when are we expecting the GAO report to be issued?

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is our understanding that the GAO intends to issue its report by September 1 of this year.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my colleague and I expect that the information to be concluded in the GAO report may assist the subcommittee and all Members in examining the reallocations that are underway. It would have been our wish, and I suspect the wish of the chairman and the ranking member, to have this report in hand before considering this legislation. At a minimum, we hope that it will be given careful consideration during conference.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, to ensure that this year’s appropriation bill provides adequate resources to every VISN to provide every veteran with the quality health care to which he or she is entitled, I would ask the chairman and ranking member to assure the body that as this legislation goes to conference that they will do all they can to ensure the recommendations of the GAO are taken into consideration.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Speaking for myself, I tell the gentlemen from Maine that I will carefully examine the GAO report and will take the GAO’s recommendations in due consideration as we go through the conference.

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

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Stokes. Also speaking for myself, I similarly assure the gentlemen from Maine that I will carefully examine the GAO report and will take the GAO’s recommendations in due consideration. Providing quality health care to all of our Nation’s veterans must be our highest priority.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their commitment to the veterans of this country.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise to engage the distinguished chair from California in a colloquy. I want to highlight the merits of an innovative approach to water-management related plant research and wastewater system management that has been initiated by a terrific project called the Oregon Garden Project in Silverton, Oregon. It has national implications and is a national model. By publicly showcasing how wetland functions as a natural water filtration system, and demonstrating unique wetland restoration, the Oregon Garden Project has been recognized as a model of excellence. The project provides an outstanding public education opportunity.

The garden, a $36 million construction project, is being funded by $8 million in private dollars and contributions from a partnership of State, Federal and local government. In fiscal year 1999, I am requesting a final $1 million to be provided within the EPA account for completion of construction, complementing the $2 million already provided.

The Oregon Garden holds a great deal of promise for teaching the public and developers about the critical role wetlands play in habitat and ecosystem management. While developed wetlands will never be able to replace preservation of existing wetlands, the reality is that wetlands must be restored and created. Developers must know how they function to accommodate this process.

The nursery industry in the State of Oregon is the fastest growing industry in our State. It holds great potential for job development. We feel like the more than $9 million that have already been invested in this project makes us an excellent partner.

I recognize the gentleman cannot grant every request, but I wonder if the chairman would work with the other body in the conference and try to find funding for the Oregon Garden.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the gentleman from California.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentlewoman probably does not know this, but my first grandchild, Katelyn Rose, was born three years ago. Since that time I have been in the gardening business. So I want the gentlewoman to know that not only do I appreciate her making this effort, we will try to do everything we can to move the bill along and we will be glad to be cooperative with her.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. Lewis), the chairman of the VA-HUD appropriations subcommittee, for the time and hard work which he and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Stokes) have rendered in bringing this legislation before the House. I want to raise an issue related to a component of the bill before us today, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

On July 6, residents of my district and five adjacent districts in Los Angeles County came under a mandate to purchase flood insurance through the National Flood Insurance Program administered by FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. This mandate has caused a spirited debate within the region as to the necessity for this insurance and the accuracy of the maps of the Los Angeles County Drainage Area, which includes the Los Angeles River, the Rio Hondo River, and the Santa Gabriel River. Those maps simply are not accurate, and yet one has to purchase insurance based on those maps.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Is it not correct that the city of Lakewood,
California, paid for a new survey and found that almost 5,000 homes and businesses were mistakenly included in the floodplain and, thus, would have been required to purchase insurance when it was, in fact, not required?

Mr. HORN. That is true, and 5,000 structure were exempted.

Lakewood did this at no small cost based on its limited budget. The city undertook the survey to ensure that the revised insurance rate maps were as accurate as possible. And as I say, there were many inaccuracies.

It strikes me as unfair that the Federal Government has placed this insurance mandate upon 500,000 constituents from six congressional districts. But FEMA has not made the proper flood plain insurance maps as accurate as possible.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I feel that before the Government acts, it should make a good faith effort to use the best information that is available, particularly when good citizens—and many of these citizens are in a lower-economic category—must pay out of their pockets for any mistakes the Government might make.

For this reason, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman if funding could be made available to ensure that new maps would be prepared more accurately and reflect the true areas which might be impacted by the 100-year flood event. I would hope that the flood insurance now being imposed would also have a moratorium placed on it until the maps of the flood plain prove to be accurate.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, my colleague is raising a very, very important point; and this issue is one that has been around for a while and yet it needs some serious oversight and review. It is a problem that I would like to continue to explore with my colleagues, especially the gentleman from California (Mr. Horn) and I appreciate his bringing this to our attention further.

Mr. HORN. Reclaiming my time, I would hope that something could happen in conference or in another way.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If I know the gentleman from California (Mr. Horn), he will see what we try.

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

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remark.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak about my amendment and engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis). As the gentleman is undoubtedly aware, the American Heritage Rivers Initiative was established by an executive order and has not gone through the entire committee process. It has not received any Congressional authorization. It has not received any appropriation and it has not received sufficient oversight by the committee of jurisdiction.

A number of Members, including myself, are very concerned about this American Heritage Rivers Initiative program, and it has not been authorized by Congress. So I rise today to ensure that the Congressional intent is not to be misconstrued by the Council on Environmental Quality, or CEQ.

The CEQ should not rely on the Committee on Appropriations VA-HUD Appropriations report to fund the American Heritage Rivers Initiative, and I am just asking the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis), if that is his understanding.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am very well aware of your concerns; and if you recall, I shared them with the administration on several instances during the past year. It is not my intent that the report language be a base for future funding.

Mr. STEARNS. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the concern of the chairman because, as it points out, the committee states that the Council on Environmental Quality should "strike a balance when allocating resources so as to adequately fund Congressional priorities as well as the administration’s priorities such as the American Heritage Rivers Initiative."

So primarily I was concerned that CEQ would misconstrue that statement through the House committee report that it spoke for the entire House. So I appreciate the statement of the chairman on this.

Mr. Chairman, do you acknowledge this as a program that has really not been approved by Congress?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I do not only acknowledge but state flatly that this is an unauthorized program, and I want my colleague to know that I intend to maintain my position. I am going to go to conference because that both the House and Senate are very clear on this matter.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the concern of the gentleman and I appreciate what he just spoke, the endorse-ments for fund certain when we go to conference and the House and Senate are very clear on this matter.

The language as is written could be construed, but I think my colleague has made it clear tonight, that if a program is not authorized by Congress, and this report language does not do that.

As the chairman is aware, the federal involvement in local land issues has been a rocky history lately.

At this point I include for the record, Mr. Chairman, the following body of my remarks, which gives this rocky history without belaboring it here on the House floor:

By way of background, on April 13, 1998, a US District Court Judge ruled that the National Park Service had an obligation to block the construction of a proposed St. Croix River Bridge connecting Stillwater, Minnesota, with Houlton, Wisconsin. Minnesota and Wisconsin spent $14 million on bridge design and purchase of required right-of-way. This construction block was allowed despite Department of Transportation approval of the project. Why was the project halted? Because the St. Croix River is designated as a Wild and Scenic River, under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. This Act was the basis for the National Park Service’s Authority.

The decision turned on the interpretation of the project as a “water resource project” by the National Park Service. This gave the National Park Service authority over the project, even though apparent Congressional intent to prevent any bridge over a designated river to be considered a “water resource project” under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

In the case of the American Heritage Rivers Initiative, as Congress was not involved in the creation of the project, courts would have no Congressional history as guidance should disputes arise.

If the Wild and Scenic Rivers Program is any indication, we have reason to be concerned about increased federal involvement in our local affairs. It is still unclear exactly what American Heritage Rivers designation means. Already, we are seeing that the policy on this Initiative is far from clear. I wrote to the CEQ over a month ago to request clarification on what a kind of an exemption a Congress-man whose District was opted out could expect to receive. I still have received no response from the CEQ.

Does the Chairman agree that the CEQ should not use VA-HUD appropriation funds to operate the American Heritage Rivers Initiative without Congressional approval?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, I do. I will work with concerned members of this body to make sure that we prevent the CEQ from operating the American Heritage Rivers initiative with public money without Congressional Approval.

Mr. STEARNS. Given Mr. Lewis’ agreement to resolve this situation, I would like to withdraw my amendment to prevent the CEQ from using VA-HUD Appropriation funds to administer the American Heritage Rivers Initiative. I look forward to working with the Chairman and ensuring that the CEQ does not use federal funds to operate the American Heritage Rivers Initiative without Congressional Approval.

I would like to thank the gentleman for his continued leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying, does the chairman agree that the CEQ should not use VA-HUD appropriation funds to operate the American Heritage Rivers Initiative without Congressional approval?

Mr. LEWIS of California. That is the strong position of the chairman.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statements of the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) here and I look forward to working with him in ensuring that the CEQ does not use federal funds to operate the American Heritage Rivers Initiative without Congressional approval?
Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would otherwise have risen in strong support of the gentleman's amendment. But what we have decided is we will have a colloquy to discuss this. If the gentleman from California would join us, I would like to ask a question.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from California is aware, the Emergency Food and Shelter Program is a model program that acts as a vast safety net for homeless and hungry individuals nationwide. I know that the gentleman has been supportive of this program and has indicated a willingness to see what can be done to provide additional resources for this program.

Would the gentleman agree that the Emergency Food and Shelter Program is an effective, well-run program and that it has become increasingly difficult to accommodate all the requests from charitable organizations for emergency food assistance?

Mr. LEWIS. Of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I concur with the gentleman from New York. The Emergency Food and Shelter Program is a well-administered, effective program. The program is a model of public-private partnership with local boards distributing funds quickly and efficiently to the neediest areas of the country with minimal but accountable reporting. I also recognize that there are growing requests for emergency assistance from charitable organizations that have made it increasingly difficult to meet all the requests for food assistance.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in the event that additional resources become available when the House conference with the Senate begins on this bill, will the gentleman work with us to see if some additional funds may be made available for this effective, vitally needed program?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman's continued interest in this program. Let me assure the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Florida and others with an interest in supporting the Emergency Food and Shelter Program that to the degree that additional resources become available when we go to conference on this bill, I will continue to work together with these gentlemen to see if additional resources can be found for this important program.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman. Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I, under the circumstances, will not offer the amendment. I would just point out that these are effective programs that very often the benefits go directly to people. There has been very little in increase that has been provided for these programs over the last 4 or 5 years. I think that they are due an increase especially because the local groups that are in fact operating these programs are operating on overload and much need help. I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to work with us and therefore will not be offering the amendments and will withdraw them.

