United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 2000 No. 78

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 20, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4475. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4475) ''An Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BYRD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. INOUYE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

PUTTING A FACE ON THE VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have spent my adult life in public service, but one element that disappoints me is the failure of our society to address the critical problem of reducing gun violence in our society.

Since I started my career, over 1 million Americans have become victims to gun violence. This is more than all the Americans who have died in all the battles since the Civil War.

One of the reasons, I think, that we have failed to make progress in reducing this epidemic of gun violence is because we have failed to put a face on a million victims. One of the things that I would like to do, as a small contribution towards the reduction of this gun violence, is to help put faces on those victims. We cannot afford for them to be anonymous.

Today I would like to spend a couple of minutes talking about young Kevin Imel. He was visiting a school mate during spring vacation. The evening before, an 11-year-old friend had been playing with his parents' gun. The guns were not safely stored. They did not have trigger locks. They had bullets. Kevin was not comfortable and would not play with his friend and made it clear to him.

The next morning as they were watching Saturday cartoons, the friend suggested again that they play with this gun. Kevin was evidently forceful in indicating that one should not play with guns. It angered his 11-year-old classmate, who went to his parents' room while his mother was putting on makeup, marched out of the room with a rifle, announcing, ''Kevin, you are dead.''

He fired a bullet that went through Kevin's shoulder. His little sister who was there helped carry him to the car, and Kevin bled to death on the way to the hospital.

Kevin Imel's parents are well-known in my community. His mother is characterized with courage and warmth, who helps others by deed and leads by example in terms of leadership of what people in the disabled community can do.

Lon, the father, was a labor leader. He worked for our former colleague, Congresswoman Elizabeth Furse, and he too has been active in the community. Their service is all the more poignant, I think, because their son Kevin today is a series of warm memories and a life tragically cut short rather than growing into adulthood and being productive and carrying forward himself.

It is time for America to remember the Kevin Imels of this world, to put a face on those million victims. I do think that it is time for our friends in the Republican leadership in this Congress to allow us to deliberate on items that would reduce gun violence. For almost a year now, the conference committee on juvenile crime has not met. The provisions that have passed the Senate, three simple common sense provisions that would help reduce gun violence, that are supported by the overwhelming majority of the Americans and indeed of American gun owners, have not been deliberated. It is time for the Republican leadership to

Printed on recycled paper.

honor the memory of people like Kevin Imel, allow us to deliberate, allow us to put these into action, allow us to help make sure that those million people who have died to gun violence have not died in vain.

IN HONOR OF ASIAN PACIFIC ISLANDER VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize the contributions of Asian and Pacific Island veterans. Tomorrow, President Clinton will be presenting this Nation's highest military award for valor, the Congressional Medal of Honor, to 21 Asian American veterans who previously won the Distinguished Service Cross.

President Clinton approved the Army's recommendations for the upgrades this past May. Nineteen of the twenty-one veterans were members of the all-Japanese 100th Infantry Battalion, or 442nd Regimental Combat Team. For their size, it was amongst the most highest decorated units in U.S. military history. Members of this noble unit earned an amazing number of decorations, 18,000 individual decorations, including one wartime Medal of Honor, 53 Distinguished Service Crosses, 9,486 Purple Hearts and 7 Presidential Unit Citations, the Nation's top award for combat units.

The upgrading of the medals stems from efforts made by Senator DANIEL AKAKA of Hawaii, who authored the provision in the 1996 Defense Authorization Act mandating a review of the service records of Asian Pacific Americans who received the Distinguished Service Cross.

The recommendation by Secretary of the Army Louis Caldera, and the subsequent order by President Clinton, serves to correct the injustice of racial discrimination that was prevalent against Asian Pacific Americans during World War II. Many of the Japanese Americans who served in the 442nd volunteered from internment camps, where their families had been relocated at the outbreak of the war. These men fought in 8 major campaigns in Italy, France and Germany, including battles at Monte Cassino, Anzio and Biffontaine. Despite the ferocity of the fighting they endured and the degree of bravery exhibited by these men, the climate of racism precluded many from due recognition of their actions under fire. Tomorrow's White House ceremony will finally redress this past wrong.

One of those honored for valor is Senator DANIEL INOUYE who distinguished himself when leading his platoon against the enemy at San Terenzo on April 21, 1945. Though hit in the abdomen by a bullet that came out his back and barely missed his spine, he continued to lead the platoon and advanced alone against a machine gun nest that had pinned down his men.

He tossed two hand grenades with devastating effect before his right arm was shattered by a German rifle grenade at close range, according to the senatorial bio. INOUYE threw his last grenade with his left hand, attacked with a submachine gun, and was finally knocked down the hill by a bullet in the leg.

After 20 months in Army hospitals, INOUYE returned home as a captain with a Distinguished Service Cross, the Nation's second highest award for military valor, the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart with oak leaf cluster and 12 other medals and citations, and of course he now has a distinguished career in the other body.

Many of these names which I will enter into the RECORD will add to the Pantheon of true American heroes, names like Hajiro, Hayashi, Kobashigawa, Ono, Wai and Davila, add to the great tradition of American military history, and it should be noted, and I have noted here in my extended remarks, that these men endured, along with many other Asian Pacific Islanders during the war, a climate of racism that continued to persevere, and made their contributions in a number of combat units throughout the war, men from Pacific Islands like American Samoa and Guam, people who served in the Philippine armed services under the American flag, and, of course, many who joined the regular armed forces of the U.S. and who were limited to service and transportation units.

The other soldiers who will be honored are: Staff Sgt. (later 2nd Lt.) Rudolph B. Davila, Pvt. Barney F. Hajiro, Pvt. Mikio Hasemoto (posthumous), Pvt. Joe Hayashi, Pvt. Shizuya Hayashi, Tech. Sgt. Yeiki Kobashigawa, Staff Sgt. Robert T. Kuroda (posthumous), Pfc. Kaoru Moto (posthumous), Pfc. Kiyoshi K. Muranaga (posthumous), Pvt. Masato Nakae (posthumous), Pvt. Shinyei Nakamine (posthumous), Pfc. William K. Nakamura (posthumous), Pfc. Joe M. Nishimoto (posthumous), Sgt. (later Staff Sgt.) Allan M. Ohata, Tech. Sgt. Yukio Okutsu, Pfc. Frank H. Ono (posthumous), Staff Sgt. Kazuo Otani (posthumous), Pvt. George T. Sakato, Tech. Sgt. Ted T. Tanouye (posthumous), and Capt. Francis B. Wai (posthumous).

In honoring the heroism of these Asian Pacific veterans, I am reminded of the sacrifices of all our minority veterans. Today, several weeks after Memorial Day, I would like to take a few moments to talk about the tens of thousands of minority Americans who set aside political, economic and social disenfranchisement, to answer the call to arms against the forces of tyranny.

Minorities have served in the American military since the early days of the republic and valiantly fought in every major engagement including the Civil War, Spanish-American War, WWI, WWII, Korea, Vietnam and the Persian Gulf.

The moment of truth for most minority veterans was solidly demonstrated in WWII. Undaunted by discrimination and racism, they endeavored to serve their country. In the beginning of the war, many minority servicemen were relegated to serve only in ''rear echelon'' positions or support positions during the war. They served as munitions men, truck drivers, cooks, stewards, and in cleaning and repair details. I am reminded of Uncle ''Bob'' Lizama, a native son of Guam who served in the U.S. Navy as a steward. His naval career spanned over 30 years including service in three major wars.

Minorities also labored in the factories and farms throughout the United States working towards the war effort. In many cases, when in combat zones, the men in these positions manned weapons and fought honorably side-by-side with white soldiers and sailors during furious engagements.

Later in the war, after tremendous lobbying efforts by minority civic leaders, combat units were established for minority populations. These brave men and women came from all walks of life but were bound by a love of the principles of duty to God and country. They lived in a separate component of American society that was defined by an unfortunate climate of prejudice. African-Americans, Hispanics, native Hawaiians, Chamorros, Samoans, Asian Americans, Filipinos, American Indians, and Native Alaskans all served honorably in many capacities with the U.S. military to combat the hegemonic forces of Germany, Italy and Japan.

In segregated units, often led by white officers, these noble men distinguished themselves in combat and proved to the entire nation that they too were willing to lay down their lives for freedom. The Tuskegee Airmen, the famed 442nd Regimental Combat Team, the 100th Infantry Battalion, the Navaho Code-Talkers, the U.S. Navy's Fita Fita Guard (a U.S. Navy auxiliary unit in American Samoa), the 1st Samoan Battalion, U.S. Marine Corps, and the Guam Combat Patrol (a U.S. Marine Corps auxiliary unit in Guam) are just a few of the organizations where minorities fought valiantly in some of the most difficult combat assignments anywhere in World War II.

After WWII, President Harry S. Truman desegregated the U.S. military. Beginning with the Korean war, minority soldiers, sailors, and airmen have fought alongside with all Americans. Recently, Congress passed a resolution honoring all of America's minority veterans. I am very pleased to have worked with both Representative SHEILA JACKSON-LEE and Senator EDWARD KENNEDY to ensure that the Pacific Islanders were represented in the resolution's text.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the level of dedication, sacrifice and honor, that minority veterans displayed while serving in our nation's military, we must in every way possible ensure that any past instance of wholesale discrimination be addressed and corrected. In this light it may be prudent to have legislation that establishes a commission to ensure that minority veterans during the Korean and Vietnam conflicts were not denied awards for valor on account of the color of their skin or on the basis of their national origin. At the beginning of the 21st Century, we should conclusively and exhaustively rectify as many of these past racial injustices so that we can finally proceed forward in unity and in the spirit of brotherhood. The noble sacrifices of our forbearers who fought valiantly for our freedom should never go unrecognized, nor be tarnished by societal

ignorance. We, the benefactors of their sacrifice owe them at least that much.

THE REPUBLICAN PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the last couple of weeks have produced some of the most spectacular propaganda we have seen here in some time. It relates to the Republicans Medicare prescription drug proposal. First PHRMA, the drug industry and prescription drug manufacturers' lobbying group, launched an advertising campaign in the newspaper Roll Call and other papers claiming that a plan like the Republican proposal could cut prices by 30 to 39 percent.

By expressing their exuberant support for this plan and its alleged results, the drug industry as much as said it can comfortably weather price cuts in the 30 to 39 percent price range. If that is the case, the drug industry should do us all a favor and simply make the cuts in price. It is a lot easier than requiring seniors to go into a prescription drug coverage market that does not exist to purchase a stand-alone product that cannot stand alone.

The second wave of rhetoric came yesterday when Chairman THOMAS announced the GOP prescription drug plan which relies on private insurers to offer individual prescription drug coverage saying it would cut prices twice as much as the Democrats Medicare based plan. If only it were true. The Congressional Budget Office said the Republican drug plan may cut costs by 25 percent, not through lower prices but by restricting access to medically necessary drugs.

It is an important division. I will say it again. The Republican plan saves money not by miraculously convincing drug companies to lower their prices but instead by limiting access for senior citizens to medically necessary prescription drugs. It cuts costs by decreasing the value of the prescription drug benefit. The insurers win, the drug companies win, the government wins but senior citizens lose.

The Republican plan gives insurance companies carte blanche to do what they are doing today, that is, put price tags on treatment decisions and deny coverage for medically necessary treatment. Sound familiar? The President's plan is explicit in requiring coverage, on the other hand, for any medically necessary drug prescribed by a doctor, which makes sense given it is the doctor, not the insurer, who should be and is making medical decisions and who is actually treating the patient.

The Republican plan guarantees nothing other than assistance for low income seniors. Prescription drugs, however, are not just a low income problem. Seniors who thought they were financially secure are watching their savings go straight into the pockets of drug makers. Some of my colleagues are trying to tell seniors that there will be a choice of reliable, affordable private prescription drug insurance plans available to them. Based on what? Certainly not history. Even the insurance industry is balking at the idea. It says something that insurers do not sell prescription drug coverage on a stand-alone basis today, even to young and to healthy individuals. That is because it does not make sense.

Medicare is reliable. Medicare is a large enough insurance program to accommodate the risks associated with prescription drug coverage. Individual stand-alone prescription drug policies are not.

Some in this body are actually trying to convince seniors who stand firmly behind Medicare that expanding the current benefit package is less efficient, more onerous, than manufacturing a new bureaucracy, as the Republican plan does, and conjuring up a new insurance market. Seniors are simply too smart for that.

I do not want to ask seniors in my district and across the country to rely on a market that does not want the business to provide a benefit not suited to stand-alone coverage to a population that, let us face it, has never been served well by the private insurance market.

I do not want seniors in my district and across the country to be coerced into managed care plans in order to avoid dealing with three different insurance plans, with Medicare, with Medigap and with individual prescription drug coverage.

I do not want seniors in my district or across the country to receive a letter from their employer telling them that their retiree prescription drug coverage has been terminated on the premise, quote, that the government is offering private insurance now.

I do not want to forsake volume discounts and economies of scale by segmenting the largest purchasing pool in this country, and then waste trust fund dollars on insurance company margins, on insurance company market expenses, on insurance company huge executive salaries.