The Emergency Food and Shelter program is a unique program that partners the Federal Government and some of the largest national charity organizations down to the local level. The charities that work in partnership with the EFS program are on overload. Demand for food and shelter is rising and the funding level of EFS has not kept pace with the need. Second Harvest has reported to us that 8 million children, 3.5 million senior citizens, and millions of the working poor people sought emergency food assistance in 1997. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has reported that 86 percent of cities cite an increase in food demand and that some 19 percent of the requests for food have gone unmet.

Given this additional funding, the Emergency Food and Shelter program through its partners, can help these citizens in need. The EFS program has had an outstanding record of allocation of funds to the neediest areas in our country. The Emergency Food and Shelter Program provides just that, food and shelter or emergency housing assistance, to hundreds of thousands of families, with 97 percent of the funds going directly for food and shelter services.

The offset for this bill is coming from a program that has received a $268 million increase over FY 1998 funding, while the EFS program has not received an increase of even $1 million since 1990 and in fact, it was cut by $30 million in FY 1995.

The effort to increase funds for this program is supported by a solid group of organizations deeply concerned about the increased demand for emergency food and shelter. Groups like the American Red Cross, Catholic Charities, the United Way, Council of Jewish Federations, Food Research and Action Center, the National Council of Churches, Bread for the World, National Alliance to End Homelessness, National Low Income Housing Coalition, Second Harvest, and many others. This effort is deserving of other members support as well.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I move to do this in order to recognize the statesmanship of the gentleman from California (Mr. Rohrabacher) who has put his 5-minute speech in the RECORD. I will put my 10-minute speech in the RECORD, also.

Mr. Chairman, a mere 10 minutes is not enough to praise the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes) for the way in which they have conducted themselves.

I do want to take a minute for a very brief colloquy with the gentleman from California with regard to FEMA if he is willing to do so.
I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) for directing the Federal Emergency Management Agency in last year’s bill to submit a report assessing the need for additional Federal disaster response training capabilities.

It is my understanding that FEMA acknowledged the need for an expanded program to meet the increased demand for training of emergency personnel. Therefore, I would like to inquire as to the gentleman’s intent regarding the development of additional FEMA training facilities. Is it the gentleman’s intention to encourage FEMA to take a more thorough look at this option?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. First let me say I very much appreciate my colleague from California raising this question to an appropriation not only his interest but our mutual interest in this subject, the item having to do with this colloquy about having FEMA establish an additional disaster procedures training center in or near the territory that we represent. It is absolutely crucial to me that this project is given additional consideration and to work closely with the gentleman toward that end.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to enter into a colloquy with both the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes).

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Ohio for engaging me in this very important colloquy. The State of Texas, along with my district in Houston, faces a grave heat crisis. This current disaster has resulted in hundreds of dead cattle, wasted crops and diminished water sources throughout Texas. Worse yet, there are reports of people dying in Houston as a result of the torrid heat. Sadly, it appears that our elderly are the greatest at risk. Over 2.5 million Texans are at least 60 years old, 14 percent of the overall population. Additionally, my district includes many low-income Houstonians living in homes without air conditioning. According to reports from FEMA after convening many Federal agencies including the National Weather Service, this crisis will persist into the winter.

Mr. Chairman, I urge us to examine how FEMA can respond and provide relief for this crisis across the Nation. I believe that the Federal Government should work concurrently with Houston and the Texas State government to rectify the situation.

I wish to clarify several points. One, the State of Texas experiencing this heat crisis, which is an act of nature, can receive help from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Number two, FEMA could act to assist by the request of local officials through their State government. FEMA is not precluded from using the proper appropriated funds for the easing of this heat crisis in Texas and other States. And FEMA will not be precluded from furnishing training which is needed to develop a format for outreach teams to visit Houston neighborhoods and determine the extent of the crisis and need.

FEMA may find solutions in funding to provide cooling equipment, alternative sources of water, educational forums for citizens to learn how to counter the harmful effects of the heat and other forms of relief. Today the President has astutely recognized our current plight and has provided $100 million in relief to the 11 States plagued most by the unrelenting heat which includes Texas. FEMA’s expertise in fighting the devastating effects of a national disaster will be an important component to the President’s newly announced assistance.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for bringing this very important matter to the VA-HUD appropriation subcommittee’s attention. I agree that the present heat crisis threatens both the lives and livelihoods of a great number of our citizens. FEMA has pledged to reduce loss of life and property and has promised to protect our Nation’s critical infrastructure from all types of hazards. We will do everything within our power to work with you until a viable solution is available for everyone. I want the gentlewoman to know that it is my intention to work very closely with her and with FEMA on this matter.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas for yielding to me. I would say to her that I must concur with the chairman. I too thank her for bringing this serious item to our attention. FEMA is a Federal agency with more than 2,600 full-time employees. FEMA often works in partnership with other organizations, including State and local emergency management agencies. We would encourage FEMA to work with Houston and Texas authorities to bring a quick end to the current problem in hoping to bring relief to this current devastating heat.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Ohio. I thank them for their concern and their willingness to ensure the President took this serious matter to the attention of the VA-HUD appropriations subcommittee and the whole House because we must be concerned about how we will protect our citizens from this deadly and unusual heat. Texas, especially its elderly citizens, deserves our help. I urge Congress to endorse this proposal with the serious heat will continue to endure. I urge FEMA’s assistance. I thank them very much for their cooperation.

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

Mr. Chairman, just a few moments ago several of our colleagues engaged in a colloquy with regard to the subject of the Veterans Administration and the implementation of the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation System.

From the course of that colloquy, they drew the attention of the House to the impact of the implementation of this system on the funding for the veterans services, particularly veterans health care services in the State of Texas and elsewhere in New England.

I intend to put this on the calendar for consideration of H.R. 4194 to offer an amendment which would prescribe that none of the funds available in this act may be used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement or administer the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation System.

The reason that I will do that is because there is nothing equitable in the administration of this system by the Veterans Administration. In fact, it is having a profound negative effect on the quality of health care of many of our veterans health care institutions across the country, resulting in the deterioration of the health care of veterans and their health and even the loss of life in many instances.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to draw to the attention of the House to the impact of these proposed cuts in veterans health care funding in various sectors of the country which will take place shortly unless we intervene and make it impossible for the Veterans Administration to implement this program.

They are as follows: For network number 1, Boston, serving Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, the cut there will be $38.8 million. For Albany, serving upstate New York, the cut there will be $12 million. For New York City, serving lower New York, Newark, and New Jersey, the cut there will be $48 million. For Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, serving Pennsylvania, Delaware, and part of West Virginia, the cut there will be $3 million. That is network number 4.

For network number 6, headquartered in Durham, serving North Carolina and part of West Virginia and Virginia, the cut there will be $1 million. For network number 9, headquartered in Nashville, serving Tennessee, part of West Virginia, and Kentucky, the cut there will be $12 million. For network number 12, headquartered in Houston, serving part of Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, the cut there will be $28 million.

For network 15, headquartered in Kansas City, serving Kansas, Missouri,
and part of Illinois, the cut there will be $20 million. For network 17, headquartered in Dallas, serving Texas, except for Houston, the cut there will be $10.5 million. For network 19, headquartered in Denver, serving Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and Montana, the cut there will be $13 million. For network 22, Long Beach, serving California, lower California and Nevada, the cut there will be $23 million.

Mr. Chairman, I will offer at the appropriate time an amendment to strike this provision from H.R. 4194, which will result from these cuts taking place. I wanted at this moment to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the impact of these cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman is proposing is to roll back VERA, which was passed last year, which made an allocation on funds based upon population. As the gentleman knows, there has been many, many years with the population, particularly the veterans who have been moving to the Sun Belt. As the gentleman knows, lots of hospitals have moved this money that they could not even use. So the VERA allocation was worked out in the Senate and the House after strong long deliberations.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to respond to the gentleman because he raises a very important point. The gentleman suggests that the Veterans Administration has even required funds to be returned from certain Veterans Administration hospitals. This is absolutely true. In fact, $20 million was returned from veterans hospitals in southeastern New York.

At the time that that $20 million was forced to be returned by the Veterans Administration, alleging that it was excess, and it was enormous, profound problems were taking place at the Castle Point Veterans Hospital and the Montrose Veterans Hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) has expired.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not go into detail at this moment about the tragedy of some health care that is except to say that many veterans lost their lives as a result of the return of this money. That is substantiated by a report which was done by the Inspector General in carrying out the provision of law, no funds other than those appropriated under this heading 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, $440,000.

Mr. ROUKEMA. That was my understanding. But the question had been raised on this side. I certainly would look forward to that, because this should not be a regional issue. Clearly, the issue has been distorted here in terms of the cost of caring for the veterans in our region.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is absolutely correct. That is my understanding. This is a very serious matter. We believe that, at this particular moment, this is the proper way to address it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the parties involved that, if there is going to be an amendment later, we could discuss this later instead of talking about it now.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. That is certainly correct. And I wanted to clarify the point.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to this section of the bill, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, services 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. 5575, 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, $37,138,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL


EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE


1.2 million.

Moreover, it is evident that the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration are not the only federal agencies to experience difficulties in carrying out their responsibilities. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for example, has had to deal with a number of challenges in recent years, including the need to strengthen its financial systems and improve its risk management practices.
SI21 et seq.], the Earthquake Hazards Reduc-
tion Act of 1977, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7701 et
seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Con-
seq.), the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, as
amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sec-
tions 107 and 303 of the National Security
Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 404±405),
and section No. 3 of the War Depreciation Act of

HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. Chairman, today, in 1998, the
International Space Station, according to the
General Accounting Office study, the total cost of
maintaining, of research and development, of
protecting the International Space Station,
has gone from $8 billion to $98 billion.

What about the Space Station of
the past? The Space Station of the present:
Mr. Golden, who I deeply respect running
NASA now, has appointed an outside
accounting of what the Space Station is
gonna cost us in the future.

I was delighted to see our chairman,
the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON),
he has read the New York Times, he said for the first time in
a few months. Those of us who are reading the New York Times and the Post are
somewhere between a $130 million and
$22 billion IMF package. Yet they are our key
partners in putting the Space Station together. They cannot come through
with funding the Space Station. They have$22 billion from the IMF.

Who is going to pay for the Russian participation? You got it. The
taxpayer. The taxpayer is going to pay.

Mr. Chairman, the Space Station of the
department, according to the JAY
Chabrow report, appointed by Mr. Golden, if everything goes perfectly
now with the Space Station, it will cost us $100 billion. But if the Russians pull out, they are just getting a $22 bil-
lion bailout package. You are not going to be able to pay for their
fair share. The costs do not cover the like-
lihood of losing a launch vehicle, they do not include delays, they do not in-
clude what this report, the Jay
Chabrow report, indicates that will be someplace between a $130 million and
$250 million cost per month, per month, from now into the future.

So that is the Space Station of the past and the Space Station of the
present. What about the Space Station of the future?

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the
gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER)
has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROEMER
is accorded an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, the
Space Station of the future, what we

President Reagan said that the cost of the Space Station would be about $8 billion, would house eight astronauts and
do eight scientific missions. It would be completed in 1992.

Mr. Chairman, today, in 1998, the
International Space Station, according to the
General Accounting Office study, the total cost of maintaining, of research and development, of protecting the
International Space Station, has gone from $8 billion to $98 billion.

Now, one might say, $98 billion for eight
missions, that is not too bad. We of the eight missions, staging is
gone; transportation, no, we cannot do that anymore; manufacturing facility,
we cannot do that anymore; assembly facility, storage facility, we cannot do any of those. But for $98 bil-

I have a bargain for you. We can do some research.

$8 billion for eight scientific missions has
to be expended. That is the General
Accounting Office. That is not Tim
ROEMER, that is not the opponents, that is a bipartisan study. That is the Space
Station of the past.

The Space Station of the present: Mr. Golden, who I deeply respect running NASA now, has appointed an outside
accounting of what the Space Station is
gonna cost us in the future.

I was delighted to see our chairman,
the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), he has read the New York Times, he said for the first time in
a few months. Those of us who are reading the New York Times and the Post are
somewhere between a $130 million and
$22 billion IMF package. Yet they are our key
partners in putting the Space Station together. They cannot come through
with funding the Space Station. They have$22 billion from the IMF.

Who is going to pay for the Russian participation? You got it. The
taxpayer. The taxpayer is going to pay.

Mr. Chairman, the Space Station of the
department, according to the JAY
Chabrow report, appointed by Mr. Golden, if everything goes perfectly
now with the Space Station, it will cost us $100 billion. But if the Russians pull out, they are just getting a $22 bil-
lion bailout package. You are not going to be able to pay for their
fair share. The costs do not cover the like-
lihood of losing a launch vehicle, they do not include delays, they do not in-
clude what this report, the Jay
Chabrow report, indicates that will be someplace between a $130 million and
$250 million cost per month, per month, from now into the future.

So that is the Space Station of the past and the Space Station of the
present. What about the Space Station of the future?

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the
gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER)
has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROEMER
is accorded an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, the
Space Station of the future, what we

Appropriations. For fiscal year 1999, flood in-
surance rates shall not exceed the level au-
thorized by the National Flood Insurance Re-

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER FUND

For necessary expenses of the Consumer
Information Center, including services au-
thorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,619,000, to be de-
posited into the Consumer Information Center Fund; plus amounts
collected from persons assessed and
charged for services, including services
authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $5,309,000,000, to remain available until

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ROEMER:
Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an
amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will des-
ignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
lows:
Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ROEMER:
Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise
wanted to offer an amendment with my friend, the
gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), to cancel the funding for the
International Space Station. While I
have the deepest respect for my chairman,
the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and my dear friend, the
gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), who has received so many accurate
tributes tonight, I deeply disagree with
them on the funding for this Space Sta-
tion.

Now, while the facts continue to pile
up for, I think, our side to cancel this
Space Station, the votes continue to go
down, but I hope that my colleagues
will pay attention to the debate to-
night and to three reasons why I think
we should cancel this Space Station.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my col-
leagues will be patient at the late hour of
this evening. I have three arguments
to cancel the Space Station: The Space
Station of the past, the Space Station of
the present, and the Space Station of
the future.

First of all, the past. When the Inter-
national Space Station was first de-
vised by then-president Ronald Reagan,
Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, the
Space Station of the future, what we

78,464,000 for flood mitigation, including up
to $30,000,000 for expenses under section 1366
of the National Flood Insurance Act, which
amount shall be available for transfer to the
National Flood Mitigation Fund until
September 30, 2000. In fiscal year 1999, no funds in
excess of: (1) $47,000,000 for operating ex-
penses; (2) $343,989,000 for agents' commis-
sions and taxes; and (3) $360,000,000 for interest
on deposits shall be available from the National
Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on
appropriations. For fiscal year 1999, flood in-
surance rates shall not exceed the level au-
thorized by the National Flood Insurance Re-

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER FUND

For necessary expenses of the Consumer
Information Center, including services au-
thorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,619,000, to be de-
posited into the Consumer Information Center Fund; plus amounts
collected from persons assessed and
charged for services, including services
authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $5,309,000,000, to remain available until

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ROEMER:
Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an
amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will des-
ignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
lows:
Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ROEMER:
Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise
wanted to offer an amendment with my friend, the
gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), to cancel the funding for the
International Space Station. While I
have the deepest respect for my chairman,
the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and my dear friend, the
gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), who has received so many accurate
tributes tonight, I deeply disagree with
them on the funding for this Space Sta-
tion.

Now, while the facts continue to pile
up for, I think, our side to cancel this
Space Station, the votes continue to go
down, but I hope that my colleagues
will pay attention to the debate to-
night and to three reasons why I think
we should cancel this Space Station.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my col-
leagues will be patient at the late hour of
this evening. I have three arguments
to cancel the Space Station: The Space
Station of the past, the Space Station of
the present, and the Space Station of
the future.

First of all, the past. When the Inter-
national Space Station was first de-
vised by then-president Ronald Reagan,
have in this bill, and we have agreed to a balanced budget, we have in this bill zero funding of AmeriCorps, yet full funding for the Space Station. The President asked for 100,000 Section 8 vouchers for the poorest of the poor in our inner cities. We could not even pass an amendment to get vouchers for 35,000 of those poor people. And $80 million is cut for community development block grants from the 1998 level, again for the poorest of the poor, the people who are going to benefit from the economic bull market. That is the Space Station of the future, taking money away from other valuable programs.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) would yield, let me say to the distinguished gentleman that I have not been able to control the time that has been allocated to this bill all day.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, again reclaiming my time, I can tell that the gentleman is not interested.

Mr. ROEMER. Well, we may not have very many speakers, Mr. Chairman, and we may not need a time agreement. I am sure after the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) speaks, we may not have very many more.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, again reclaiming my time, let me say that we have had this discussion on many an occasion. The last time we had a vote on this same proposal, admittedly that vote was on the authorization bill, the vote was 305 to 112 in favor of maintaining the station.

The important point here is that I think my colleague realizes that one of the reasons that this bill is so difficult, and that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) and I work so hard to provide some balance in this bill, is because we have got a variety and mix of important Federal responsibilities within this package.

The question of VA medical care is a very, very critical part of this bill. Our housing programs are a very important part of the bill. EPA is. But also NASA’s work happens to be a part of our bill. And for someone to suggest that one way or another we are going to juxtapose our vital work in space versus housing programs is not only not fair, it is a reflection of a lack of understanding of the significance of the work of this subcommittee.

There is not any doubt that Space Station is fundamental to our future work in space. And, indeed, if we find ourselves at one point or another faltering on Station, then NASA, in my judgment from United States history, is the agency that we now consider it to be. Its budget will shrink dramatically and our role in space will be radically impacted.

I think it important for my colleagues, those who are especially mindful today of the role and importance of the United States human space flight program, I think it important for them to focus upon the sad news that we received yesterday of the death of Alan Shepard, the first American in space.

On May 5, 1961, Alan Shepard was launched into space aboard a converted missile which had an imperfect success record in a capsule that had never been tested with a human occupant, with many, many questions about what the impact of space flight would be on human beings. It was this Nation’s first step in human space flight.

Alan Shepard was welcomed back from the Atlantic Ocean after a suborbital flight 115 miles into the Florida sky and 302 miles downrange, and as a true American hero he was welcomed back. He was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for space, two NASA Distinguished Service Medals, Exceptional Service Medal and numerous other medals and awards.

His death is a great loss to the Nation and I join with all of those who mourn his passing and celebrate his life, but indeed there is little question that America is most interested and supportive of man’s role in space. Fundamental to that role in space is the work that we are about Space Station. The Roemer amendment is that at this point in time would really be a great disservice, not just to our country but to the world’s interest as well as our future in space.

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

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

(Mr. SENSENBERNER asked and was permitted to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SENSENBERNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. Let me associate myself with his remarks. Voting down the Roemer amendment is essential if NASA is to stay alive. We have spent $22 billion already on the Space Station. There are several hundred thousand pounds of materials that are set and ready to go for launch. We should put those in orbit. We should not put them in a museum.

I have a rather lengthy statement in support of the Space Station and against the Roemer amendment, which I would not give due to the lateness of the hour.

Today, Representative ROEMER is offering an amendment to cancel the International Space Station. While he has offered the amendment before because he felt this was a poor investment of taxpayer money, he is the unexpected beneficiary today of the fact that the Space Station has run into difficulty.

Nevertheless, this amendment asks Congress to turn our backs on a commitment the American people have made to the American people, in investing billions on their contributions to the International Space Station. This would have us throw away some $22 billion the American taxpayers have already spent building the hardware for the International Space Station. Most of that hardware already exists. Several hundred thousands of pounds are being processed for launch into space at Kennedy Space Center right now. The Station’s opponents would have us forego all of the scientific benefits that are going to flow from this unique research laboratory. Finally, it would turn us away from our future in the human exploration and development of space. That is not the vision of a space program that most of us have.

Nevertheless, this amendment asks Congress to turn our backs on a commitment the American people have made to the American people, in investing billions on their contributions to the International Space Station. This would have us throw away some $22 billion the American taxpayers have already spent building the hardware for the International Space Station. Most of that hardware already exists. Several hundred thousands of pounds are being processed for launch into space at Kennedy Space Center right now. The Station’s opponents would have us forego all of the scientific benefits that are going to flow from this unique research laboratory. Finally, it would turn us away from our future in the human exploration and development of space. That is not the vision of a space program that most of us have.

Nevertheless, this amendment asks Congress to turn our backs on a commitment the American people have made to the American people, in investing billions on their contributions to the International Space Station. This would have us throw away some $22 billion the American taxpayers have already spent building the hardware for the International Space Station. Most of that hardware already exists. Several hundred thousands of pounds are being processed for launch into space at Kennedy Space Center right now. The Station’s opponents would have us forego all of the scientific benefits that are going to flow from this unique research laboratory. Finally, it would turn us away from our future in the human exploration and development of space. That is not the vision of a space program that most of us have.

Nevertheless, this amendment asks Congress to turn our backs on a commitment the American people have made to the American people, in investing billions on their contributions to the International Space Station. This would have us throw away some $22 billion the American taxpayers have already spent building the hardware for the International Space Station. Most of that hardware already exists. Several hundred thousands of pounds are being processed for launch into space at Kennedy Space Center right now. The Station’s opponents would have us forego all of the scientific benefits that are going to flow from this unique research laboratory. Finally, it would turn us away from our future in the human exploration and development of space. That is not the vision of a space program that most of us have.