I do not think the individual health insurance market is a reasonable model for Medicare prescription drug benefits. In fact, as anyone who has had to purchase or sale coverage in that market knows the individual health insurance market is not even a good model for individual health insurance. It is the poster child for selection problems, for rate spirals and for insurance scams.

The very fact that the drug industry backs Citizens for a Better Medicare supports the private plan approach is a giant strike against it. The drug industry and their puppet organization clearly feel that undercutting seniors' collective purchasing power, relegating seniors to private stand-alone prescription drug plans, is the key, underscore this, is the key to preserving discriminatory monopolistically set outrageously high prices.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Members of this Congress read the fine print when we decide these Medicare prescription drug bills.

RESOLUTION OF KASHMIR ISSUE MUST INCLUDE THE KASHMIRI PANDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the United States and the world community have been forced to confront the need for a resolution of the conflict in Kashmir. This conflict in the Himalayan Mountains has for decades poisoned relations between India and Pakistan.

The conflict has also poisoned life within Kashmir itself. People from all ethnic and religious groups have suffered from the violence, be they Hindu, Muslim or Sikh, but the most forgotten victims have been the Pandits.

Recently, it was reported by the Indo-American Kashmir forum that Karl Inderfurth, the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia, reiterated the view that Pandits should not be ignored in upcoming discussions of the Kashmir issue. In a meeting with the National Advisory Council on South Asia at the State Department earlier this month, Mr. Inderfurth acknowledged that the U.S. has not always mentioned the Pandits in its statements on the Kashmir, but assured the Council that the displaced status of the Pandits is a matter of concern to the United States.

As a U.S. official who has frequently sought to give more attention to the plight of the Pandits, I am encouraged by Mr. Inderfurth's recent statement. I will urge our State Department to continue to draw attention to the suffering that the Pandits have endured and continue to endure in its statements on the Kashmir issue.

I have also called for the U.N. and international organizations to devote greater attention to what I consider a case of ethnic cleansing that is afflicting the Kashmiri Pandit community.

Mr. Speaker, India's Prime Minister Vajpayee has indicated that his government would be willing to meet with Kashmiri groups to address their concerns but the prime minister has stressed that Pakistan should not have any role in this dialogue, which is in fact an internal matter for India.

Some of these separatist elements within Kashmir, the same organizations involved in the terrorism that has uprooted the Pandit community, are clearly working to promote greater Pakistani involvement in this process.

Mr. Speaker, there is overwhelming evidence of Pakistani support for the continued terror campaign in Jammu and Kashmir. Indeed, Pakistani involvement and terrorist activities in Kashmir has been acknowledged by our State Department and a Congressionally appointed advisory panel has recommended that Pakistan be designated as the government that is not fully cooperative against terrorism.

The Pakistani government itself has at least tacitly acknowledged, under heavy international pressure, that it must take action to curb the network of militants that has taken root on its soil. The one aspect of this tragedy that frequently is overlooked is the plight of the Hindu community of this region, the Kashmiri Pandits. As I have gotten to know the Kashmiri American community, and hearing about the situation facing the Pandits, I have been increasingly outraged not only at the terrible abuses they have suffered but at the seeming indifference of the world community. At the same time, I am impressed by the dignity and the determination that the Kashmiri Pandits have maintained despite their horrible conditions, and I am touched by the deep concern that the Kashmiri Americans feel for their brothers and sisters living in Kashmir in the refugee centers set up in India to accommodate the Pandits driven from their homes in the Kashmir Valley.

Mr. Speaker, in the great international debates that we have, it is sometimes all too easy to overlook the so-called small problem of one persecuted ethnic group, but I hope that the United States and India, as the world's two largest democracies, will show determination to finally address this humanitarian catastrophe in an effective and humane way.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Ken L. Day, Level Cross United Methodist Church, Randleman, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Most Holy Lord God, You have created and designed us for intimate fellowship with You, one another, and all Your creation. We acknowledge that You are the giver of all good and perfect gifts we are endowed with for this fellowship to be realized. We also acknowledge that You continually present us with opportunities to exercise these gifts and abilities. These representatives, staffs, and aides have assembled here this day to freely exercise these gifts and abilities in service to You and our country.

We confess that we have not always exercised these gifts and abilities faithfully. We have occasionally allowed selfish desires and personal agendas to cloud our visions and influence our actions. Forgive us, Lord, when we fail to esteem others higher than ourselves. And in forgiving us, allow us continued opportunities to serve You, one another, and our country. In Christ's holy name we pray, amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LINDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOME TO THE REVEREND KEN L. DAY

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the privilege to recognize our guest pastor today who is from my district. He serves the Level Cross United Methodist Church in Level Cross, North Carolina. I said to him yesterday, ''I address my minister as Preacher. Ken, are you comfortable with that endearing title?''

He said, ''That is an ascribed title, not earned. I like it.''

So, Preacher, it is good to have you with us here today. Your family is in the gallery. I know your parishioners are watching today.

SAFEGUARDING SECRETS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, my mother makes a great carrot cake. For generations the recipe has been a guarded secret. In fact, the recipe to our family's carrot cake is probably more secure than this country's nuclear secrets. However, based on the lack of concern from the Vice President, you would not think our national security was a major issue. The Vice President has had no problem taking credit for discovering Love Canal, inspiring the novel ''Love Story,'' inventing the Internet, and just last week he took credit for the strength of our economy. But when this administration has repeated security lapses, putting our citizens at risk, he is nowhere to be found.

The Vice President and the other side of the aisle have spent most of their time and energy on this floor worried about political attacks when instead we should be concerned about defending this Nation from nuclear attacks.

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue in my efforts to bring to light the problem of international child abduction. Every day possible I have come to the House floor to deliver a 1-minute on the issue and including in that 1-minute the story of an individual child. Today I will tell you about Benjamin Eric Roche.

Benjamin was abducted when he was 3 years old by his mother Suzanne Riley and taken to Germany. Ms. Riley had physical custody of Benjamin at that time, but both she and his father, Mr. Ken Roche, shared joint custody. Under the Hague Convention, a German court ordered Benjamin to be returned to the United States in August of 1993.

Mr. Roche had not heard from his ex-wife or his son until February 1, 2000, when Ms. Riley initiated contact with him. However, since that contact, Mr. Roche has once again not heard from her or his son.

Mr. Speaker, there are 10,000 other children who are in the same shoes as Benjamin. They have been kidnapped across international borders. We must continue to work to make sure that they are returned. We must bring our children home.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG CHOICES

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last year a 75-year-old woman in Las Vegas had to let her homeowners insurance policy lapse just to pay for her prescription heart medicine. Tragically her home was destroyed in the floods that ravaged the Las Vegas valley last year as well.

Mr. Speaker, such a tragedy should never have been allowed to happen. This Congress has an opportunity to provide a voluntary, affordable and accessible Medicare drug benefit plan to all our Nation's seniors. The House bipartisan prescription drug plan will solve this very serious problem currently facing our Nation's seniors.

With this plan, senior citizens will no longer have to choose between food, shelter and medication. Instead, the only choice they will have to make is which prescription plan best meets their individual needs.

I urge my colleagues to support the House bipartisan prescription drug plan. It is the fair thing to do, but, more importantly, it is the right thing to do.

OIL COMPANIES REPORT RECORD PROFITS IN WAKE OF RISING GASOLINE PRICES

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, as gasoline prices throughout the United States go from $2 a gallon and even towards $3 a gallon, I think it is instructive for this Congress to review the profits of the major oil companies even before this round of increases in the price of gas.

Listen to this, the profit increases over the last year: Texaco, 473 percent increase in profit. Phillips Petroleum, 257 percent increase in profit. Conoco, 371 percent increase in profit. Chevron, 291 percent increase in profit. BP Amoco, 296 percent increase in profit.

I do not know of anyone in America who is getting a raise of a few hundred percent. The American people are struggling to survive and the oil companies are ripping them off. We need a windfall profits tax. We need to make sure that there is some balance brought back in this economy. It is time to go after the oil companies.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION EXPRESSING CONCERN FOR WELL-BEING OF CITIZENS INJURED IN MEXICO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for sponsoring a resolution that expresses the concern of the Congress for the safety and well-being of United States citizens injured while traveling in Mexico and calls for the President to begin negotiations with the government of Mexico to establish a humanitarian exemption to that country's exit bond requirements.

No American should have to live through the nightmare faced by Michael and Lorraine Andrews, a couple from my congressional district, on a recent trip to Mexico. What was supposed to be a peaceful vacation cruise became a life-and-death situation after a serious car accident required Michael's immediate transfer to the United States to receive adequate medical treatment for a spinal cord injury. The Andrews couple was delayed by Mexican authorities and had to pay off several individuals in order to board the plane to head home.

Humanitarian considerations should be allowed to supersede any regulatory bond that may delay an American's departure to receive proper medical care so that emergencies like that of Michael and Lorraine Andrews will be prevented in the future.

POLITICAL CORRECTNESS RULES AT SUPREME COURT

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. The Supreme Court says pornography is okay and it is okay to burn the flag, that Communists can work in our defense plants, that it is okay to teach witchcraft in our schools and that it is okay for our students to write papers about the devil.

But the Supreme Court says it is illegal to write papers about Jesus, it is illegal to pray in school, and now the Supreme Court says it is even illegal to pray before a football game.

Beam me up. I thought the founders intended to create a Supreme Court, not the Supreme Being. Think about that statement.

I yield back a Supreme Court that is so politically correct they are downright stupid, so stupid they could throw themselves at the ground and miss.

SUPPORT LINDER–COLLINS AMENDMENT TO VA–HUD APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of an amendment the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and I plan to offer later today to the VA–HUD appropriations bill. The amendment would simply ensure that Federal, State and local governments do not waste precious taxpayer dollars on air quality standards that have been rendered unenforceable by a Federal appeals court.

This would not be the first time the Congress has done this. In 1998, the 105th Congress passed TEA–21 which included language that extended the designation time line for a year because the matter was in court. That time line has now run out. Two hundred ninety-seven Members of this House supported that language. This change recognized both the burdens placed on States and localities by these standards and the need to stop any process that would interfere with litigation surrounding the standards.

The gentleman from Georgia and I bring our amendment before the House today in the same spirit. We have no interest in preventing reasonable clean air standards from being enforced. We just want to make sure that the Supreme Court has an opportunity to rule in the case first. Continue the congressional tradition of holding harmless our constituents while the lawyers and bureaucrats debate the merits of policy. Support the Linder-Collins amendment today.

SUPPORT HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would think that America would want its leadership to make the right kind of statement to the world. I do not know why we have not been able to pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999, and now 2000. The other body vigorously debated Senator KENNEDY's legislation yesterday and today they vote. I think it is very important that today the Senate takes the first step to tell the world that America abhors hatred.

Just yesterday, I met with the relatives of James Byrd, Jr., and they told me that even today people are desecrating on his grave, trying to intimidate the community. Hate crimes are not individualized. It is a statement that says, We don't like you because you're different. Because you're African American, Hispanic, you're a woman, you are disabled, you have a different life-style, you are Asian, you practice your religion differently.

Can America not come under the umbrella of the Statue of Liberty that encouraged all of us to come to this free land? It is important that we stand up as legislators and denounce hatred in this Nation by voting for the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 and 2000.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded it is against the rules of the House to urge action in the other body.

PRESIDENT'S SCHOOL REFORM TOUR NEEDS GEOGRAPHY LESSON

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has often used bus tours and the like to promote his latest proposals for new government programs. As you recall, his most notable tour advocated the First Lady's massive Federal health care plan. The President's latest road trip involves his school reform tour which will take him to four different cities in the United States. But before the President leaves for his tour, he may want to consult with a geography teacher. Apparently, the President's first official school reform tour website showed the State of

Kentucky relocated to the area currently known as Tennessee. The White House, justifiably embarrassed by the incident, has corrected its website. However, it begs the question, should a White House that cannot even correctly identify which States are which be mapping out key education reforms that will affect our children? This concerns me and it should concern the American people.

□ 1015

AMENDMENT TO VA/HUD BILL TO PREVENT EPA MOVING FORWARD ON DESIGNATION OF NEW NONATTAINMENT AREAS

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, when a lower court ruled in 1999 against new Federal air standards, reasonable persons expected the EPA to delay further implementation of the standards until the Supreme Court ruled on the agency's appeal.

Instead, the EPA is pushing forward with rules that force State and local governments across the country to spend thousands of dollars to comply with new invalid standards.

To stop this waste of taxpayer money, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and I will offer an amendment to VA/HUD later today which will prevent the EPA from moving forward with the designation of new nonattainment areas until such time as the Supreme Court makes a decision.

State and local governments could better use their resources to help their communities to comply with the rules that may never become legally enforceable.

Our amendment is simple. It does not affect existing air quality standards, nor does it render judgment on the new standards. It only requires EPA to postpone further action until the Supreme Court issues a final ruling.

It is common sense to postpone the designation process until we are certain that it will not be a huge waste of Federal, State and local resources.

LOS ALAMOS LEAKS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers saw a national security as the very first duty of government. First amongst the powers given to Congress is the power to provide for the common defense. The first duty listed for the President is to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

National security is a very serious matter; and when nuclear secrets are lost, our national safety is threatened. Then why have we seen repeated security breaches at the Los Alamos National Laboratory?