Nevertheless, this amendment asks Congress to turn our backs on a commitment the American people have made to the American people, in investing billions on their contributions to the International Space Station. This would have us throw away some $22 billion the American taxpayers have already spent building the hardware for the International Space Station. Most of that hardware already exists. Several hundred thousands of pounds are being processed for launch into space at Kennedy Space Center right now. The Station’s opponents would have us forego all of the scientific benefits that are going to flow from this unique research laboratory. Finally, it would turn us away from our future in the human exploration and development of space. That is not the vision of a space program that most of us have.
Since the President has declined to suggest a solution of his own to the problems created by Russia's involvement in the program or to enforce his own budget caps, Congress must hold the Administration's feet to the fire.

The Senate has proposed one option of isolating the International Space Station in its own appropriations account in order to end the financial shell games that the Administration has been playing for the last few years.

While this is an important step, we also need the President to do his part. H.R. 4194 does just that, providing all of the funding for the International Space Station that the President originally promised us he would need. But, in holding the President to his original promise that the Station would cost no more than $2.1 billion a year, this bill reflects a lack of confidence in NASA's justification for program increases in the absence of meaningful reforms necessary to prevent further schedule slips and cost overruns.

The decision to fund the International Space Station at $2.27 billion despite the Administration's $2.27 billion request reflects the reality that NASA's budget numbers for this program have no credibility. In recent years, NASA has a track record of revising its estimates just a few weeks after Congress funds the Station at the Administration's request. I don't think anyone should be surprised that this budget strategy has worn thin. NASA has $400 to $500 million of carryover in the Space Station program which should satisfy any budget shortfall.

Members who vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will vote to provide an adequate level of funding while sending a message that NASA must get its fiscal house in order.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I feel the underlying basis of our commitment to the human exploration of space while responsibly addressing the program management's flaws. I urge my colleagues to support human space exploration, our international commitments, and those who have dedicated themselves to get the research laboratory off the drawing board and into space.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would announce to Members that because there is no time agreement, this will be the last debate this evening and there will be no more votes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear what the gentleman from California said and I am not certain what he meant by what he said.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman stated that the debate on this subject would be the last debate tonight and there would be no more rollover votes tonight.

Mr. OBEY. Does that mean that the gentleman intends to finish the debate on this amendment tonight?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do intend to finish the debate on this amendment tonight. We will not roll that vote. We will not go any further than the NASA section this evening and so essentially this will be the end of the debate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, could I ask, has that arrangement been cleared with our leadership?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I believe that is correct. I have been instructed that is correct.

Mr. OBEY. That the debate will continue on this amendment until it is finished tonight, but no more amendments?

Mr. LEWIS of California. No more amendments, that is correct, and no votes. In other words, the vote will be rolled until then.

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

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this amendment but, frankly, we have had a good day filled with a lot of congeniality and camaraderie, but one of the observations made by the subcommittee chairman frankly got my dander up a little bit.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I did not mean to say that I want the gentleman to know.

Mr. OBEY. I simply want to suggest that I do not think that the juxtaposition that the gentleman from Indiana laid out between spending in space and spending here on the planet is at all illegitimate, as the gentleman seemed to suggest.

I remember being thrilled when Alan Shepard went into space, and I am still thrilled by the prospect of space exploration. But times have changed and budgets have changed. When Alan Shepard went in space, we were meeting our obligation to a house of people on the ground, we were meeting our obligations to our environment, we were meeting our obligations to the poorest among us. We still had national standards for the treatment of persons who were not in the winner's circle. Today, we have none.

It just seems to me that when we see that this system has been redesigned seven times, when we see that the cost has exploded, when we see that this Congress is apparently willing to kill the low-income heating assistance program to keep houses warm for four million people on the face of the Earth, then I feel no guilt whatsoever in suggesting that we ought to shut down that fancy house in the sky for eight people.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate where my colleague is coming from. We have had this discussion a number of times on the floor, as the gentleman knows. And the gentleman certainly knows that our committee is doing everything we can to adequately fund the Bill program.

But having said that, within this specific category the entire administration is supporting our position regarding this.
NASA projects and missions and other technological advances. Now the Space Station is simply a floating lemon that will cost 24 times its weight in pure gold. This is a project plagued with delays, cost overruns and unfulfilled promises. Our present ZiA has fallen short and the American taxpayer has been left picking up the tab.

The other day I listened to two renowned scientists argue this $98 billion black hole is not necessary and is actually science that threatens valuable space-related projects and drains the scientific vitality of nations. The $80 billion not yet spent on the Space Station could provide an enormous benefit to earth-based research.

I am not advocating we stop exploring space. In fact, I support space exploration. I must regret that the costs of this project far exceed the benefits. Last year NASA captivated the world when it successfully landed the Pathfinder on Mars at a cost of $267 million, a mere fraction of the cost of the Space Station. Let us not forget that while space is infinite, the American taxpayers’ deep pockets are not.

We must get serious about what the core functions of the Federal Government are. We continue to pay over $350 billion in interest on the debt year after year. And while children have been amazed by the promises of space exploration and the excitement it generates, I am concerned with the debt each of these children will inherit. Congress should invest the $80 billion in those children’s future, not in a flying lemon.

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

I appreciate the persistence of the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Michigan. The Space Station was being debated when I first got here. And one of the major arguments for it was that we had to do it before the Russians did. I would recommend that people go back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This started out as something we had to do to frustrate the Russians. We now have to do it to help the Russians. The justification for the Space Station is scientifically very important.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) try to set a comparison about how we spend money in the Government. And I want to commend the chairman, also a member of the Committee on Appropriations, not the subcommittee, but the whole committee, and I appreciate the chairman and the subcommittee allocating the funds appropriately in a very tough budget climate.

I would just say to my colleagues, what is it worth to cure cancer, that is what we are talking about, or helping cure diabetes, or helping cure paralyzes? There is a great body of scientific research going on through NASA that is planned for the International Space Station to cure these diseases, to grow cells and try to see what impact microgravity or near-zero gravity has so that we can employ that kind of technology and research and information and bring it here on earth and replicate it and cure disease.

So I think I make the argument very forcefully that I think we are going to do perhaps more to help people in the years ahead through the International Space Station than any other re-search. It has got a tremendous potential to help people in need. And there is nothing that has a greater need in our society than health care for our people and in combating disease.
And I can say to my friends from first-hand experience, and I do not know if the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Roe-mer) or the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Camp) or others have gone there, but if they have not, I suggest they do to get a true understanding of what is happening out there. Well, that is fine. But I tell my colleagues, the morale of the people working on the Space Station is extremely high. They have great hope and great interest in the good things that will come of this Space Station.

So I would just say to my friends and my colleagues, I think this has great, great future value, this whole Space Station concept and all the medical research, just from a medical research standpoint, and I think that is what we are potential in the diseases that I mentioned earlier, cancer, diabetes, microgravity and paralysis. I mean, there is a tremendous potential here that we should not overlook and be shortsighted about.

So I urge rejection respectfully of the Roemer-Camp amendment because I really think this is something we have to do in order to meet the future needs of our country and pay attention to the future and certainly the health future of this great Nation and the world.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Roemer-Camp bipartisan amendment. And to my colleague from California, the subcommittee chairman that I respect so very much, I think we should know that maybe the reason this discussion is ongoing from year to year, if we are trying to make it clearer to those who are voting here on the House floor that our investment, that of the United States, and Russia's investment is going deeper and deeper in the hole and, in turn, it is negatively affecting our very own domestic budget. And those of us that keep talking about this do it for a purpose. I mean, bad money after good money does not make sense when we have such tight budgets.

I oppose further funding for the Space Station because I believe it is wasteful. It is wasteful spending that drains resources from our Nation's most urgent needs. This project, I believe, is an unwise investment for our Nation, not only fiscally but also scientifically.

To date, the Space Station has experienced cost overruns resulting in billions of dollars that our taxpayers are paying, and it is not even in billed them. I must say, Russia's inability to pay its fair share of the project is extremely troubling to me. This is an international project. I mean, it is supposed to be. I think that is one of the things we should be deciding, is it or is it not an international project.

Also, supporters of the Space Station say we can learn many things from microgravity research. We just heard that from Mr. Wexler. We have many benefits from this amendment, we could offer college education, including tuition, fees and books to 500,000, a half a million, students who could not otherwise afford college right here on earth.

With $1.6 billion, we could provide prenatal care to all the women who do not have access to routine health care right here on earth. With $1.6 billion, we could expand the WIC program so that all eligible pregnant and nursing mothers can get the food supplements; and we would still have money left over.

Supporters of the Space Station make claims that research in space will advance health research. Well, with $1.6 billion, we could fully fund the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institutes right here on earth.

With limited funds available for programs right here on earth, we must focus our resources on our Nation's most urgent needs in order to ensure a bright and secure future.

Let us not send our tax dollars out in space on a project that is clearly lost in space when we have needs not met right here on earth. Let us cancel the Space Station. Do it now. Stop wasting money. Vote yes on the Roemer-Camp amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Roemer-Camp amendment. And to my colleague from California, the subcommittee chairman that I respect so very much, I think we should know that maybe the reason this discussion is ongoing from year to year, if we are trying to make it clearer to those who are voting here on the House floor that our investment, that of the United States, and Russia's investment is going deeper and deeper in the hole and, in turn, it is negatively affecting our very own domestic budget. And those of us that keep talking about this do it for a purpose. I mean, bad money after good money does not make sense when we have such tight budgets.

I oppose further funding for the Space Station because I believe it is wasteful. It is wasteful spending that drains resources from our Nation's most urgent needs. This project, I believe, is an unwise investment for our Nation, not only fiscally but also scientifically.

To date, the Space Station has experienced cost overruns resulting in billions of dollars that our taxpayers are paying, and it is not even in billed them. I must say, Russia's inability to pay its fair share of the project is extremely troubling to me. This is an international project. I mean, it is supposed to be. I think that is one of the things we should be deciding, is it or is it not an international project.

Also, supporters of the Space Station say we can learn many things from microgravity research. We just heard that from Mr. Wexler. We have many benefits from this amendment, we could offer college education, including tuition, fees and books to 500,000, a half a million, students who could not otherwise afford college right here on earth.

With $1.6 billion, we could provide prenatal care to all the women who do not have access to routine health care right here on earth. With $1.6 billion, we could expand the WIC program so that all eligible pregnant and nursing mothers can get the food supplements; and we would still have money left over.

Supporters of the Space Station make claims that research in space will advance health research. Well, with $1.6 billion, we could fully fund the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institutes right here on earth.

With limited funds available for programs right here on earth, we must focus our resources on our Nation's most urgent needs in order to ensure a bright and secure future.

Let us not send our tax dollars out in space on a project that is clearly lost in space when we have needs not met right here on earth. Let us cancel the Space Station. Do it now. Stop wasting money. Vote yes on the Roemer-Camp amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Roemer-Camp amendment. And to my colleague from California, the subcommittee chairman that I respect so very much, I think we should know that maybe the reason this discussion is ongoing from year to year, if we are trying to make it clearer to those who are voting here on the House floor that our investment, that of the United States, and Russia's investment is going deeper and deeper in the hole and, in turn, it is negatively affecting our very own domestic budget. And those of us that keep talking about this do it for a purpose. I mean, bad money after good money does not make sense when we have such tight budgets.

I oppose further funding for the Space Station because I believe it is wasteful. It is wasteful spending that drains resources from our Nation's most urgent needs. This project, I believe, is an unwise investment for our Nation, not only fiscally but also scientifically.

To date, the Space Station has experienced cost overruns resulting in billions of dollars that our taxpayers are paying, and it is not even in billed them. I must say, Russia's inability to pay its fair share of the project is extremely troubling to me. This is an international project. I mean, it is supposed to be. I think that is one of the things we should be deciding, is it or is it not an international project.

Also, supporters of the Space Station say we can learn many things from microgravity research. We just heard that from Mr. Wexler. We have many benefits from this amendment, we could offer college education, including tuition, fees and books to 500,000, a half a million, students who could not otherwise afford college right here on earth.

With $1.6 billion, we could provide prenatal care to all the women who do not have access to routine health care right here on earth. With $1.6 billion, we could expand the WIC program so that all eligible pregnant and nursing mothers can get the food supplements; and we would still have money left over.

Supporters of the Space Station make claims that research in space will advance health research. Well, with $1.6 billion, we could fully fund the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institutes right here on earth.

With limited funds available for programs right here on earth, we must focus our resources on our Nation's most urgent needs in order to ensure a bright and secure future.

Let us not send our tax dollars out in space on a project that is clearly lost in space when we have needs not met right here on earth. Let us cancel the Space Station. Do it now. Stop wasting money. Vote yes on the Roemer-Camp amendment.
Members to be far-sighted and oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment would end U.S. participation in the International Space Station. Once again, as we look year in and year out, we find ourselves debating whether or not to continue U.S. leadership in this vital space initiative. Opponents of this program ask you to focus on cost. But any cost analysis must also involve a benefit analysis. The benefits to be gained from research and technological leadership reverberate far beyond space exploration and will be shared by all Americans.

The international space station will serve as a research laboratory for present day advancements. The station will undeniably lead to enhanced drug design and better treatment of diseases.

Technology developed for the space station will also lead to advances in numerous fields, including environmental systems, communications, and computer technology. Micro technologies and robotic systems developed for the space station are just two areas where businesses are already reaping benefits. More gains will follow.

New technologies will allow for the expansion of existing businesses and the creation of new businesses. Advances gained through NASA programs have been, and will continue to be, an important source of commercial development.

Just as the race to the Moon propelled the United States to the world leadership role in science and technology in the second half of the 20th century, the space station will guarantee the United States remains the leader far into the 21st century.

While the full participation of our partners remains a concern, NASA has taken concrete steps to plan for any contingency. NASA is proactively addressing these problems—establishing the Russian program assurance budget to provide contingency planning funds, and initiating development of an internal control module should the Russian service module be delayed.

With the first components of the space station planned for launch in the next several months, now is not the time to retreat from our commitments.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and continue support for our Nation's space program.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia, and simply say that for each dollar that we invest in the space program we receive up to nine in return in new products, technologies, and processes on Earth.

I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), but let me say to you that the numbers are somewhat skewed. The gentleman from Indiana knows and we know that the original 1984 estimate of $8 billion for the Space Station was development cost. In 1993, NASA estimated that a fully operational Space Station would cost $17 billion. The $17 billion include research and operating expenses, along with hardware development. The $96 billion figure includes costs such as $43 billion for the space station alone and $53 billion for 10 years of operating expenses. The real cost for the International Space Station is $21 billion.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that we cannot afford to get rid of the Space Station. Our Russian friends and our copartners around the world are committed to saving the Space Station. The Space Station provides us in the show and tell with an array of opportunities, air conditioning, advanced materials in airplanes and many others. I oppose the amendment because I believe we cannot look back, and in tribute to Alan Shepard we must look to the future. I think all Americans would like us to do that. Mr. Chairman, I arise against the amendment offered by Representative ROEMER, and in support of our efforts in space.

The persons who support this amendment argue that they can no longer afford to invest in the International Space Station. I believe, on the other hand, that this space station is an opportunity that we cannot afford to pass up. NASA has a proven track record. The science experiments that have been performed have lead not only to safer, more efficient, and cost-effective ways to live on Earth, but also improve our health and well-being. For each dollar that we invest in space programs, we receive up to nine in return in new products, technologies, and processes here on Earth. Fellow colleagues, we owe it to our constituents to make sure that the International Space Station becomes a reality.

I want to remind you all, the materials research that has been done by NASA in space has been invaluable to us. With the help of the International Space Station, we can only expect more breakthroughs and innovations for manufacturers, businesses, and consumers.

I would like to give you an example of how research in space is helping our materials research on Earth today. If you look around, you will notice a plethora of metal items. Metals like steel and aluminum are often cast directly into the shapes that you see, and even more likely, the metal started out as a liquid, way back at the beginning of its manufacturing life. If you look closely at the making things out of metal, like casting an engine block for a car or the circuitry for a microchip, you would want to know some very important things—for instance, how durable will the metal be? Or how long will it take to make this product? For manufacturers, knowing these things is extremely beneficial, because it affects the cost and the quality of their products. To answer these questions, scientists must rely on the science of micro-physics, or the study of microstructure, which helps predict the behavior of materials at the molecular level.

Because gravity affects the way that things solidify, gravity also affects the formation of microstructure. This makes it very difficult for engineers and scientists to predict what will happen when you begin the manufacturing process. In other words, it is simply too difficult to make any predictions about what gravity will do to the formation of the microstructures, unless you know what will happen when there is no gravity to control the manufacturing process.

Experiments conducted on the Space Shuttle by Professor Martha Glicksman have helped materials scientists and engineers take significant strides toward the goal of being able to predict how microstructures will develop during the manufacturing process.

As a benefit of these experiments in space, scientists have obtained the highest quality information about the formation and evolution of dendrites, a basic building block of microstructures. This research has produced a benchmark against which theories and computer simulations that predict microstructures can be rigorously tested.

This information would not be available to us today without the help of NASA, and its programs in space. The International Space Station will serve as a world-class research and technological leadership vehicle. In support of our efforts in space.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I specifically wanted to respond to the gentlewoman from Texas as well. I appreciate both of your participation in this.

The gentlewoman from Texas mentioned very briefly the international partnership that is involved here. We have not discussed that very much this evening, and I think certainly we should. The fact that our international partners in the European space agency are being so cooperative, the fact that we do have an ongoing relationship with Russia in spite of their economic difficulties in which they are putting the money that they are obligated to in the pipeline. The reality that this is now a world Space Station that provides our future hope for man's work in space, that has so much potential in terms of economic and medical and other kinds of breakthroughs, is a very important item, and I appreciate very much both of you participating in it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Roemer amendment and I encourage all my colleagues to vote “no.” We have been engaging in this debate for many years, many months, and it is true that each year more and more Members vote against killing the Space Station and in support of continuing this project. The reason I believe is obvious. This project has a tremendous potential to yield incredible
benefits to mankind. Balancing the budget is a very, very noble task and it is certainly something that is important to our children. Indeed, it is a very good thing for us to do that. But I can tell you from my experience of talking to kids on the floor of this House 1 month ago about a product that is a spin-off of our space program called Quick Boost that has the potential to improve the efficiency of air conditioning units all over this country and has the potential to save energy costs equivalent to the entire cost of our manned space flight program from its very beginnings, from the beginning of the Mercury Program to this date.

I encourage all of my colleagues to, again, resoundingly reject the Roemer amendment and vote “no” on the Roemer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my very good friend and colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Alabama (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida for yielding. I want to associate myself with his remarks. I, too, rise in opposition to the Roemer amendment.

This amendment. We have debated this amendment many, many times before. We have had a fair fight. But never have we debated it in the wee hours of the morning like this and under these circumstances.

But my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, makes excellent points about our international partners. By the end of this year, NASA and the international partners will have built over half a million pounds of flight hardware. The first two elements of the Space Station will be in orbit. It is too late to turn our back on this project now. If we turn our back on this project, we are turning our back on human space flight; and we cannot do that either.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. WELDON) of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to add one more thing. I have gone into the first elements into space cheaply.

I want to just say to my colleagues as well as all who might be interested to this discussion, no one has made the contribution that the gentleman from Florida has regarding this effort. His consistent and intensive focus upon the space station has taken the station out of space and the work that involves the station itself is very much appreciated, and he has made a very significant difference in the effectiveness, not just in our discussion, but also the rapidity of which we are moving forward in this program.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to add one more thing. I have gone into the Space Station processing facility of Kennedy Space Center, and I have gone into the first elements. I want to tell my colleagues that the people who are working on this program are excited and ready. The kids are excited to see this program flying in the sky. The potential benefits that can accrue to mankind are huge. They are not even imaginable.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer amendment. I do so reluctantly because I have always been a supporter of the space program, and I believe that we have a bright future for manned exploration in space. But I think that does not make sense to continue with this project at this time on several bases. First, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) in terms of the priorities within this budget now in terms of our social programs here at home.

Second, however, let us talk about the space program. I fear we are repeating a mistake we made in the 1970s and 1980s. Santayana defined a fanatic as one who redoubles his efforts when he has forgotten his purposes. I think that characterizes the Space Station.

We are told that the Space Station is not justified for manned exploration. But we do not have a program for manned space exploration. If we had made a national goal of reexploring the moon, of going back to the moon and starting to exploit its natural resources, of having a manned program to Mars, we might support such a program; and then the Space Station would make sense as part of it.

But every justification for the space program that I have seen, none can equally or better be done without the expenditure and the Space Station. That one is research on the long-term physiological effects of manned space flight. For that, we will need a Space Station.

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

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I want to just say to my colleagues as well as all who might be interested to this discussion, no one has made the contribution that the gentleman from Florida has regarding this effort. His consistent and intensive focus upon the space station has taken the station out of space and the work that involves the station itself is very much appreciated, and he has made a very significant difference in the effectiveness, not just in our discussion, but also the rapidity of which we are moving forward in this program.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to add one more thing. I have gone into the Space Station processing facility of Kennedy Space Center, and I have gone into the first elements. I want to tell my colleagues that the people who are working on this program are excited and ready. The kids are excited to see this program flying in the sky. The potential benefits that can accrue to mankind are huge. They are not even imaginable.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer amendment. I do so reluctantly because I have always been a supporter of the space program, and I believe that we have a bright future for manned exploration in space. But I think that does not make sense to continue with this project at this time on several bases. First, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) in terms of the priorities within this budget now in terms of our social programs here at home.