Dr. Wen Ho Lee is still in jail awaiting trial for mishandling secret data a year ago. When that happened, Energy Secretary Richardson opposed new security measures, insisting that he wanted to be in charge and that he could handle the security himself.

Clearly, he has failed to do that. Some think we have better security at Wal-Mart than we do in Los Alamos. Richardson blamed the University of California, but even his director of counterintelligence says we cannot rule out espionage.

If the Secretary of Energy cannot provide security for our Nation's top nuclear secrets, the President needs to find someone who can.

LAX SECURITY AT LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY

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

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, last year, following disturbing reports of lax security at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, the Congress passed and the President signed a law creating an Under Secretary for national security at the Department of Energy. This new position was created to strengthen security at our labs. Now Secretary Richardson objects to filling this post; and as a previous speaker said, he specifically took personal responsibility for security.

Now we know of another massive security breach at the lab. But is Secretary Richardson taking personal responsibility for these lapses occurring on his watch? Nope, not a chance. He has found a scapegoat in the University of California.

Madam Speaker, UC does have a contract to manage the lab, but responsibility for security lies with the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, blaming the University of California for the security breakdown at the lab is like the captain of the Titanic blaming the head waiter for the iceberg. Of course, the captain did not; he took responsibility and went down with the ship. It is time for the Secretary of Energy to do the same and resign.

SUPPORTING LEGISLATION CALLING FOR APOLOGY FOR SLAVERY

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support and cosponsor the legislation of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) that calls for an apology for slavery. I have heard the snickers, the snide comments, the perplexed faces from Members baffled by the gentleman's quest for justice. I think we all need to check ourselves.

This great Nation of ours did something terribly wrong during its infancy: I was written out of its Constitution, and it turned its head on slavery. And when our country actually saw itself for the first time in a mirror, its response was to proclaim that the black man had no rights that a white man was bound to respect.

It took a second look, however, and began to exorcise its demons; that is what reparations to Native Americans, Holocaust victims, and Japanese Americans was all about. Sadly, nobody thought about me. Yet an unarmed black man can be murdered on the streets of America and no one blinks an eye.

Innocent black men disappear to death row. Crack cocaine dumped into our neighborhoods. Malcolm X and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., murdered in conspiracies.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) is trying to close these wounds, not reopen them.

NONCOMMERCIAL BROADCASTING FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION ACT OF 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 527 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 527

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4201) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the service obligations of noncommercial educational broadcast stations. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce; (2) a further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII, if offered by representative Markey of Massachusetts or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 527 is a fair rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4201, the Noncommercial Broadcasting Freedom of Expression Act of 2000. H. Res. 527 provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking

minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

The rule provides that the amendment recommended by the Committee on Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. In addition, the rule provides for the consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) or his designee, which shall be considered as read, debatable for 1 hour equally divided between proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, like most Members, I have been contacted by a number of my constituents regarding the Federal Communication Commission's ruling on religious programming. By way of background, since 1952, the FCC has reserved a limited number of television channels for educational broadcasters, known as noncommercial education channels, provided that the nonprofit groups, including religious organizations, can show that they will devote more than half of their programming to general education purposes.

However, in the December 29, 1999, ruling granting a noncommercial educational television station license, the FCC included a section on ''additional guidance'' and ruled that programming largely ''devoted to religious exhortation, proselytizing, or statements of personally held religious views and beliefs'' would not count as educational.

I am disheartened that the FCC initially believed that religious programs do not serve the educational, instructional, and cultural needs of the community as defined by NCE regulations. I have no doubt that the millions of Americans who attend and watch church services find culture and education in the teachings of a sermon. I am pleased, however, that the FCC has since vacated its order.

Despite the fact that the decision has been reversed, many Members did, I know, have concerns about the FCC's interpretation of the law in this matter. In addition, we are concerned that the FCC ruled without the benefit of public comment, taking unilateral action without consulting those who would be affected. Moreover, in clarifying NCE television rules, the FCC established a new benchmark for evaluating the content of religious broadcasts. In effect, the FCC created a precedent that could have required the FCC to monitor and evaluate religious programming and decide what is educational.

Mr. Speaker, I find this course of action intrusive and question a decision that replaces programming decisions based on the community with FCC guidance.

This is why we need to consider H.R. 4201 this morning. This bill ensures that the FCC does not engage in regulating the content of speech broadcast by noncommercial education stations, except by means of a formal agency rulemaking. This is responsible legislation that will answer the policy questions that arose following the FCC decision on this matter.

Nonetheless, there is an amendment that deserves consideration of the House on the House floor. In the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) offered an amendment to amend the bill, and the rule we had before us will permit the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) the opportunity to offer his substitute amendment.

I also want to applaud the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the gentleman from Mississippi, my friend (Mr. PICKERING), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), for the work on this legislation. I encourage every Member to support this fair rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me the time. Mr. Speaker, this is a restrictive rule which will allow for the consideration of H.R. 4201.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), has explained, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to go equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

Under current rules, the Federal Communication Commission grants noncommercial broadcasting licenses for programming that is primarily educational in nature. This bill expands the qualifications to include cultural or religious programming.

The bill also restricts the FCC's authority to establish requirements on programming by noncommercial broadcasters.

The rule makes in order just one amendment that can be offered during floor consideration of the bill. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) would maintain an educational requirement to obtain a noncommercial broadcast license. No other amendments may be offered to the bill.

I regret that the Committee on Rules approved such a restrictive rule. I see no reason why this bill cannot receive an open rule. Also, Members have not been given enough notice that the bill would be taken up on the House floor and that a restrictive rule was under consideration.

However, because the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was the only Member testifying at yesterday's Committee on Rules hearing in support of an amendment and the rule does make in order that amendment, I will not oppose the rule.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers. If the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) is prepared to yield back, I will yield back.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill to a large number of people in my district. I am a little surprised that it has come up so abruptly and then we had no time to prepare for it, but I want to register my strong support for the steps that are being taken by the Federal Communications Commission to make broadcasting available, the opportunity to broadcast to small and nonprofit groups.

There is a whole array of groups beyond the obvious ones that are mentioned, the religious groups, educational groups that particularly want to push some aspect of education to the numerous ethnic and nationality groups in my district. There are a large number of people who are of Caribbean descent in my district and have had a great deal of problems with trying to get radio broadcasts which focus on their particular interests, Haitian, Jamaican, Canadian, and numerous others.

I think it is very appropriate that we take a step in this direction and leave it as broad and open as possible, following the general approach of the Federal Communications Commission without any restrictions. Indeed, the restrictions have been too great all these years. The broadcasting is regulated by the Federal Government. It is a form of free speech; and because it is regulated by the Federal Government, I think efforts should have been made many years ago to make it freer.

We have not had free speech using radio waves or free speech using television or any of the regulated broadcast bands that the Government is in control of.

□ 1030

The Government is in control, and that means that all of the people are in control; all the people should be served. It should not be a matter of those who have the necessary capital to be able to capitalize a radio or television station. We are talking primarily here about radio now, which is the simplest and the cheapest way to provide some means of broadcasting for people who do not have means.

Certainly, if we are going to have freedom of speech, freedom of speech ought to mean that everybody has a chance to speak over the airwaves, especially if that is regulated by government. We have freedom of speech in terms of printed matter, and anybody who can afford it can, of course, print matter. Of course the big newspaper chains and people that have money are able to take advantage of that even

more so. But the Government does not regulate anybody out of the print business.

If one has the money, if one has the wherewithal, one can get into the print business at one level or another. That may mean passing out pamphlets, it may mean finding a newspaper, or it may mean starting a magazine. But it is not so in the broadcast arena. One cannot, even if one has the wherewithal, enter the broadcast arena, because that is tightly regulated by the Government, more than it should have been all of these years.

Mr. Speaker, we need more freedom and more opportunities, not fewer.

So I wholeheartedly support the steps that are being taken by the Federal Communications Commission, and I think that any attempts to restrict it in any way are steps that are moving us backwards in the wrong direction. I think it is long overdue that we allow small groups to have their voice, and perhaps we should look at the bill and look at the regulations being proposed by the Federal Communications Commission and make them broader and more liberal. The range of areas that are covered by these nonprofit stations in many cases is too small, and we would like to see them broadened. We would like to see efforts made to make it even less costly to begin a nonprofit station.

Full freedom of speech means that the freedom ought to be able to be a freedom that we can utilize over the free and regulated Federal airwaves.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) to clarify some information for the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to clarify for my friend from New York that this is not the low-power FM bill dealing with the Commission's decision to authorize the expansion of radio broadcasting to FM low power. This bill merely deals with the noncommercial television and radio licenses that are already issued by the commission. There are about 800 to 1,000 radio licenses; and there are 15 television licenses, eight more in the pipe, that are held by religious broadcasters. And the issue today that this rule authorizes the legislation on will be to limit the FCC's capacity to regulate the content of the religious broadcasting that goes on these noncommercial television and radio stations that are already on the air.

So the gentleman's concern about the FM low-power issue is obviously a very important one, and we dealt with that issue I think several weeks ago. This is a separate issue dealing with religious radio and television broadcasting.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 527, I call up the bill (H.R. 4201) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the service obligations of noncommercial educational broadcast stations, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Pursuant to House Resolution 527, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 4201 is as follows:

H.R. 4201

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Noncommercial Broadcasting Freedom of Expression Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) In the additional guidance contained in the Federal Communication Commission's memorandum opinion and order in WQED Pittsburgh (FCC 99–393), adopted December 15, 1999, and released December 29, 1999, the Commission attempted to impose content-based programming requirements on noncommercial educational television broadcasters without the benefit of notice and comment in a rulemaking proceeding.

(2) In doing so, the Commission did not adequately consider the implications of its proposed guidelines on the rights of such broadcasters under First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

(3) Noncommercial educational broadcasters should be responsible for using the station to primarily serve an educational, instructional, or cultural purpose in its community of license, and for making judgments about the types of programming that serve those purposes.

(4) The Commission should not engage in regulating the content of speech broadcast by noncommercial educational stations.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF SERVICE OBLIGATIONS OF NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL OR PUBLIC BROADCAST STATIONS.

Section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) SERVICE CONDITIONS ON NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL AND PUBLIC BROADCAST STATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A nonprofit organization or entity shall be eligible to hold a noncommercial educational radio or television license if the station is used primarily to broadcast material that the organization or entity determines serves an educational, instructional, or cultural purpose (or any combination of such purposes) in the station's community of license, unless that determination is arbitrary or unreasonable.

''(2) ADDITIONAL CONTENT-BASED REQUIREMENTS PROHIBITED.—The Commission shall not—

''(A) impose or enforce any quantitative requirement on noncommercial educational radio or television licenses based on the number of hours of programming that serve educational, instructional, or cultural purposes;

''(B) prevent religious programming, including religious services, from being determined by an organization or entity to serve an educational, instructional, or cultural purpose; or

''(C) impose or enforce any other requirement on the content of the programming broadcast by a licensee, permittee, or applicant for a noncommercial educational radio or television license that is not imposed and enforced on a licensee, permittee, or applicant for a commercial radio or television license, respectively.''.

SEC. 4. RULEMAKING.

(a) LIMITATION.—After the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall not establish, expand, or otherwise modify requirements relating to the service obligations of noncommercial educational radio or television stations except by means of agency rulemaking conducted in accordance with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and other applicable law (including the amendment made by section 3).

(b) RULEMAKING DEADLINE.—The Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe such revisions to its regulations as may be necessary to comply with the amendment made by section 3 within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Commerce printed in the bill is adopted.

The text of H.R. 4201, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 527, is as follows:

H.R. 4201

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Noncommercial Broadcasting Freedom of Expression Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) In the additional guidance contained in the Federal Communication Commission's memorandum opinion and order in WQED Pittsburgh (FCC 99–393), adopted December 15, 1999, and released December 29, 1999, the Commission attempted to impose content-based programming requirements on noncommercial educational television broadcasters without the benefit of notice and comment in a rulemaking proceeding.

(2) In doing so, the Commission did not adequately consider the implications of its proposed guidelines on the rights of such broadcasters under First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

(3) Noncommercial educational broadcasters should be responsible for using the station to primarily serve an educational, instructional, cultural, or religious purpose in its community of license, and for making judgments about the types of programming that serve those purposes.

(4) Religious programming contributes to serving the educational and cultural needs of the public, and should be treated by the Commission on a par with other educational and cultural programming.

(5) Because noncommercial broadcasters are not permitted to sell air time, they should not be required to provide free air time to commercial entities or political candidates.

(6) The Commission should not engage in regulating the content of speech broadcast by noncommercial educational stations.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF SERVICE OBLIGATIONS OF NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL OR PUBLIC BROADCAST STATIONS.

(a) SERVICE CONDITIONS.—Section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) SERVICE CONDITIONS ON NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL AND PUBLIC BROADCAST STATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A nonprofit organization shall be eligible to hold a noncommercial educational radio or television license if the station is used primarily to broadcast material that the organization determines serves an educational, instructional, cultural, or religious purpose (or any combination of such purposes) in the station's community of license, unless that determination is arbitrary or unreasonable.