Second, however, let us talk about the space program. I fear we are repeating a mistake we made in the 1970s and 1980s. Santayana defined a fanatic as one who redoubles his efforts when he has forgotten his purposes. I think that characterizes the Space Station.

We are told that the Space Station is not justified for manned exploration. But we do not have a program for manned space exploration. If we had made a national goal of reexploring the moon, of going back to the moon and starting to exploit its natural resources, of having a manned program to Mars, we might support such a program; and then the Space Station would make sense as part of it.
If the United States were pursuing a properly targeted space program, we would now have a crash program to develop cheap launch vehicles so that the Hugheses and Lorias and General Dynamics of our country would want to launch their satellites into our rockets because they are cheaper and more efficient, and we would not have to worry about the security with the Chinese.

We are paying for the mistakes of the 1970s and 1980s, and now we are going to repeat that mistake on a larger scale. The space shuttle is, as beautiful as it is, was a blind alley because what did it get us that we did not have? It did not reduce the cost of poundage into orbit which was the promise. It diverted us from the proper courses we are to make.

At this point, we are to be spending some of this money on low-income housing units, some of this money on school, some of this money on low-income heating. We ought to be spending more on cheaper, more efficient rockets, for current satellite launchers. We ought to be spending more of the money on developing the capability of launching large payloads into space at a much lower unit cost so that it makes sense for our commercial private sector to get more heavily involved with less subsidy.

Finally, let me say this is distorting our relationship with our foreign friends.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Roemer-Camp amendment to end this black hole of fiscal irresponsibility known as the International Space Station, but I do so very sadly. Mr. Chairman, I do commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) for the courage that they are showing by offering this amendment.

I would venture to guess if this issue was polled in the general and abstract, it would be overwhelmingly supported. I am a strong supporter of space exploration and our national space program, a strong supporter of the NASA budget, and in fact, of the next fiscal year.

Of the $15 billion in this budget, $13.5 billion is fine. It is the $1.5 billion that adds to the continuation of the International Space Station. We have a problem with. Because the space program is really what America is all about. It brings about the best in America and what we are.

Who will be the first of you living, the moment when Yuri Gugarin of Russia was the first person to be launched into space, and the shock waves that reverberated around the country that, my goodness, we are falling behind the Soviet Union in space? But, 20 days later, Alan Shepard, sitting on that Mercury Redstone rocket with courage that only he could know whether or not it was going to blow up underneath him, was the first American in space. And then 20 days after that, where a young president by the name of John F. Kennedy challenged our Nation to send a man to the moon and safely return him to earth.

It has brought out the best in America and what we stand for, and the hopes and dreams of not only adults, but of children, realizing the importance of science and math. Alan Shepard was a childhood hero of mine. I had Freedom VII on my dresser growing up as a kid in the 1960s. Our hearts felt condolences go out to his family tonight. He was a great American hero. Perhaps this country would be better served if my astronaut magazine were to grace the magazine covers today, rather than the Hollywood stars and sports heroes that seem to dominate popular culture today. Who would forget Apollo XIII and those dreaded bone chat that went "Houston, we have a problem," and the fact that after the explosion and the machine that filtered the carbon dioxide from the capsule went under, the Director of Space Operations got all the scientists and engineers together and the material that the capsule had and said, You have one hour to come up with a device that will filter the carbon dioxide out of the capsule so the astronauts can breathe and we can get them home safely. As he continued and was walking out, then he turned and said, "failure is not an option." It was not. They came up with a device and were able to save the astronauts and return them safely.

It was one of my great honors just a few weeks ago to be able to present Commander Jim Lovell in western Wisconsin at a space show the Outstanding Wisconsin Aviator because he came from Milwaukee.

The space program is a wonderful program, Mr. Chairman, there is no question about it. But what has to be questioned is the tremendous cost. Why is it that every year the American taxpayers are facing today in order to perpetuate a space program that, by and large throughout the scientific community, has limited value.

You are hard pressed to find any scientist in the entire country who will come out in support of the space program who is not already on the NASA budget. I think that sends a very strong message about the lunacy of continuing to throw good money after bad in this venture.

I think it is time that we step back, take a deep breath, and realize what is happening with a program that is 1.200 percent over budget. And where is the end, and what is going to be the scientific value? What have we accomplished scientifically on the space shuttle today that can be on the space station? These are the things that we have to question. That is why we are having the debate at a quarter to one here in Washington, D.C. tonight.

In an era when we are trying to tighten our belts, to bring fiscal responsibility to this place and hopefully reduce the $5.5 trillion national debt, a 1.200 percent over-budget program is what we ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, why on Earth do we spend money in space?

Mr. Chairman, when a young President, John Kennedy, described his vision in 1961 of landing a man on the moon, he encountered also many skeptics. She said it could not be done. She said it would cost too much money. But when I watched Neil Armstrong take his first step on to the moon eight years later, I knew the naysayers were wrong, and so did my high school students, who huddled around the television set with me that unforgettable day. I saw the gleam in their eyes that inspired them to become our future engineers and future scientists.

So why on earth do we spend money in space? So our kids will have a dream to dream. Space exploration has evolved over the last 30 years to more than just romantic notions of collecting moon rocks and taking pictures of other planets in our solar system. Scientific studies conducted in space have led to thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of practical applications here on earth, as this graph here illustrates.

In fact, financing research projects in space is one of the best investments our Nation can make. For each tax dollar we spend in space, we get a $9 return here on earth in new products, in new technologies, in new improvements for millions of people around the world.

It would take too long to recount the many advances in agriculture, business and medicine that are a direct result of manned space exploration. Instead, let me tell you about some real people who have already benefitted from the discoveries made in space for the last three decades.

Let me start with someone in the district of the gentleman from Indiana
(Mr. ROEMER). Weather satellite storm prediction systems and long-range weather forecasts developed during space missions helped Brent Graybill, the director of the Elkhart County, Indiana, Office of Emergency Management. Graybill, the director of hazardous flash floods and dangerous tornadoes before they destroy people's homes and take their lives, a direct result of manned space exploration.

And in the hometown of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), Midland, Michigan, the fire chief there, Dan Hargarten, he uses protective clothing made possible due to space research to help protect his crew from harm as they battle destructive fires, and technological advances in breathing apparatus are studied in space and will allow 68 brave Michigan fire fighters, all volunteers, to battle Florida's fire storms without losing their lives, another direct result of manned space exploration.

And in the district of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the "After Breast Cancer" support group meets every Monday evening to share their experiences fighting breast cancer. Well, many cancer survivors are living longer, fuller lives, thanks to early detection of cancer cells made possible by CAT scan technology. You guessed it, a direct result of manned space exploration.

So why on earth should we spend money in space? Because we owe it to the millions of Americans who could benefit from future medical advances to continue funding, rather than gutting the International Space Station.

NASA researchers are making great strides in, for example, neurobiology, that could help my sister, Mary J. o, and countless others who are confined to wheel chairs regain their mobility.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who feel that we do not need men and women, as you have heard, in space, and that we can be replaced by robots. Of course, there are also those who say the same thing about Congress. So why on earth do we spend money in space? For the sake of my sister, and your children's children; because every dollar we spend on a space program yields $9 in returns here on earth; and because that young President said, when he stood in Houston, Texas, on September 12, 1962. This country of the United States was not built in one day. We waited and we stood and wished to look behind them. This country was conquered by those who moved forward, and so will space.

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

☐ 0050

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

Mr. Chairman, earlier this evening in this debate, one of the proponents of the Space Station described the benefits of the Space Station as indescribable. I could not agree more. And the reason they are indescribable is because they do not exist.

We have listened now for 14 years about the benefits of the Space Station, about the potential, and that same speaker made reference to the potential on the Space Station several times during his speech.

But the time comes, Mr. Chairman, when we have to move from the potential to the reality. We have heard so much about waiting for the Space Station, waiting for the Space Station, and all the benefits that are going to come from it. It reminds me of the play "Waiting for Godot," where we keep waiting and waiting and waiting and it never comes.

The Space Station never comes and the benefits never come. We have heard time and time again how the Space Station is going to help our international relationship with Russia. That this is going to improve our relations with Russia. Of course, it started way back 15 years ago when we were going to build the Space Station to ward off Russia. Things have changed, and now we are going to cement our relationship with Russia.

Have we seen that happen? No, we have seen more friction with Russia and their inability to finance their share and that has basically set back our relationship more than improved it.

We have been told that there is going to be tremendous job growth, and I agree. Frankly, if I were a representative from one of the districts, as we have seen tonight, that benefit economically from the Space Station, my colleagues can bet I would get up here and talk about the benefits. Because if we are spending $99 billion and even 10 percent of that were coming to my district, if I had $10 billion, I do not care what it would be. I would be talking about the economic benefits of the Space Station.

But if the Space Station is merely a jobs program, then we should call it a jobs program and we should spread the benefits throughout this country.

But the fact of the matter is 85 percent of the jobs are located in three States. So we have a tremendous influx of great economic resources into those three States, but does it benefit the country? I do not think it does.

But the one that kills me, the argument that I have heard it time and time again, is how the Space Station is literally the greatest thing since sliced bread. In the 6 years I have been here, the Space Station was going to cure cancer, was going to cure Alzheimer's disease, was going to cure Parkinson's disease. Tonight we hear it is going to improve air conditioning.

Mr. Chairman, I hear these over and over again, and as I am listening to the debate the thought came back to me, time and time again, and it reminds me of the story of the emperor with no clothes, because we parade this huge monstrosity, this huge economic black hole in front of Congress and we dress it up and say it is going to cure cancer. And then we dress it up and say it is going to cure Parkinson's disease. And then it is going to cure AIDS. At some point somebody has got to get up and say the emperor has no clothes. It does not solve these problems.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard people who are proponents of the Space Station say that those of us who are opposed to it are opposed to a manned space program. That is the furthest thing from the truth. Every single speaker has talked about the joy that we have experienced because of the great steps forward as a result of the NASA manned space program. But to say that one is opposed to the Space Station means that they are opposed to sending money into space needlessly and that is a key distinction.

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I think that is an important point to clarify, because personally I am for NASA and I am for the other $11 billion that we spend every year.

I would recommend to the viewers out there at 1 o'clock in the morning who are tuned into this TV station to pick up the August issue of the National Geographic and to see the wonderful pictures of what Pathfinder did for $267 million, did it on budget, on time, with a third of the bureaucracy that NASA has done with other projects at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in California. Did a wonderful job and excited the Nation.