''(2) ADDITIONAL CONTENT-BASED REQUIREMENTS PROHIBITED.—The Commission shall not—

''(A) impose or enforce any quantitative requirement on noncommercial educational radio or television licenses based on the number of hours of programming that serve educational, instructional, cultural, or religious purposes; or

''(B) impose or enforce any other requirement on the content of the programming broadcast by a licensee, permittee, or applicant for a noncommercial educational radio or television license that is not imposed and enforced on a licensee, permittee, or applicant for a commercial radio or television license, respectively.

''(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as affecting—

''(A) any obligation of noncommercial educational television broadcast stations under the Children's Television Act of 1990 (47 U.S.C. 303a, 303b); or

''(B) the requirements of section 396, 399, 399A, and 399B of this Act.''.

(b) POLITICAL BROADCASTING EXEMPTION.—Section 312(a)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 312(a)(7)) is amended by inserting '', other than a noncommercial educational broadcast station,'' after ''use of a broadcasting station''.

(c) AUDIT OF COMPLIANCE WITH DONOR PRIVACY PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 396(l)(3)(B)(ii) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396(l)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', and shall include a determination of the compliance of the entity with the requirements of subsection (k)(12)''; and

(2) in subclause (II), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', except that such statement shall include a statement regarding the extent of the compliance of the entity with the requirements of subsection (k)(12)''.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—Consistent with the requirements of section 4 of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall amend sections 73.1930 through 73.1944 of its rules (47 C.F.R. 73.1930–73.1944) to provide that those sections do not apply to noncommercial educational broadcast stations.

SEC. 4. RULEMAKING.

(a) LIMITATION.—After the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall not establish, expand, or otherwise modify requirements relating to the service obligations of noncommercial educational radio or television stations except by means of agency rulemaking conducted in accordance with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and other applicable law (including the amendments made by section 3).

(b) RULEMAKING DEADLINE.—The Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe such revisions to its regulations as may be necessary to comply with the amendment made by section 3 within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider a further amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be debated for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes of debate on the bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

I rise in support of H.R. 4201, the Noncommercial Broadcast Freedom of Expression Act of 2000. While this is indeed a good bill, I am frankly disappointed that it is necessary. It is necessary to correct a gross blunder by the FCC and to prevent it from ever happening again.

Earlier this year, in the WQED Pittsburgh station case, a television transfer case, the FCC sought to quantify the service obligations of noncommercial television licenses by requiring that ''more than half of the hours of programming aired on a reserved channel must serve an educational, instructional, or cultural purpose in the station's community of license.'' But they went on to say that while programming which teaches about religion would count toward that new benchmark, programming that was ''devoted to religious exhortation, proselytizing, or statements of personally held religious views and beliefs'' would not. In short, the Commission was drawing substantive distinctions between what religious message would qualify in the content of that station's broadcasting.

Now, the FCC has licensed quite a number of religious broadcasters on the noncommercial airwaves of America. About 800 to 1,000 radio licenses are currently held and operated by religious broadcasters. There are 15 television stations operated by religious broadcasters as a noncommercial license. The FCC has never before now tried to regulate the content of those religious messages in religious broadcasting. But in this situation, the FCC tried to do so.

I do not have to tell my colleagues that they were met with a huge outpouring of objections, not only from Members of Congress, but from people across America. Indeed, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and I, along with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), and about 140 additional Members of the House, including, by the way, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) all joined forces against the commission's action.

Fortunately, in response to the collective public outcry against these actions, the FCC wisely decided to vacate the additional guidance, these new instructions that they were issuing in this order, and they vacated that order by a vote of four to six.

In other words, they back-peddled quickly. They quickly tried to undo the mistake they made. In fact, the concern that they might make that mistake again is, unfortunately still with us, because despite this four to one reversal, when we held a hearing at the Subcommittee on Telecommunications of the Committee on Commerce, one of the commissioners, Commissioner Tristani asserted, and this is a quote, that she, ''for one, will continue to cast the vote in accordance with the views expressed in the additional guidance.'' In other words, there is still a sense that the commission, at least by some of the members of the FCC, that they would like to dictate the content of religious broadcasting in America.

Mr. Speaker, imagine that. Federal bureaucrats telling us what we can and cannot hear on a religious broadcast station, what qualifies as a good message and what does not. Government telling religious broadcasters what they can and cannot say in a religious television or radio broadcast. What a horrible notion. And yet, at least one of our commissioners says, given the chance, she would do it again. Therefore, this bill becomes necessary.

This bill, which we have constructed and passed out of the Committee on Commerce and brought to the floor today, H.R. 4201 authored by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) on behalf of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), myself, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), takes the appropriate stance against what the FCC tried to do. It basically codifies the old rule of the commission. The old rule of the commission, which basically is encapsulated in the commission's reversal, by which they reversed their bad decision, is as follows. This is what the Commission said when it finally backed up and corrected the bad mistake it made: ''In hindsight, we see the difficulty of minting clear definitional parameters for educational, instructional, or cultural programming. Therefore, we vacate our additional guidance. We will defer to the editorial judgment of the licensee unless that judgment is arbitrary or unreasonable.''

That has always been the standard. The commission has always left it up to the licensee to decide what messages were broadcast on these religious noncommercial airwaves. That has always been the rule; this bill codifies that rule. In fact, the bill says that from now on, the commission shall not have the authority to change it, to try to dictate the content of religious broadcasting.

Now, in just a few minutes we will hear from my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and others about their objections to the bill. They come in two forms. One, they will argue that the bill broadens the eligibility standard for noncommercial educational licenses. That is not true. We simply codify the current standards. Under current standards, the FCC, licensing over 800 to 1,000 radio stations and now, nearly

23 television stations, uses either a point system or a lottery system that has nothing to do with religious affiliation and simply awards these stations on that basis. Nothing we do changes that. But the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) will offer an amendment later to try to reinsert into the bill the capacity of the FCC to determine whether the station is educational enough; that is, again, to give it the right to get in and dictate what messages qualify, which do not; which religious messages are educational and which, in the opinion of the FCC, are not.

For example, they could not tell us whether Handel's Messiah performing in the Kennedy Center would be educational; but it would not be educational on a religious broadcast station. We can see the difficulty and why this amendment needs to be defeated. It was defeated in the committee; it should be defeated on the floor.

Finally, I want to point out that the bill does exactly what the Constitution says it ought to do when it comes to religion. It simply provides a no-nonsense statement that instructional, educational, cultural, and religious programming are treated exactly the same, no difference. No preference for religion, no penalties for religious broadcasting. In short, it literally abides by the Constitution, protects free speech, protects religious broadcasting from government interference. This is a good bill and we need to pass it, and we need to defeat the Markey amendment when it is offered.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin this debate by clarifying for anyone who may be listening what we are fighting about. In the United States, we have two types of television stations. We have commercial television stations. On commercial television stations people see the evening news, Who Wants to be a Millionaire, Survivor, a whole host of programs which are basically commercial.

Now, it is possible, and frequently it occurs, that individual religions purchase commercial TV stations because they want to use them as the vehicle by which they are able to communicate their message into a community. Those are commercial television stations.

Then we have the other kind of television stations, public TV stations. Most often we consider them to be PBS. We turn to them, we actually consider them just to have a number, in Boston it is channel 2, WGBH; and we have another smaller public television station as well. Those television stations are meant to serve the noncommercial, educational needs for the entire community. Commercial: Who Wants to Be a Millionaire, or any religion that wants to purchase a commercial station in order to advance the goals of that religion; noncommercial educational, a separate category, stations meant to serve the educational needs of the entire community.

This is a debate over one of those noncommercial, educational television stations. And the story is one which really does not deal with whether or not religions can purchase commercial stations in order to advance their goals within a particular community; they may continue to do so. This debate is over whether or not if a religion gains control over a noncommercial educational station, whether or not that religion can use it in order to advance full time, all day long the goals of its own religion, and not serve the noncommercial educational needs of the entire community.

□ 1045

That is the debate in a nutshell, should we, in other words, continue to maintain the special purpose for which these noncommercial educational stations have always been reserved while allowing religions to run them if they want but under the guidelines that historically they have always had to maintain in order to ensure that the entire community is served.

If we allow this wall to be broken down, then we are going to wind up in a situation where individual religions are able to move into community after community with populations that have very diverse religious backgrounds and to use one of these very small number of public TV stations in a community exclusively for the religious purpose of that one religion. I believe that that is very dangerous, very dangerous, especially since each one of these religions has the ability to buy a commercial TV station.

Now, as we move forward in this debate, this very important debate, it is going to be critical for everyone to understand the historic nature of what we are talking about here today. If in any way there is a misunderstanding with regard to whether or not any of us believes there should be any restrictions placed upon the ability of religious broadcasters on commercial stations to, in fact, proselytize if they want, then they misunderstand the nature of what it is we are proposing.

The essence of this debate is whether or not we want to continue to keep a distinction in place which separates public TV stations from commercial TV stations, commercial stations from noncommercial stations intended to educate the entire community.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a debate which, unfortunately, has developed connotations which do not accurately reflect the core of the debate, the issues that are at the essence of this controversy. Our hope is that, in the course of this couple of hours, that we are going to be able to explain the very real differences of opinion that exist here with the hope that we can maintain this wall that historically we have created between the State and the establishment of religion, which I am afraid is being broken down by the legislation which is on the floor here today.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), the author of the legislation, who has done an enormously excellent job in bringing this bill through the committee and to the floor.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support and as a proud sponsor of this legislation. This is a critically important debate, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) indicated. Whereas, usually we try to find common ground on the Committee on Commerce, and I have with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) on many occasions found that common ground, but today we are debating something that gives us a fundamental disagreement or provides a fundamental disagreement.

The gentleman from Massachusetts said the wall could be or will be or is being broken that separates church and State. He is correct. But it is not the breaking from the religious, but it is the heavy hand of government coming crashing down on that wall saying this is acceptable or this is unacceptable speech. It is the hand of the government coming in to regulate and to control and to set up a police of our speech, of our religious freedom and expression.

It is a very critical issue. Are we going to maintain the current tradition of our religious liberties and expression? Make no mistake, this is not about changing our current practice at the FCC. This is about something that the FCC did that changed, fundamentally changed, and set a new course and a new policy for how religious broadcastings and noncommercial licenses would be regulated, the guidelines for that.

Let me read, this is from the FCC, ''This is unacceptable speech: Programming primarily devoted to religious exploitation, proselytizing, or statements or personally held religious views and beliefs.'' They went on to say, ''church services would not qualify.''

So if Martin Luther King were alive today, and he were giving a speech or a sermon at a church, that would not be educational. It would not be cultural. It would provide no instructional benefit to any communities. That is the FCC's view.

So if one is Catholic or one is Protestant or African American or serving a rural community or urban, and it is a church service where one has moral instruction, one has cultural benefit, where one has teachings of educational importance, under the FCC's view, no value.

This is what the debate is about. Do we value the voice of the religious in the public square, or do we ban, do we exclude, or do we shovel them aside? Does it have value in our culture? Should they be in our public square?

Let me read a quote that I think captures this debate. ''Americans feel that, instead of celebrating their love for God in public, they are being forced to hide their faith behind closed doors. That is wrong. Americans should never have to hide their faith. But some Americans have been denied the right to express their religion, and that has to stop. It is crucial that government does not dictate or demand specific religious views. But equally crucial that government does not prevent the expression of specific religious views.''

The person who said those words was Bill Clinton at an address at James Madison High School in Vienna, Virginia. He was talking about this issue, does the religious voice have a place in our public square? He was making the case that it does. What is more public than our public spectrum, our licenses that the FCC gives, the greatest way to communicate on a broad basis.

What does this legislation do and what does it not do? Now, if one was listening to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) one would think that no religious institution has had one of these noncommercial educational licenses in the past, that they were reserved solely and strictly for educational institutions, for the CPB or the public stations.

The reality is that we have had a tradition and a precedent and a practice of religious broadcasters holding these licenses. What we are doing is not changing current practice, current precedent. We are simply trying to prevent and prohibit the FCC from going down a dangerous path of regulating religious speech, religious expression.

We have to do it because the FCC has tried to deem itself the holy trinity of the Constitution. They woke up one day and said, we can decide the establishment clause without a public comment or a public process, we can set a legislative policy that is reserved for this branch, not the executive branch.

So they have decided that they are both the court, the Congress, the executive branch in one, and they try to do something that is fundamentally unfair in a closed process that fundamentally challenged our core beliefs of religious freedom and religious expression.

What we are saying in this legislation today is not only, must one do everything in a public process, in a public fashion, in an open fashion, there will be no dark of nights but we are not going to allow one to undo the fundamental premises of our founding. We will not allow one to come in and regulate and control the religious speech and the religious beliefs of our people of this great Nation.

What is at stake? Do we honor our heritage? Do we say that government has the right to discriminate against religion and control religious speech? Should it be free of government regulation? Is the religious voice valuable in the public square? Is there a place for the religious voice?

With this debate, with these votes, we shall say that we will not have government intervention, interference, and regulation of the religious beliefs and religious views. We will find a value for the religious voice in the public square. We will protect that. We will not let the heavy hand of government come crashing down on the wall that separates and protects our people from an intrusive government.

I ask my colleagues to continue to vote in support of what we are trying to do today.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, just so it is very clear, if the bill being proposed today is adopted, there will no longer ever again be a requirement that a public television station must serve the educational needs of a community. They will not have that requirement any longer. It is gone. They can serve that community under this new bill as long as they are broadcasting religion all day long. They have fulfilled a requirement now under the new law. No education at all is required.

So here is a public television station. It has been in a community for 50 years, it has served the educational needs of the entire community, everyone who lives within that 1 million, 2 million, 3 million, 4 million person area, and all of a sudden it is now being run by a religion that has absolutely no responsibility to serve the educational needs of that community, none, zero, gone, do not have to ever again put on a single educational program. That is their new law.

Now, how does that serve a community? Some religion comes in, it could be a cult by the way, some cult comes in and buys a noncommercial educational station and says we are not going to serve the local educational needs of the community any longer. We are just going to have our own little cult on this TV station. Under this law, that is legal. That is legal. One cannot say anything about it.

The language in the bill says that, as long as one serves the religious purpose in a nonarbitrary or reasonable way, which the FCC would have to move in and challenge, then one is serving the entire community.

Now, how can that be a good thing? How can it be a good thing for one religion to move in, a cult potentially, buy one or two public television stations in town, and just broadcast their religion all day long.

Now, the only way in which that can be challenged is if the FCC, under their bill, the FCC comes in and determines that there is something wrong with this cult or that it is acting in an arbitrary or unreasonable way; that is this cult, this religion, that is now operating the public television station in town.

Well, let us take it a step further. Let us say two religions come along, and each one of them wants to run this public television station in the town. Now, who determines who gets this public television station? Well, under the bill, the FCC has to determine which of the two religions is more religious. Which of the two religions has the better likelihood of serving one community on the public television station, on potentially the only public television station available in town.

How can that be a good thing? How can we have the FCC in determining which religion is better, not based upon whether or not, by the way, they are going to serve the educational needs of the community, because there is no requirement, once this bill passes, that the educational needs of the community is served. They do not have to do it at all. They can, 100 percent of the time, just broadcast their religion, their cult potentially.

The FCC determines which of the two religions or cults is the better religion or cult to be the only religion on the public television station in a community that had historically been served as a noncommercial educational station, serving the entire community for the last 30 or 40 or 50 years. This is not a good idea. This is not what we intended noncommercial educational, that is, public television stations, to play as a role in communities across this country.

The deeper we get into this debate, the more troubling it becomes, because it is very evident that, at the end of the day, there will be a small number of religions who will try their best to get ahold of these TV stations, these public TV stations, all across the country just to proselytize, just to run their religion into people's homes in these individual communities.

Again, we have nothing against any religion purchasing a commercial television station. They can do so, and they do in every single community across this entire country. We have no problem with any individual sect running a noncommercial public television station as long as they fulfill the requirements that they serve the educational needs of every child, every child who lives within that area. Every child within a 2 million or 3 million person area is not going to be served by one religion broadcasting its religion into the minds of every child in that broadcasting area.

□ 1100

That is not an educational purpose, as far as most parents are going to be concerned. Most parents are not going to want the public television station in their community broadcasting one religion into the minds of their children all day long. If a religion wants to do that, they should purchase a commercial television station. If they want to purchase the public television station in town, they should be required to serve every single child.

Now, some religions say by broadcasting their religion, even if 90 percent of the community is not of that religion, that they are furthering the educational needs of that community. Well, I would contend and maintain

that almost every parent is of the belief that their child is not going to be served by listening to one religion all day long on the public television station in their community. They are going to be of just the opposite opinion; that their child is being misserved; that their child should not be watching that TV station; that it is no longer an educational TV station but it is a religious broadcasting station which should be a commercial station.

So in every one of our hometowns we have a public television station, and it has Sesame Street on it and it has all the rest of that programming that children across our country watch on an ongoing basis. Now, if this new law passes, and a particular religion gets access to one of these public TV stations, they do not have to put on anything except their own religion all day long. That cannot be a good idea. That is a complete perversion of the notion that was established 50 years ago about having these public television stations, that are public parks, in essence. They are public parks that every child, every adult can go to. It is common ground. It is not offensive to anyone. It is programming that everyone feels that they are benefiting from, not just one sect, one sub part of a community.

So, my colleagues, this bill takes the public parks that are the public television stations in our country and they turn them into private preserves of one religion, one sub part of the community. And if we want to play in that park, if we want to watch that public television station, we have to assume that our children or our families are going to be exposed continuously, 100 percent of the time, to the religious tenets of that one religion.

Again, no one has any objection to any religion purchasing a commercial television station. They do so by the hundreds across the country. No one has any objection to a particular religion running a noncommercial television station, a public television station, as long as they abide by the rules that they are serving the entire community's educational needs, not religious needs. One religion should not be able to say, here is the religious programming that this one community needs and we are going to put it on 100 percent of the time on the educational television station in town. That is wrong, and that is why this legislation should be defeated.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

My friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, made an interesting speech, but he has it all wrong. We are not talking about the Sesame Street stations. There are 800 to 1,000 noncommercial religious broadcasters today on the radio. There are 23, counting the television stations in the pipe, religious television broadcasters on television holding noncommercial television licenses. That is the current state of the law. We are not talking about anything different than what currently occurs.

If those religious broadcasters were not qualified to hold those licenses, because they are producing religious programming, they would not hold them today. The FCC tried to take them away, in effect, by deciding they were going to decide what programming could be on those programs. They were going to decide what religious messages were going to be on all those stations. This bill prevents that.

Secondly, let me point out that for years these stations have operated as religious broadcasters. The FCC has always considered that the religious messages they promote all day long are currently considered primarily educational. That is the current law. The bill incorporates the current law only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), who has been a leader in the fight to prevent the FCC from content regulation of religious broadcasting.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, let us review a little bit of history. Back in December of last year, late December, between Christmas and New Year's, the FCC determined, in a rather ordinary license swap that goes on virtually every day, in this case a Pittsburgh license swap where the religious broadcasting was changing from a commercial to a noncommercial broadcasting license, the FCC determined at that date, when Congress was not in session, under what would be considered to be an ordinary license swap that the FCC would determine what would be educational, and they would determine whether, in fact, that particular broadcaster was broadcasting enough of what they would consider to be educational programming in nature. This was essentially a determination by the FCC what was educational or what was not, for the first time basically setting up the Government as the arbiter of what was to be considered educational broadcasting. It was a brazen attempt to force traditional religious programming off noncommercial channels.

At that point, working with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), we all immediately wrote a letter to the FCC and then later introduced a bill, as soon as Congress returned, which overturned that directive. Religious viewers and listeners flooded Capitol Hill. I am sure many of the Members received phone calls and letters and faxes and E-mails regarding this outrageous decision by the FCC.

Because of the public outcry, the FCC almost immediately then vacated the order that they had first introduced after our bill was put in the hopper. But ultimately they never acknowledged, that is the FCC majority, their procedural, legal, or constitutional errors. And let me point out that the original vote, with two strong dissents from Republican Members, was a 3 to 2 vote, basically ruling that the FCC had that ability to determine what was educational. They quickly retreated and that vote was a 4 to 1 vote, with Commissioner Tristani voting in the negative to vacate the ruling.

But the interesting thing about the original decision and the vacation of the ruling was that the FCC never acknowledged their procedural, legal, or constitutional errors. They blamed the controversy on ''confusion over their intent.'' I do not think there was ever any confusion about what the intent of the majority was. One commissioner, Commissioner Tristani, even dissented from overturning the order, saying that she would continue to vote as if the original directive were still in place, and she, in fact, testified to that before the committee.

Against this backdrop we worked together to craft a bill, which is now 4201, sponsored by the gentleman from Mississippi, which is on the floor today. It would prevent the FCC from restricting religious content in the future by affirmatively stating that cultural and religious programming meet the educational mandate.

Now, I assume my friend from Massachusetts probably supported the original decision by the FCC; and as a result, we are here today. Some public broadcasting stations are opposing the bill. I can only conclude that they do not want to share their free noncommercial spectrum with religious broadcasters. But let us make one thing clear. Public broadcasters do not have a special claim to noncommercial channels. Indeed, if they did, C–SPAN would not be on the air. Religious broadcasters and others have an equal right to hold such licenses.

H.R. 4201 is a measured response to the effort to single out religious content for special scrutiny. The FCC has no business discriminating against faith-based programming. H.R. 4201 merely spells out that religious and cultural programming deserve the same treatment as educational and instructional programming. Nothing more and nothing less.

Ultimately, the issue is about freedom of religious expression and, indeed, whether government can control content. That is the ultimate issue. And the Constitution is pretty clear on that; that government shall not determine content.

Now, my friend from Massachusetts is worried about a cult getting a radio station. I would point out that the bill states that broadcasters' determinations that their programming serve as an educational, cultural, or religious purpose may not be arbitrary or unreasonable. So I would say the argument is fallacious.

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

The bottom line on this bill is that under current law the FCC decides

whether the programming is educational. That is their job: Does, in fact, the public TV station fulfill the educational requirement to serve the entire community. If we adopt this bill, the FCC will have to decide whether the programming is religious. That is its responsibility.

Now, no one believes that it is the job of the FCC to make religious determinations, yet that is exactly what this legislation asks it to do. We will have turned the Federal Communication Commission into the faith-based content commission, all the time saying that they did not mean to. They did not mean to do that; they did not mean to have the FCC determining whether or not this public television station had served the religious needs of the community. But it will have to do that.

If we support public television, we should vote against this bill. If we support keeping Federal bureaucrats out of religion, we should vote against this bill. But if we want the Federal Communications Commission deciding whether a broadcast applicant is sufficiently religious to qualify for a brand new licensing category, entitled ''primarily religious,'' then this bill is the right bill. This takes the public television stations across America and has the Federal Communication Commission determining whether or not they are primarily religious; that is, are they religious enough.

Again, there is nothing wrong with some religion running a public television station. There is nothing wrong with them having a religious component. Much of what can be done with a public television station can include a lot of religious educational broadcasting. Educational. Not proselytizing, but educational. And that occurs today. It occurs today on a thousand radio stations across the country. It occurs on public television stations today that are being operated by individual religions, but it does not allow that religion to turn it into nothing more than a sanctuary for their own religion broadcasting 24 hours a day into the homes of every person that lives in that community.

Now, just so it is clear, there are a lot of people that oppose this particular bill. The Interfaith Alliance opposes it, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States opposes it, the National Education Association opposes this bill, the National PTA, the prime supporters of public television in America, especially because of its children's television component, opposes it. The National PTA opposes this bill. The Unitarian Universalists Association of Congregations opposes this bill.

This should send chills up the spine of any person that really does respect their own religion. Because rather than having a public television station in a community any longer serving the entire community, we are going to wind up with individual religions thinking that they can take one of the small number of public television stations in each community and just turning it into their own private preserve.

Again, nothing wrong with information on a public television station that is educational when it relates to religion, but when it turns into something that is nothing more than a pulpit for one church, I think there are real problems.

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

□ 1115

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I first yield myself 30 seconds to read my colleagues a list of associations in support of this legislation: The Christian Coalition; the American Family Association; Concerned Women for America; Family Research Council; Home School Legal Defense Association; American Association of Christian Schools; Justice Fellowship; Religious Freedom Coalition; Republican Jewish Coalition; Traditional Family Property, Inc.; Traditional Values Coalition; Vision America.

There is huge support among the religious community for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to our Constitution establishes the freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom to petition for redress of grievances.

This debate combines two of our most precious freedoms, the freedom of speech and the freedom of religion. These freedoms are the core of the first amendment and the Bill of Rights.

Do we really believe our Founding Fathers wanted the Federal Government to restrict or regulate free religious speech on our airwaves? This legislation will send a strong message to the FCC that they cannot and should not restrict free speech of religious broadcasters.

The Federal power to issue licenses to regulate commerce is a powerful one. It should not be misused to restrict, control, or regulate our freedom to speak or worship as we see fit. There is nothing that teaches children more that something is irrelevant than to require something be completely ignored. To require silence teaches irrelevance. We might as well teach religious bigotry.

The FCC tried once to restrict religious speech in the public square. This bill will make sure they will not do it again. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the legislation and reject the amendment.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), from the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very easy bill to understand. What the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) wants to do is have a government-based content bill; and what we want to do is continue the status quo.

Now, there are five FCC commissioners who decided this ultimately in a 4–1 decision. On the commission there are five commissioners. Two are Republicans, and three are Democrats. They voted 4–1 in favor of what the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has tried to do.

So, in this case, two Democrats on the commission who have all the information that is necessary and understand it much better than the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), perhaps better than anyone else here, voted with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN). They felt the status quo and the precedent had been established and that they did not want to have government-based content.

In my home State of Florida there are three stations, one out of Boca Raton, Ft. Pierce, and Jacksonville, 24-hour a day with religious broadcasting. More than 125 noncommercial television broadcasters would be forced to completely drop their programs.

Under the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), it would be almost impossible for a broadcaster to walk this line created by his bill. In fact, we had a hearing. Ms. Tristani, who is one of the commissioners, was asked to actually tell us if she could determine what was educational and what was religious broadcasting. And she admitted she could not.