We had children all across the Nation glued to the TV, as I was glued to the TV in 1968 to watch Neil Armstrong take a step on the moon. These programs can work and we should support them. And I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, there are very good programs going on in NASA, but not the Space Station.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, finally I want to compliment the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) because they have been leaders in the wilderness on this issue. It is not easy to get before this Congress when there are vast resources put into promoting this program.

But it takes people I think to have the determination, like the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Michigan, to continue this fight. And we may not win tonight, but sooner or later the American people are going to for this that is being shipped into outer space.

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

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, let me add my compliments for...
the role that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has played over the years in voicing his objections to the Space Station. He showed great understanding and knowledge of the space program, great tenacity.

Mr. ROEMER. The system is such that he may well end up being chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics in the fairly near future, and he may have an opportunity to directly exercise the kind of control over the Space Station that he is trying to do indirectly at this point in time.

I do not agree with his position, and so I rise in opposition to his amendment. I would like to point out that the space program has never been judged in terms of its immediate, measurable benefits. Several mentions have been made of Alan Shepard's flight back in 1962, and of President Kennedy's announcement of the Apollo program shortly after that.

There is no way on earth we can justify the Apollo program on economic grounds. It was a one-time effort. It was a crash effort. It was done out of fear that the Russians, who had already excelled in several things, they had launched the first satellite, they had launched the first man, and it was the fear in America that we had irreparably lost our technological leadership of the world. That led the President to announce that we would send a man to the moon. We created the Apollo program. The huge Saturn rockets, we have never used them again. We have lost the plans to them. We would not know how to build another one of them. What remains is in some museum somewhere. And after we had successfully completed the program, then we sat back and said what will we do next?

It took us a little while to decide maybe we should go for a space transportation system instead of a grandiose plan of a giant Saturn rocket. That time during the 1960s was three times what it is today. It has gone down steadily since that period of time, and I regret that. I frequently mention that NASA is going downhill more than I would like.

There was no economic benefit from that. It was merely a psychological benefit restoring the confidence of America in their ability to cope with Russia and the rest of the world.

Now, as to the Decent Situation with the Space Station. Incidentally, the Space Station did not develop as a program to beat the Russians, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) mentioned earlier. The Russians already had a Space Station when we decided that we were going to build a Space Station.

We recognized that if we had any intention of human role in space, that it had to be based upon the ability to create some space and to live in those structures and to make use of those structures in zero or relatively zero gravity for the purpose of determining the sustainability of life in space and conducting research that would be beneficial in space.

We did not even bring back a bag of rocks from the moon that we could look to and say this is the economic benefit we have reached. The Russians went to the moon, I picked up a bag of rocks, and brought them back. We subsequently gathered a few, but they were not nearly as many as the Russians and so they outdid us on the one economic benefit, collecting rocks. And there was no gold or diamonds in those rocks.

But what we have been almost unconsciously doing is voicing the aspiration of the human race to move beyond the bounds of earth into a new environment that is universal. This is something that attracts a huge amount of people. We cannot quantify it. We cannot measure the economic benefit. It is a matter of satisfying the demands of the human spirit; the same thing in a different sense that drove us to send the Apollo astronauts into space and land the first humans on the moon.

Incidentally, those who know the Shepard story well recognize that he had one first. He was not the first man on the moon. He was the first man to hit a golf ball on the moon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. LEWIS of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to express my deep appreciation for not just the gentleman's commentary this evening but for the initiative of this lady's amendment to these programs and understanding them perhaps better than anybody else in the House.

The reality is that Space Station is not just a toy out in space. I have heard several of our colleagues this evening talk about how they support NASA, they support our probe in space, support our work in space. And yet the reality is that if man is going to be in space, we need to learn many of these things that we are learning by this process.

It is not just a question of health, things that we learn from people being in zero gravity, et cetera. It is building things in space. Having men and women work in space. Indeed, if NASA is going to carry forward that Horizon project that is the dream of our people, that new horizon, it will not be done without an effective Space Station.

The gentleman's work has been extremely helpful and I wanted him to know I appreciate him.

Mr. BROWN of California. And I want the gentleman to know I appreciate his continued support and that of his colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Here are some facts on the Space Station. Significant development progress has been made on the International Space Station. Seventy-five percent of the development milestones have been completed. The first two elements of the Space Station are ready and being prepared for launch. Over 400,000 pounds of flight hardware have been built. By the end of 1998, NASA and its international partners will have built over a half million pounds of flight hardware. And the first two elements of the Space Station will be in orbit.

The return of U.S. astronaut Andy Thomas marks the successful conclusion of the Shuttle-Mir program. Ten rendezvous and nine docking missions, and over 350 days of U.S. astronaut exposure to space and conducting research that the United States invaluable experience in long-term space operations which has prepared NASA to more effectively conduct permanent operations aboard the International Space Station.

The Space Shuttle crews to the first three assembly flights of the International Space Station have already been selected and begun training. The Space Station assembly crews have already been selected. The first four crews to live and work aboard the Space Station have been selected and are actively training in Russia, the United States, Europe, and Canada.

The International Space Station Research Plan has been adopted and published and selection is underway for what will eventually be 900 principal investigators conducting research aboard the Space Station. NASA remains fully committed to meet Space Station research requirements, and has included full funding for enhanced research capabilities in the budget of the program.

The Research Plan outlines the use of the world class International Space Station laboratories. Space Station capacity for data transfer has been significantly updated from the original plan.

November 20th, 1998 is the revised launch date for the U.S.-owned Russian-built control module. It will follow four crews to live and work aboard the launch of Unity, the U.S. node. Launch of the Russian Service Module is scheduled for April 1999. Assembly will be complete in January 2004.

The Russian-built service module is 95 percent complete and has been shipped for final outfitting and testing. As a hedge against Russian Service Module delays, NASA has modified the Russian-built control module and is developing a U.S. Interim control module in the event additional Service Module delays are encountered.

Although the recently issued report of the Cost Assessment and Validation Task Force, headed by Jay Chabrow,
has concluded that technical and schedule risk could force total International Space Station costs to reach $24.7 billion, NASA has not revised its existing estimate of $21.3 billion.

NASA continues to evaluate other contingencies and to tighten further Russian funding delays and is refining those plans for implementation, if needed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Space Station, despite its difficulties is the greatest, peaceful, international scientific endeavor in the history of the world. The Space Station is a platform for international peace. It is a platform for international science. It is a platform for national and international economic growth. It is a platform for future generations.

Children sense it. In my own district I saw John Glenn speak to a school full of elementary children, and they stood transfixed as he talked about his flight, as he talked about outer space, as he talked about where America was going for the future, because they saw it as their future as well.

The Space Station is a platform for future human achievement. It will help us grow the economy of the future, to improve the quality of life for all people. Twenty-nine years ago the United States became the first Nation to land an astronaut on the moon. Now, what if Congress had told John Kennedy, when he set out to make a lunar landing a national goal, what if Congress had said, "No, you can't. It is impractical. It is wasteful." Twenty-nine years ago the people of the United States stood transfixed as we saw Neil Armstrong take one small step for man, one giant step for mankind.

One mission after another, the space program has kept advancing America's frontiers. Advancing our dreams. Now, the poet Browning once wrote, "But a man's reach should exceed his grasp or what's a heaven for." The Alan Shepard, the Gus Grissoms, the John Glenns, the Buzz Aldrins, the Christa McAuliffes all represent the courage, the vision of this great country.

America is a practical Nation. We understand cost benefits, and there have been practical benefits, as has been pointed out, $9 returned for every $1 spent in the space program. But America, too, is a Nation about a ceaseless quest for achievement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Kucinich) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Kucinich was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the stars which emblazon our flag, which ring this chamber and which surround that eagle that looks down on us every day, those stars could also represent the stars that we reach for.

Our future as a Nation is certainly about what we do on this earth, but it is also about the sky above. It is also about the human heart exploring the unknown. Americans know this. That is why they support the space program, and that is why they are hoping this Congress is going to support the International Space Station.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this debate is more about the future of those middle school children. Whether they are white, black, Hispanic, or whatever their nationality, space is their goal, and that is why I think it is so important and that is why I think tomorrow hopefully, when the House votes, we will vote again respectfully to defeat the Roemer amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hands a 5-minute speech praising the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) who has done a terrific job this year in cooperating with the authorizers. We have had such a good relationship that I wanted to praise him in this speech. I also in this 5-minute speech talk about the NASA budget, but instead will include this in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, today the Appropriations Committee has brought before the House a bill which, a bill which, among other things, funds our nation's civilian space agency, NASA, for fiscal year 1999.

As chairman of the authorizing subcommittee for NASA, I think it's fair to say that there has not always been perfect agreement between the authorizers and my friend from Ohio, Mr. Stokes, has brought to the floor today.

Many of the top priorities of the Science Committee, as expressed in H.R. 1275, the bipartisan Civilian Space Authorization Act which this House passed last year, have been honored and emphasized in H.R. 4194. Let me just mention a few:

First, the Committee has sent a clear message to NASA that there is a limit to how much money we can spend on the International Space Station. The $170 million from the ISS budget in this bill, made possible due to predicted carryover funding of $400-500 million from FY98, is the best argument against the proposed amendment by my colleague Mr. ROEMER of Indiana. The Appropriations Committee's report language on the ISS program shows that they have now joined with Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Mr. Brown, and the rest of the authorizers in imposing standards on this Administration's performance on the Space Station. Together we are saying that the White House must fix the broken policy of its partnership with Russia, and that NASA must fix its financial and technical management of the program.

Second, the report as H.R. 4194 endorses the idea that greater commercial participation in the Station and Space Shuttle programs can both reduce and help defray many of the cost overruns in the Space Station program, and for this I am personally grateful to Chairman Rohrabacher.

Third, the report specifically tracks with H.R. 1275 in directing that NASA's Life and Microgravity Science office manage Space Station
research, instead of the Station program office. The scientists who will use our national laboratory in space should manage their research funding, not the engineers that are building the lab.

Next, the report provides additional funding for human research, scientific, and commercial projects in NASA. H.R. 4194 increases by $20 million NASA’s planned $5 million funding level for Space Solar Power research, and provides an additional $1.6 million for the Near Earth Asteroid Tracking program.