In fact, I asked her during the hearing, would a TV show on collecting comic books or wrestling magazines be educational or not. She could not answer. Instructions on living with the Ten Commandments, is that religious or is that educational? Shows on collecting pet rocks. In all three cases, she had no idea whether that was educational or religious broadcasting. And that shows the confusion that people would have to culturally decide what is educational and what is religious broadcasting.

Let me quote from Furchtgott-Roth, who is one of the commissioners. He said, ''The scariest moment, the most frightening moment, the most chilling moment'' in all of his tenure at the FCC is when his staff asked him if he wanted to review videotapes to make the decision whether it was educational or religious. And he went on to say, ''I will never support any move to have the Government in a position of deciding whether programming fits into any one pigeon hole or another.''

So if my colleagues want more FCC regulation, then vote for the Markey amendment. If they believe in restricting, changing the precedent changing the status quo, then they should vote for the Markey amendment.

I believe, actually, the Markey amendment is unconstitutional because it allows the Federal Government to scrutinize and grade the content of religious broadcasting. It would insert the word ''educational'' in front of ''religious broadcasting,'' which would give the FCC discretion to determine whether religious broadcasting is, in fact, educational.

I think it creates a loophole for allowing the FCC to continue to regulate unabashedly in this country and avoids the original intent of H.R. 4201.

So I ask my colleagues to vote no for the Markey amendment and yes for the Tauzin bill and understand that when they are voting for the Tauzin bill, they are voting for the present status quo, the tradition which has existed in this country for so many years.

Many of us believe the FCC should be reformed. We do not have an FCC with the computer industry. With all the information we have coming to Americans today, up to 250 channels through direct satellite broadcasting, wireless, the Internet, cable, and all the myriad of new innovations that are coming, do we need the FCC standing in the gap and saying to Americans this is what they will watch and this is what they will not watch?

In fact, we probably should go back to the licensing of educational broadcasting stations and reform that because of the information that is available.

So I urge no on the Markey amendment and yes on the Tauzin.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I do thank my good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for yielding me the time, and I hope the House has been listening to him.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues want to start the religious wars, if they want to create all manner of trouble, if they want to put together a piece of legislation that is going to bring the Government into real conflict over religion, if they want to have a massive amount of trouble at some future time when the broadcasters and the people and the religious institutions in this country find out what we have done, then, by all means, vote for this legislation.

First of all, this legislation is opposed by religious groups who are smart enough to know the evil that we are sowing amongst ourselves today. That includes the National Council of Churches of Christ in America and a large number of other religious institutions which know that they do not want Government in their business.

Second of all, it is fully possible for a religious broadcaster to purchase a station which they can use for religious purposes in any fashion they want. It is also possible for them to bid on an educational station and to simply establish that they will provide good educational services in addition to religious services. They are doing that all over this country and are exercising that right. No one has been kicked off.

The FCC, in its great folly, and I want to point out I was as critical of the FCC on that matter as was anybody else in this Chamber, has withdrawn the rather silly set of rules which they were proposing. So there is no threat to religion, no threat to religious broadcasters under practices as they exist today.

Now, I would point out that what this does is to give essentially a situation to the American people in which, first of all, anybody who calls himself religious or a religious institution can proceed to go about getting one of these. And let us talk about who would receive special preference and special treatment under this.

The World Church of the Creator, a White Supremist Institution; the Aum Supreme Truth, that is the institution which gassed the Japanese subways; the Branch Davidians and Mr. David Koresh; Heaven's Gate, where there were suicides in March of 1997 outside of San Diego; the People's Temple, run by Mr. Jim Jones, who poisoned people with Kool-Aid. These are all subject to very special and preferential treatment under the legislation which is presented to us today.

The Movement for the Restoration of the Ten Commandments of God in Uganda, where, on March 17 of this year, some 1,000 people were killed. Charles Manson and family, who had a religious mission we are so told. Satanism would qualify because it is a religion. And witchcraft or the local coven could seek to get special preference under this.

The result of this kind of situation is the FCC is shortly going to be compelled to come forward and to hold comparative proceedings between religious institutions. This is something which the FCC since its creation has prudently, carefully, wisely, and successfully avoided.

The practical result of comparative proceedings between two religious groups or between a religious group and an educational group, without having clear definition of what the purposes of the legislation are or what must be the defined behavior of the applicant, is to create a massive opportunity for real religious difficulties and troubles which will come back to plague not only this Chamber but the people of the United States.

I think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), which will shortly be before us, is perhaps a way out of this thicket because it again restores the responsibility of the FCC to see to it that the judgment on channels which are now educational, and they are required under law to be educational but may also be religious, is the way to resolve the problem to keep the FCC and this Congress and this Government out of the business of making selections with regard to whose religion will receive a preference in terms of receiving a license to broadcast on airwaves which are a public trust.

If we want to get away from that, then vote for the bill and vote against the Markey amendment; and we are going to have all kinds of trouble, and there are going to be lots of red faces around this place; and lots of people who are going to be trying to lie out of what it was they did at some prior time.

Now, I repeat, I am no defender of the FCC. I have gone after them harder than anybody else in this institution and with excellent good reason. And I think their original judgment in this matter was wrong. But they have withdrawn that and that issue is no longer.

I would observe that to do what we are doing here is no correction of anything which is wrong in broadcasting. Religion broadcasters can now broadcast under full license of the FCC. There are no end of religious broadcasters who are running religious and educational stations who have gotten the right to do that under the regular practices now in force. There is no reason to change that. And they broadcast both educational, they broadcast cultural things, like music. And they also broadcast religion, something which I applaud.

There is no threat to religious broadcasting in this country at this time. The FCC has withdrawn anything which offered any peril to religion broadcasters and to the use of our airwaves for religious purposes. But to take this legislation and to put the FCC in a position of having comparative hearings over the question of who is going to broadcast should gray the hair of anybody in this Chamber.

I urge colleagues to vote against the bill, vote for the Markey amendment, and to support the views that are held and brought forward by responsible religious groups and religious broadcasters.

H.R. 4201 purports to correct a particularly unwise decision made by the Federal Communications Commission last year. As many Members are aware, I am not generally known to be a great fan of the FCC. It is an agency that often blunders badly, and this mistake was certainly no exception. However, what makes this FCC foul-up unusual is that the Commission admitted its error and quickly corrected it.

So why is this bill before us? The sponsors say that legislation is needed to make sure the FCC does not make the same mistake again down the road. Ordinarily, I would agree. A prophylactic measure often is called for when dealing with an agency—like the FCC—that seems to take great sport in pushing the limits of its authority on a regular basis.

Unfortunately, the bill before us is not a simple prophylactic measure. It goes well beyond its stated purpose. In fact, it could not be clearer from the text that its drafters intend to fundamentally change the character of public broadcasting in this country.

For nearly 50 years the government has set aside specially reserved radio and television channels for public, noncommercial use. These channels are available to qualified organizations free of charge, with a catch. The

catch is that these groups must have an educational mission, and must broadcast some educational programming.

This bill would change all that. It would actually abolish the educational requirement for public television programs. The bill's sponsors seem to think that promoting education is too much to ask of groups that receive this special license.

The fact is that the majority of Americans support public broadcasting as we know it today. An even greater number believe that education should be among the nation's top priorities. This bill manages to eviscerate not one, but both of these important American values in one fell swoop.

The bill suffers additional infirmities. It contains no definition of ''nonprofit organization'' or ''religious broadcasting'' to help determine who is eligible to receive this special license. As a result, any religious extremist or cult group would be eligible for a noncommercial license—at the expense of the American taxpayer—and program anything it sees fit, whether educational or not.

Hate speech, religious bigotry, and doomsday prophesies are all fair game, so long as the group asserts a ''religious purpose.'' Parents who today rely on public television as a safe haven for their children may have nowhere to turn if this bill is enacted. Sesame Street and Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood could be displaced by programming produced by cult leaders like Jim Jones and David Koresh—each of whom would have been eligible to receive a specially reserved television channel under this bill.

The Markey amendment, which will be offered later, is an extremely simple, but significant, improvement to this legislation that I support. I would note a particular oddity in the underlying bill. While it eliminates the educational requirement for public broadcasting, the drafters still use the term ''noncommercial educational license'' throughout the text. The Markey amendment would simply restore proper meaning to this term by requiring an educational commitment of all public broadcasters—religious or secular—who hold this special license.

I urge my colleagues to support the Markey amendment and oppose H.R. 4201 as reported.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to correct the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in this bill creates a requirement on the commission to do comparative hearings to decide which religious broadcaster get a station. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The current law which is incorporated in this bill has a four-point system that is purely sectarian, has no religious connotations at all. It deals with diversity, statewide networks, technical parameters, and establishes local entity points that are awarded to the winner of these licenses, totally no connection at all to whether or not this entity is religious.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), who is in support of the legislation.

(Mr. HALL of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1130

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Noncommercial Broadcasting Freedom of Expression Act. It is a bill, as has been said here many times, that will ensure that Americans are going to continue to enjoy the broadcasting of church services and other religious programming that is on our Nation's broadcast channels. I have high regard for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) who just spoke. He named off a group of people that really should not have had access to the channels. They did have. But of the 12 the Master picked, one of them was bad, that was Judas, and that is about the only one most people can name.

This is a bill that would preserve the freedom of religion and religious expression, and I think prevents the FCC from regulating the content like they did some time back.

H.R. 4201 is an outgrowth of a decision by the FCC that would have restricted religious broadcasting on television. This action, and I think it was done without the benefit of any public comment or any congressional input, I believe it was done December 28 or 29 when Congress was not even in session and Congress was not even in town, would have forced some religious television broadcasters to either alter their programming or risk losing their licenses. The FCC ruling was wrong from both a procedural and a constitutional standpoint. It would have set a dangerous precedent that would have suppressed religious broadcasting and narrowed the definition of what is considered educational.

In response to this ruling, several of us got together and thousands of Americans in protesting the action of the FCC and called for an immediate reversal of this ruling. Now, something happened after we made that calling and that insistence. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) was among those, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), and others of us. The FCC backed down on it. And unless they were definitely and totally wrong not only in their action but in how they took that action, they would not have taken that backward step. I also joined several of my colleagues in cosponsoring the Oxley bill, the Religious Broadcasting Freedom Act, which could have required the FCC to follow established agency rule-making procedures.

H.R. 4201 is an outgrowth of these efforts and goes a step further by making it a little bit easier for religious broadcasters to obtain noncommercial educational broadcast licenses. I am pleased to join the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) and others on both sides of the aisle as a cosponsor of this important legislation.

In closing, we need this bill to ensure that there will be no erosion of freedom of religious programming in America. Mr. Speaker, we need this bill to ensure that Americans will continue to enjoy the religious broadcasting that they have come to depend upon. And we need this bill to ensure that the Federal Government does not become involved in regulating content of our broadcast programming.

I urge my colleagues to vote to uphold freedom of expression by voting in support of H.R. 4201 as it is now written.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in conclusion on this portion of the debate.

The gentleman from Louisiana contends that there will be no comparative test that has to be put in place by the Federal Communications Commission in order to determine which one of two religions is better qualified for the maintenance of a particular public television station in a particular community. But the reality is that once his language is adopted, once a television station, a public television station, can be primarily religious, then necessarily that test is incorporated into the historical set of criteria which must be looked at by the Federal Communications Commission to determine which potential applicant is more qualified to operate a public television station in a particular community.

In other words, Federal Communications Commission which historically has meant Federal Communications Commission, will be changed from FCC, Federal Communications Commission to FCC, Faith Content Commission. The FCC will have to determine which of the two religions is better qualified to run a public television station.

Now, do we really want the FCC to be in the business of determining which religion is better qualified, which one is more primarily religious in its operation of a public television station? I do not think we really want that. I think that the historical standard of which of the applicants will better serve the educational needs of a community is the standard which we should maintain, it has served our country well, and it is one which I believe once the debate moves to the Markey amendment will be better understood by all who are watching it, and ultimately I think, hopefully, supported so that we can maintain that status which has served our country so well.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), a member of the Committee on Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from California (Mr. COX) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I agree with essentially all of the arguments that were advanced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) just now in opposition to this bill

because everything that they said makes sense. We ought not to have the FCC become the Faith-based Content Commission. The reason we are here on the floor is that that is exactly what the FCC tried to do.

Six months ago, the FCC ruled that church services would not qualify as general education programming. Six months ago, the FCC ruled that the broadcast of religious views would not constitute educational programming. The FCC ruled that the broadcast of religious beliefs would not qualify as educational programming. The FCC put this out in the form of a rule. They, not the Congress, put the word ''religion'' into the test for whether or not you could get a broadcast license. And so this legislation is necessary to take away that discretion. So much for the arguments made by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The gentleman from Michigan then says, ''Well, it's not necessary to be here on the floor because the FCC has withdrawn their stupid rule,'' and many of the minority who spoke against this bill called the FCC's action stupid. It was withdrawn, they said, because the FCC should not have ventured into this area. This legislation is necessary to take away power that the FCC apparently thinks it has, but no one in the majority or the minority wishes them to have, to adopt such a significant policy change as they attempted to do here to take religious broadcasting off the air without any public notice or input.