Finally, the report’s annex provides an increase of $30 million for the program that NASA Administrator Dan Goldin declared was his top priority for additional funding above the President’s request. This money is for Future-X, a program of additional experimental launch vehicles to carry on the progress we are making with the X-33 and X-34 projects. Mr. Chairman, reducing the high cost of space transportation has been my top space priority since joined the Congress and the Space subcommittee in 1989. By providing full funding for the X-33 and X-34 programs, and this funding level for Future-X program, are taking steps to ensuring that there will be a continuing stream of improved technologies to both our commercial space industry and to our military. I am particularly gratified that the Committee directs that half of the Future-X budget be spent in cooperation with the Air Force’s military spaceplane program. This honors the President’s Space Transportation Policy and Administrator Goldin’s testimony to my subcommittee that NASA would develop new space transportation technologies for and in cooperation with the Air Force. I must admit that there is one small item in the Committee report which gives me some pause, and that is the $10 million for Liquid Flyback Booster studies. Over the past year or so I have found that the Liquid Flyback Booster concept is not so much an upgrade of the Space Shuttle as it is a stalking horse for a mission to send astronauts to Mars. Well, this Congress has no intention of approving the hundreds of billions it could cost to send astronauts to Mars. Nor, would we want to spend taxpayers’ dollars to develop a NASA-owned and-operated Space Shuttle if there are lower cost commercial alternatives, including a privatized Shuttle system. Finally, I would point out that the Launch Services Purchase Act of 1990 promises NASA from building and owning any additional launch systems, and this report language on Liquid Flyback Boosters would seem to go in that direction. I would hope that in conference the Chairman of the Subcommittee might work to specify that any funding for studies of Liquid Flyback Boosters could come from the $20 million NASA has already appropriated for Space Transports Architecture Studies and not from critical technology efforts like X-33 and Future-X.

But let me once again state my strong support for the rest of the NASA appropriation. In summary, H.R. 4194 sends the Senate and the Administration a unified, two-part message from the House Authorizers and Appropriators. We both support Mr. Goldin’s emphasis on scientific research, his interest in space commercialization, and his leadership on space transportation technology. But we are also united in saying that the Space Station program must be fixed, and fixed now. Mr. MENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Roemer-Camp amendment to eliminate funding for NASA’s International Space Station.

Some have argued that it would be fiscally prudent to eliminate the space station. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, it would be terribly imprudent to kill the program. We have already invested more than $20 billion in the space station. Our 12 international partners have spent more than $5 billion. Two hundred tons of hardware has been built and first element launch is less than six months away. To eliminate the program now, after so much has been invested and so much work has been done, would be the height of irresponsibility by allowing our investment to be wasted.

The International Space Station is a worthwhile investment in exploration and science, an investment in jobs and economic growth, and most of all, an investment in improving life for all of us here on earth. The space programme and experiments conducted on the space shuttle have made remarkable contributions to medical research and the study of life on earth. The space station is the next logical step in space exploration. Let me highlight some of the station’s potential for contributing to medical advancements, for example:

Space station researchers will use the low-gravity environment of the space station to expand our understanding of cell culture, which could revolutionize treatment for joint diseases and injuries;

The space station will provide a unique environment for research on the growth of protein crystals, which aids in determining the structure and function of proteins. Crystals grown in space are far superior than those on earth. Such information will greatly enhance drug design and research into cancer, diabetes, emphysema, parasitic infections, and immune systems disorders;

The almost complete absence of gravity on the space station will allow new insights into human health and disease prevention and treatment—including heart, lung, and kidney function, cardiovascular disease, bone calcium loss, and immune system function;

I share my colleagues’ concern that continued Russian participation in this project needs to be carefully examined. The economic difficulties Russia is currently experiencing have caused several unfortunate delays in their delivery of certain space station components and this needs to be scrutinized. We need a backup plan to move forward without the Russians if necessary. But this partnership deserves every chance to succeed because of the experience and expertise the Russians bring to the table and the foreign policy benefits of continuing this partnership.

Mr. Speaker, the International Space Station is vital to continued human manned presence in space and I would urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand the recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will be postponed.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my support for the FY99 VA-HUD Appropriations bill.

A project in the VA-HUD bill, called TARP, is extremely important to not only the people of the 11th congressional district of Illinois, but the entire Chicago Metropolitan Area. This bill contains $6.5 million for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in fiscal year 1999 to go toward construction of the Calumet System TARP—the segment that directly affects my constituents.

During the summer of 1996, floods plagued the South Suburbs of Chicago. Frequent flooding in the Chicago area causes disruptions in major expressways; and rainwater and raw sewage back up into the basements of over 500,000 homes and contaminate local drinking water supplies.

As you know, TARP is an intricate system of underground tunnels, pumping stations and storage reservoirs to control flooding and combined sewage pollution in the Chicago Metropolitan Area. It is important to note that TARP will remove four times the amount of pollution as the City of Boston’s projected remediation, approximately in same amount. To date, 93 miles of control tunnels have been completed, or are under construction, and 16 miles of tunnels have yet to be completed. To the projects’ merit, the completed segments of TARP have helped to eliminate 86 percent of the combined sewage pollution in a 325 square mile area.

While we tend to think of this project as a critical flood protection measure, the truth is that the water protection is just as important. Since TARP has come on-line, we have seen a striking improvement in the quality of our waterways, bringing fish—and commerce—back to our rivers. Probably the biggest protections TARP brings is the return of our drinking water supply, Lake Michigan, to good health. By protecting Lake Michigan from raw sewage, TARP provides us with quality water supply and that our children will be protected.

I believe that Chicago and the South Suburbs cannot afford any more delays in completing this project. The fact that occurred this winter filled the TARP system to capacity and forced the release of 4.2 billion gallons of combined rainwater and sewage into Lake Michigan. This must be prevented.

Home and business owners are suffering, our drinking water supply is at risk, flood insurance premiums are increasing while property values are decreasing. The annual damages sustained by the flooding exceed $150 million. If this project were finished these damages could be eliminated, not to mention the disaster that occurred this winter that will point out that TARP was judged by the EPA twice as the most cost-effective plan to meet the enforceable provisions of the Clean Water Act. The South Suburbs have built a strong base of local support for this vital project. That is why it is essential that we receive the fiscal year 1999 funding to continue construction of TARP.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in support of H.R. 4194 and would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from California and Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies [Mr. JERRY LEWIS] and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and Ranking
Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in support of H.R. 4194 and urges his colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the final passage of H.R. 4194, the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, Interior, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999. I object because this bill fails to include any funding for the Americorps or other initiatives administered by the Corporation for National Service which are funded annually in this legislation. When coupled with the reduction of more than $5 million in funding for the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program and the freeze in spending for the National Senior Volunteer Corps recommended in the Appropriations Committee’s Report on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999, the attack on the highly successful programs administered by the Corporation for National Service included in this bill will decimate opportunities to improve the lives of every American through strong community initiatives.

Over the years I have met countless activists as well as ordinary American citizens in the Second Congressional District who take heroic steps on a daily basis towards improving their communities and their own lives. As a result, the Second Congressional District and my home state of Mississippi have made substantial progress in improving the standard of living for many of their residents. However, both the Second Congressional District and Mississippi still contain some of the poorest areas in the nation.

We must recognize that Mississippi’s economic status can never be permanently improved by either ignoring the current state of affairs or by simply writing a check. For too long policy makers here in Washington and elsewhere have followed one of these two courses of action. There have been rare exceptions—initiatives to provide not just economic assistance, but also the inspiration for people to join with their neighbors in the effort to improve their community. As every hard-working American knows, no one labors so well as when he feels that others are willing to stand there beside him and suffer through the task at hand. The Americorps, which is administered by the Corporation for National Service and normally funded in this bill, is perhaps the best example of a program which provides a tangible, uplifting presence in the numerous communities where it is active.

There are more than five hundred Americorps volunteers in Mississippi today who have partnered with community leaders to improve communities, assist in improving access to everything from child care to literacy instruction. Most importantly, the Americorps volunteers’ stirring example has inspired thousands of Mississippians to enter community service as well. Today there are more than 25,000 people of all ages and backgrounds who are helping to solve problems and build stronger communities in the 48 projects across Mississippi which are sponsored by the Americorps and other Corporation for National Services initiatives.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—including some of my friends from Mississippi—will say the Corporation for National Service and the Americorps program are wasteful or too bureaucratic. Yet I do not think any of us could find another initiative funded by the federal or state governments today which encourages 29,000 people to serve their nation and their community for a total cost of less than $7 million.

Nonetheless, many former critics have finally started to see the positive benefits of the Corporation for National Service’s work. Governor Kirk Fordice of Mississippi, widely regarded as one of the most conservative governors in the nation, made the following statement in support of the Corporation for National Service’s efforts while visiting with Learn and Serve America students at the regional service-learning conference in Biloxi, Mississippi:

As you know from your first hand volunteering, service-learning offers the opportunity for today’s young people and tomorrow’s leaders for National Service, I encourage any of your hands-on experiences reinforce what you are learning in the classroom, promoting civic responsibility and showing that citizens working together are a powerful force.

After the Americorps was created in 1993, it quickly adopted the straightforward motto of “Getting Things Done.” In the opinion of both myself and thousands of residents of the Second Congressional District who have benefited from this program, the Americorps truly has been “Getting Things Done For Mississippi.” For those who might doubt the effectiveness or importance of the Corporation for National Service and its Americorps program, the following is a complete list of all the active projects supported by the Corporation for National Service in Mississippi. Instead of making speeches in the marble halls of Washington about bureaucracy, inefficiency, disorganization or a host of other mistaken descriptions of the Americorps and the activities of the Corporation for National Service, I encourage any of my skeptical colleagues to visit these communities and talk with the beneficiaries of its work.

80 Americorps Volunteers participate in the Delta Service Corps University Center for Community in Cleveland:

40 Americorps Volunteers participate in the Delta Reads Partnerships at Delta State University in Cleveland;

6 Americorps Volunteers participate in the Mid-South Delta LISC AmeriCorps in Greenville;

20 Americorps Volunteers participate in the Mississippi Action for Community Education in Greenville;

AmeriCorps Volunteers participate in the Harrison County Human Resources Agency in Gulfport;

2 AmeriCorps Volunteers participate in the South Mississippi Family/Child Center in Gulfport;

AmeriCorps Volunteers participate in the Desoto County Literacy Council Inc. in Hernando;

100 AmeriCorps Volunteers participate in the Volunteer Assistant Teachers Train to Become Teachers in Jackson;

30 AmeriCorps Volunteers participate in the AmeriCorps Assist Program in Jackson;

30 AmeriCorps Volunteers participate in the Campus Link in Jackson;

34 AmeriCorps Volunteers participate in the Campus Link in Jackson;

16 AmeriCorps Volunteers participate in the Metro Jackson Service Coalition in Jackson;

16 AmeriCorps Volunteers participate in the Partners in Readiness in Jackson;
Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes 319 through 322, last night and today, I was in my district on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 319; "yes" on rollcall 320; "no" on rollcall 321; and "yes" on rollcall 322.

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-643) on the resolution (H.Res. 509) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4250) to provide new patient protections under group health plans, which was referred to the House CALENDAR and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes 319 through 322, last night and today, I was in my district on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 319; "yes" on rollcall 320; "no" on rollcall 321; and "yes" on rollcall 322.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. PETER T. KING, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Peter T. King, Member of Congress:


Hon. Newt Gingrich,
President pro tempore of the Senate, United States Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.