We should vote for this legislation for this reason. Here is what it says: The Commission should not engage in regulating the content of speech. That is what this is all about. Vote aye.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4201, the Non-Commercial Broadcasting Freedom of Expression Act. This legislation eliminates the educational requirement from non-commercial public radio and television stations that receive free spectrum. This program was created by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) nearly fifty years ago to serve the needs of our communities and provide educational programming to all of our families. I simply cannot watch this scarce and valuable resource be endangered by this bill. Pressure for spectrum is more intense than ever. I believe it is important to maintain the longstanding commitment to programs of broad public educational content.

As it stands, religious broadcasters are currently eligible for a license for non-commercial educational (NCE) broadcast television channels if they can demonstrate that their programming will be ''primarily educational'' in nature. H.R. 4201 eliminates the requirement that programming have an educational content.

This bill would set the stage for unwelcome government interference into religion. It would place the FCC in the untenable position of picking between competing claims of various denominations and religions—a dangerous precedent in which the government would be expressing a preference of one religion over another. With this legislation, the FCC would be forced into a position in which it must choose between two opposing religious groups that are competing for the same license. This is in clear violation of the First Amendment. Moreover, the elimination of the educational requirement opens the door to allow any fringe group in America to qualify for a free broadcast license.

Some have said that the Non-Commercial Broadcasting Freedom of Expression Act was spurred on by a misguided ruling on the part of the FCC this past December. The FCC approved Cornerstone TeleVision Inc.'s application for an NCE license with ''additional guidance'' intended to clarify the current standards and stating that at least one-half of Cornerstone's broadcasting needed to meet an educational purpose. The FCC also offered guidance as to what constituted educational programming. After a great deal of criticism from across the political spectrum for the undue meddling of the FCC, the agency rescinded the ''additional guidance'' section of the license approval offer. The problem had been solved. Yet, this legislation, which aims to prevent undue government interference in the future, creates a new problem as the FCC determines which religious organizations warrant a license and which do not.

Mr. Speaker, the whole proposition raises many troubling questions which leaves me convinced we are better off under present law. I fully support religious organizations being eligible to apply for and receive non-commercial broadcast licenses as prescribed under current statute. Many of these organizations are already broadcasting educational programming successfully and adding to our greater understanding of faith and religion. The goal here is to preserve the integrity of a program that brought our children high quality shows such as Sesame Street and Mr. Roger's Neighborhood. At its very core, public broadcasting was meant to have an educational purpose. To eliminate that provision is to place this entire program at risk.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking my colleagues from the Commerce Committee, Subcommittee Chairmen TAUZIN and OXLEY as well as CHIP PICKERING, for their hard work on this important issue.

Last December, while we were all back in our Districts for the holidays, the FCC attempted to get into the business of determining acceptable programming for public broadcasters.

Included a decision regarding a specific radio station in Pittsburgh, the FCC created ''additional guidelines'' that could have had sweeping changes to the way many broadcasters operate.

The FCC tried to claim that the changes were simple clarifications.

Further, the FCC also tried to make these changes without appropriate notice and comment.

The fact is that some in the FCC wanted to make the statement that religious expression is not educational and thus calling into question the noncommercial broadcast licenses held by religious organizations.

The truth of the matter is that these changes were more than clarifications. Beyond bad policy, the FCC's failure to allow the general public a chance to comment is equally harmful.

And criticism of these changes was universal. In fact, the outrage was so overwhelming that FCC rescinded their order in twenty-nine days. The FCC knew it was in the wrong and quickly tried to get out of the mess.

But what happens if in the future the FCC tries the same thing? What happens if instead of an explicit policy, the proposed additional guidance is implicitly used by staff behind closed doors?

It is now up to Congress to make sure something like this doesn't happen again. We have a responsibility to prevent the FCC from making content regulations for religious broadcasters using our nation's airwaves. We can achieve this today by passing H.R. 4201.

We are here not because the Federal Communications Commission simply made a mistake. We are here to make it abundantly clear that the FCC shall not have authority to impose such requirements now, or in the future.

Congress must act now and H.R. 4201 is the right legislation. I urge all Members to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for general debate has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4201

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Noncommercial Broadcasting Freedom of Expression Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF SERVICE OBLIGATIONS OF NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL OR PUBLIC BROADCAST STATIONS.

(a) SERVICE CONDITIONS.—Section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) SERVICE CONDITIONS ON NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL AND PUBLIC BROADCAST STATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A nonprofit educational organization shall be eligible to hold a noncommercial educational radio or television license if the station is used primarily to broadcast material that the organization determines serves an educational, instructional, cultural, or educational religious purpose (or any combination of such purposes) in the station's community of license, unless that determination is arbitrary or unreasonable.

''(2) ADDITIONAL CONTENT-BASED REQUIREMENTS PROHIBITED.—The Commission shall not—

''(A) impose or enforce any quantitative requirement on noncommercial educational radio or television licenses based on the number of hours of programming that serve educational, instructional, cultural, or religious purposes; or

''(B) impose or enforce any other requirement on the content of the programming broadcast by a licensee, permittee, or applicant for a noncommercial educational radio or television license that is not imposed and enforced on a licensee, permittee, or applicant for a commercial radio or television license, respectively.

''(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as affecting—

''(A) any obligation of noncommercial educational television broadcast stations under the Children's Television Act of 1990 (47 U.S.C. 303a, 303b); or

''(B) the requirements of section 396, 399, 399A, and 399B of this Act.''.

(b) POLITICAL BROADCASTING EXEMPTION.—Section 312(a)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 312(a)(7)) is amended by inserting '', other than a noncommercial educational broadcast station,'' after ''use of a broadcasting station''.

(c) AUDIT OF COMPLIANCE WITH DONOR PRIVACY PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 396(l)(3)(B)(ii) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396(l)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', and shall include a determination of the compliance of the entity with the requirements of subsection (k)(12)''; and

(2) in subclause (II), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', except that such statement shall include a statement regarding the extent of the compliance of the entity with the requirements of subsection (k)(12)''.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—Consistent with the requirements of section 3 of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall amend sections 73.1930 through 73.1944 of its rules (47 C.F.R. 73.1930–73.1944) to provide that those sections do not apply to noncommercial educational broadcast stations.

SEC. 3. RULEMAKING.

(a) LIMITATION.—After the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall not establish, expand, or otherwise modify requirements relating to the service obligations of noncommercial educational radio or television stations except by means of agency rulemaking conducted in accordance with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and other applicable law (including the amendments made by section 2).

(b) RULEMAKING DEADLINE.—The Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe such revisions to its regulations as may be necessary to comply with the amendment made by section 2 within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 527, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This amendment is very straightforward and very simple. It restores the word ''educational'' in two key areas. First, in establishing eligibility to obtain a noncommercial educational license, a public TV station, it stipulates that one must not merely be any nonprofit organization but rather a nonprofit educational organization.

Secondly, it restores the educational basis for the programming by adding the word ''educational'' before the word ''religious'' in the underlying legislation.

The point here is that noncommercial educational licenses should have an educational basis. If we do not pass the Markey substitute, the underlying bill has the effect of gutting the educational basis for public television because it would permit religious programming to qualify for such licenses 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Now, many of us would be very happy to have religious organizations broadcast in our communities, and many do so today under commercial licenses. A few also do so on noncommercial educational licenses, yet adhering to the educational requirements that such licenses hold. Nothing in this amendment would prevent religious programming. It simply states that in order to have a public TV license, a noncommercial educational license, you must be primarily educational in your programming.

I know that we have a difference of interpretation of what the sponsors of the bill believe their bill does. The sponsors believe that their bill does not change the eligibility requirements and operational requirements of noncommercial educational licenses, that is, public TV stations across the country. I continue to believe that the deletion of the word ''educational'' from the eligibility requirements so that noncommercial educational licenses are able to be licensed to any nonprofit organization as well as the inclusion of the word ''religious'' as a category of broadcast material for which these licensees must primarily serve their communities is a fundamental change.

The FCC has indicated that some religious programming will certainly qualify as educational. It always has. But we must remember that we have set these broadcast licenses aside to serve the community with educational programming. We have exempted these licenses from the auction process.

Again, that is not to say religious organizations cannot be noncommercial educational licensees. Many already hold such licenses under the current licensing regime. The only question is whether we are going to change the nature of the trusteeship of the public's spectrum. Again, these are our public airwaves. We ought to ensure that these licenses that have been specifically set aside to serve the community, the entire community, with educational, noncommercial programming serves to the maximum extent possible the educational needs of the whole community. Religious organizations can certainly fulfill that role. We welcome them in that role. But we do not have to change the eligibility and operational requirements for them to effectively participate.

Again, I believe that we tread on very dangerous ground where sectarian messages intended for the followers of a particular religion are licensed to displace nonsectarian educational messages intended for the entire community. Again, I believe we go too far where the government favors religious messages by specifically blessing them by exempting them from spectrum auctions.

My amendment simply restores the educational focus for these licenses, and I hope that the House supports it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first say the gentleman from Massachusetts' amendment is not simple at all. It is not simple at all. By reinserting the word ''educational'' in front of the word ''religious,'' what the gentleman from Massachusetts is doing is giving the FCC the authority to decide which religious programming is educational enough according to their standards. That is precisely what they tried to do in December. It is precisely the wrong, stupid action they took in December that even my colleagues on the other side have condemned as stupid and for which they turned around with a 4-to-1 vote and reversed themselves. This amendment would give them the power to do it again. And at least one of the commissioners said, given the chance, she will do it again, she will put the commission in the business of deciding which religious program, which religious message is educational enough to satisfy a Federal bureaucrat.

□ 1145

If it is not, the license can get pulled. Would that not be wonderful in America? Would we not be really blessed to have this amendment in the law, to give five federally appointed bureaucrats the right to say which religious messages are okay on these noncommercial stations and which are not?

Now, the gentleman will make us believe that there are only a few of these stations, just a little rare exception somewhere. My friends, there are 800 to 1,000 religious radio broadcasters holding noncommercial licenses today in radio. All across America, there are religious organizations and family groups who have religious programming on these stations, and nobody until December, nobody in Washington had the nerve, had the audacity under our Constitution to suggest that they knew better than those programmers what was good religious programming, what was educational enough to satisfy the bureaucrats up here in Washington.

Like bureaucrats in Washington know the value of religion in our homes and in our communities. Let me tell you where these stations are, they are across America. There are 23 religious television stations in America, 23, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), not just a few.

There is one, for example, in Takoma, Washington, the Korean American Missions Incorporated. There is one in San Antonio, Texas, the Hispanic Community Educational TV, Incorporated. There is one in West Milford, New Jersey, Family Stations of New Jersey, Incorporated; The Word of God Fellowship in Denver, Colorado. They are across America.

There are stations that own these noncommercial licenses and do religious broadcasting for the good of this country and the good of families all over America; and the bureaucrats in Washington would like the right to put them off the air because their religious views are not educational enough to satisfy whatever the standards of five commissioners sitting at the FCC are.

For heaven's sake, do we really want to give them that power? If we really do, adopt this amendment; that is what it does. If we want to take the power away from the FCC to decide whether a religious message or program or religious church service is educational enough to meet these standards, whatever they are, then vote for this bill; that is all it does.

It simply says for the future the FCC can no longer try to do the stupid thing they tried to do in December and the thing they would be allowed to do if the Markey amendment is adopted. We need to defeat this amendment and pass this bill.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Markey amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. The bill we are voting on today is quite simply an overreaction. The FCC attempted to clarify a rule. It then made a controversial decision and subsequently withdrew it, as they should have.

Today, my Republican friends at the behest of conservative religious groups are seeking to make sure that the FCC can never again venture into this area. They are seeking to use the power of the Congress to write a statute that fences the FCC off from this area.

Now, some may think this is the way that the Congress should spend its time. I think the FCC acknowledged that it made the mistake that it did; but it is overreaction, because the bill goes even beyond overreaction.

The bill is showpiece legislation for religious groups in my view. It is unnecessary. It is very, very poorly drafted, and it creates a bad precedent; but these are not criteria which exclude us from considering it. It goes beyond that.

The bill contains a very dangerous constitutional flaw. It opens the door for religions to qualify for a free noncommercial educational license provided at taxpayer expense.

We should strike that portion of the bill, by at least passing this amendment. Without this amendment, in my view, the legislation makes clear that the majority intends to change the fundamental nature of public broadcasting in America.

No longer will anyone have to prove their educational mission to obtain an educational noncommercial television license.

That standard will be changed. It will be relaxed to require only that a religious purpose exists. And how will the FCC define that religious purpose? It cannot; because the Government really has no business defining it. Therefore, anyone calling itself a religion can qualify; anyone including cults and charlatans that have called themselves prophets and even some that spread hate in our country, people like David Koresh, and Jim Jones others.

I do not think the Congress wants that. I do not think the country wants that. Mr. Speaker, without this amendment, the bill will present the FCC with the choice of choosing between religious groups. On its face it presents an unconstitutional predicament for the FCC.

In practice, it will allow potentially anyone to qualify for this free license. I appreciate the intent of those that support this bill. Many Members on the Committee on Commerce expressed what I think were somewhat sincere views. Protecting religious expression is not only a worthwhile objective for this Congress, it is our duty.

Remember the oath that we all took, when we were sworn in. Mr. Speaker, we should pass this amendment, if we do not, we will be passing legislation that will be overturned as unconstitutional. And more importantly, if we do not, we are providing television time and taxpayer money to underwrite religion. This is a slippery slope of government sponsorship of religion itself.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this amendment. It makes sense. It is good for the country. We do not need to be taking up the time of the Court to strike down the unconstitutional work of the Congress.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, again, to correct the RECORD, without the Markey amendment, the legislation, standing as it is, does not create any new standards to judge these licenses. The legislation codifies the words and the status quo, the old standard, the commission always used until December. It simply says that they will yield to the discretion of the religious broadcaster in its own programming, unless that discretion is exercised in an arbitrary or unreasonable manner, and they have always had that standard, that is, the standard in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Markey amendment. It is always a good debating point to set up a straw man. In this case, my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) sets up this straw man as being some kind of a cult that would somehow get a noncommercial license and proselytize through that operation.

I would simply say to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), that the legislation that was debated in committee, now being debated on the floor, is pretty clear, that unless it is unreasonable or arbitrary that the decision by the broadcaster will maintain and, in fact, that is the way it was from time immemorial until the FCC in this middle-of-the-night decision over the holidays determined that they would use a rather ordinary license swap to try to maintain their ability to determine what content was in the area of religious broadcasting; and had it not been for the Congress and Members of the Committee on Commerce acting quickly to point out what problems that decision would bring, had it not been for that outcry and the outcry from the people of this country, the FCC would have never decided to rescind that decision.

This bill makes certain that no matter who is at the FCC, no matter who appoints an FCC in the future, that these kinds of arbitrary decisions based on educational or cultural content basically determining what that content is by the Government shall not maintain, and that is really why this legislation is absolutely necessary.

If I was confident that in the future any FCC would follow the standard procedures that they had in the past and license swaps and decisions on licenses, I would feel a lot more comfortable. But I have to say that we have evidence to the contrary. Three FCC commissioners, the three Democrat FCC commissioners made the determination that they would determine what content in religious broadcasting was all about.

We are, indeed, representatives of the people. The FCC, despite being an independent agency, is essentially bureaucrats that interpret the law. We write the laws, so this legislation sets us back where we were very comfortably before understanding what the purview of the status was and understanding the role of the FCC.

Ultimately, the FCC cannot, should not be an arbiter of what content is in this form of broadcasting, and that is ultimately what this decision is all about.

I do not know whether my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) supported the original decision by the FCC or the decision to overturn it, but I do know where he stands on this issue. This legislation is absolutely critical.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have never met a group of people who so were irked by the possibility of straw men being set up, who have demonstrated such massive talent to create

a straw man, and I want to salute my good friend from Ohio for his ability to create a straw man. His straw man is the FCC. Now, the FCC has totally withdrawn the order. I opposed it; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) opposed the order. The order is no longer a reality; it is gone.

The FCC is still the skunk at the picnic. Now, I have been more critical of the FCC than anybody in the body. I am quite delighted to castigate them when they are wrong. The simple fact of the matter is, they are not a factor in the debate before us.

Now, let us look at what the amendment does. It inserts the word educational in two places in the legislation, one at page 4 and one at page 3; and the purpose of that is to see to it that the organizations which seek this are, in fact, setting it up for educational purposes and that they are, in fact, educational organizations. That is what existing law is.

Mr. Speaker, the practical effect of this is to assure that the FCC will not be compelled to hold comparative hearings, as they must do when there is a contest, to choose between two different religious organizations, or between a religious organization and a secular organization.

I think if this country wants to proceed down the path of triggering the religious wars, which have plagued this race of men, and I am not talking about in the United States, but in England, to set up a situation where government is going to have to choose between religions, between religious teachings or between applicants who might have a religious purpose, is probably the finest way to return to the unfortunate days of the religious wars.

Mr. Speaker, what happens if several religious organizations apply to the FCC to get a license to broadcast under the bill as it is drawn? Then the FCC must commence a process of comparative hearings which will then choose. Now the only thing these applicants must do under the legislation which is before us is to set out that their purpose is to teach certain kinds of religion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know which one it would be, but that would be then the problem before the FCC, which religion? Which religious groups? Which religious tenets must they choose?

I would note that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) generally restores existing law. It does not make possible the FCC to return to its follies which have triggered this sorry mess, but I would note for the benefit of my colleagues on the other side that it prevents the FCC from making a decision on religious grounds.

It also prevents the courts from having before them a question which is bottomed on a religion-based application by an applicant for a particular license and for a particular wave length.

Now, I think we ought to understand that this is not the kind of choice that we want to have made in this country. Government must stay out of religious matters and leave these as private judgments to the people who wish to believe and to allow them to choose that which they believe without any kind of government preference.

Now, it would appear that this is some question of religion against secularism. Nothing is further from the truth. I would remind my colleagues that there are many religious broadcasters who oppose the legislation and who support the principles of the Markey amendment, not the least of whom are the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, the Interfaith Alliance, and the Unitarian Universalist Associations of Congregations.

I would note something else. We are not without a prospering group of religious broadcasters; there are over a thousand of them. They have a regular program of mailing and discussing issues with Members of Congress.

□ 1200

I have met with my religious broadcasters; and I receive large amounts of mail, which I respond to as courteously and carefully as I know how. They are a valuable force in our community, and they are not threatened by either the status quo or the Markey amendment. The responsible ones amongst them will agree, there is no peril to them.

If you want to put government in the midst of picking religions, picking religious broadcasters, supporting religious tenets and teaching, and opposing to others, to vote for the bill as it is submitted is a fine way to accomplish that purpose.

If you want to see that government stays out and that we take care of not only religious broadcasters, as they should in a fair and proper way, but that we take care of education, because I would remind my colleagues, this is a raid on the educational broadcasting system, the educational broadcasting networks and upon public broadcasting, I would point out if this legislation is passed, you are going to find any imaginable form of religious crank or crackpot to come forward to claim priority in terms of religious broadcasting licenses. Reverend Koresh, Jim Jones, any one of many, can come in and then force your government, your agency, the FCC and this Congress, to address who is entitled to a broadcasting license.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the Chair is pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), the author of the legislation.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, again I rise, this time in opposition to the Markey amendment. Let me do two or three things: One, establish what the real agenda is in this case; establish the record; and then talk a little bit from personal experience.

One, what is the agenda? What happened in the case that was decided in December, the license in Pittsburgh? After the guidelines came out, the Pittsburgh station, the religious broadcaster withdrew its application because it did not want to submit itself to the FCC guidelines.

The real agenda here is to banish, to remove, to exclude, the religious voice, the religious broadcasters, from non-commercial licenses, educational licenses. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been very clear. He sees this as public, as educational, not as religious. They have plenty of commercial space, but they should not be on the public and the educational. He does not see them as performing an educational role, a cultural role or instructional role. The agenda is clear: Banish the religious voice from the non-commercial spectrum.

If there is a public park, do not let the religious children play. Make them go to the commercial strip mall, and that is the only place we will let them play. But not in the public park. There is no place for the religious voice in our park.

Now, we are all somewhat motivated and guided by our own personal experiences. I think many on the other side look at the religious discrimination and religious bigotry and religious bias that has occurred in our history and they see the religious practices as dangerous devices.

I have to admit I come to this floor with great concern and disappointment in my heart. I have great respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Michigan, but what has taken place today on this floor is that they try to take the worst examples, the David Koreshes, the Jim Joneses, and they demonize and they isolate and they marginalize the religious voice.

They take the whole group of religious broadcasters, and there are over 800 non-commercial religious broadcasters today on radio, and there is not one case, not one case that they can cite of any extreme, hate or group that has not behaved responsibly in performing their public interest, their community service, their educational, their cultural, their instructional roles and responsibilities in the community. Not one example.

In the Supreme Court case, Peyote, the Supreme Court said there is no government obligation to protect those who incite hate or who incite violence. So if there is a David Koresh or if there is a Jim Jones who wants this license, they will not be protected under Supreme Court precedent and under the language of our legislation.

Look at the report language: ". . . that the organization determines serves an educational, instructional, cultural or religious purpose in the station's community of license." The new section also mandates that such determination by the broadcaster may not be arbitrary or unreasonable. If it is a hate-based, extreme group, they will be viewed as unreasonable and arbitrary. They will not be able to maintain their license if they are those types of groups.

But by tainting those who are responsibly serving their community now, I think it is frankly wrong, and it is doing exactly what those on the other side hate. They are demonizing, they are marginalizing, they are isolating, which then leads to discrimination.

The religious voice in the public square or in the public park is good for our country. It has been that way from our beginning, it is that way today, and we simply want to protect and preserve that and prohibit the FCC from coming in and regulating and controlling and stifling religious expression.

The gentleman from Michigan and the gentlewoman from California say that the Markey amendment will simply return us to the past precedent, the past practice. That is not the case. It will return us to the FCC guidelines issued in December, which they both said was wrong, which led to a regulatory regime of a speech police at the FCC, determining what is and what is not acceptable or unacceptable religious speech, what is educational in their eyes.

I urge all of my colleagues, let us not divide, let us not demonize; let us protect our fundamental history and legacy of religious liberty. There are those that are now performing vital roles in their communities. Let us not prevent them from doing so in the future.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, again, let me come back to clarify once again. Under existing law, religious broadcasters are able to operate public television stations in the United States. However, they do so accepting the responsibility that they must serve primarily the educational needs of the entire community, although they are free to also broadcast their own religious beliefs. But, primarily under existing law, they must serve the educational needs of the entire community.

Under the bill being proposed here today, that very same religion will now be freed up to broadcast exclusively their own religious beliefs, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Now, that is a big change, a big change, in the history of public broadcasting in our country.

No one has any objection to the existing religious broadcasters on non-commercial educational broadcasting stations. No one has any objection to the existing standards continuing to be used in order to define whether or not they are serving the community well. But we do object to the standard which the majority is seeking to propound here today, which, in my opinion, will be a violation, an encroachment, on the establishment clause of the United States Constitution, of the first amendment, which creates a very strong line of demarcation between the state and religion.

Here a public broadcasting station will be used by an individual religion to propound primarily religious messages all day long on a public broadcasting station, and I think at the end of the day that is wrong and it is something which should be rejected, as the Markey amendment seeks to correct it on the House floor here today.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me point out that the problem is that the FCC got into doing that. It got into trying to say which religious content was educational enough to please the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) or anyone else in this country. That is what was wrong. It basically said a church service was not educational enough, a sermon perhaps by the Reverend Jessie Jackson on the Ten Commandments would not be educational enough for these commissioners, and they were going to decide when these religious broadcasters were or were not meeting the standards of the FCC, as to whether or not their religious beliefs, sermons, and services were educational enough. How crazy. Thank God they backed down from it. We need to make sure they never go back to it. That is why the Markey amendment needs to be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about with the Markey amendment is the FCC deciding what the educational religious intent of television broadcasting is. So I pose these questions for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Will the Christmas Mass at the Vatican be able to be broadcast under his amendment? Obviously it is religious. Under the gentleman's amendment, you would no longer see the Christmas Mass at the Vatican on non-commercial TV.

What about the performance of the Messiah at the Washington National Cathedral here? Under the gentleman's amendment, no longer shall we see this.

The National Day of Prayer here in Congress, which is televised, many of the non-commercial religious stations broadcast that. No longer.

Opening prayer of House and Senate. You could stretch this on and on and on and on. Teaching the Ten Commandments. Under the Markey amendment, all of this would be gone, and that is why two-thirds of the Democrats who are on the commission voted to overturn their own ruling, because they realized what they did was wrong.

What we have today is the FCC creating a category of politically correct, government-approved religious speech. Let me repeat that. The Markey amendment is creating a category of politically correct, government-approved religious speech.

Interesting, as one commissioner said, ''If you believe what you are saying about religion, you cannot say it on the non-commercial television band; but if you don't believe what you are saying, then you can.'' That is the paradox that the Markey amendment is providing here.

As I mentioned earlier, I think it is unconstitutional to let the FCC have this amount of power. Many of us think the FCC as an agency could be done away with. This whole idea of educational TV is being replaced through the Internet, through broadband, through wireless, through the cable. You get 250 channels through direct television. And here we are coming down on religious broadcasting that has been around since the start, the very start, of television broadcasting. We are totally changing this with this amendment. It has far-reaching implications.

So I ask my colleagues, do they want to do away with religious broadcasting completely and strip all religious broadcasting from television? Then they should vote for the Markey amendment. If they believe that they want to do away with the broadcasting of the Christmas Mass at the Vatican, vote for the Markey amendment. If they believe that the performance of the Messiah at the Washington Cathedral is wrong and they do not want to see it on non-commercial television, then they should vote for his amendment. In fact, simply the instructions for proselytizing or talking about religion on television will become history under the Markey amendment.

So I would close, Mr. Speaker, with these comments: The Markey amendment would create an educational religious purpose and play into the hands of those at the FCC that want to have the say over content of religious programming. Instead of providing clarity, which the Pickering amendment does, and protection from a hyperactive FCC, and I think Members on both sides of the aisle would agree that the FCC is hyperactive, instead of that, in reining in their power, we are giving them more power, and we are creating confusion for religious broadcasters and threatening their very existence.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

□ 1215

Mr. Speaker, just so we can once again clarify, under existing law, the way we have operated for the last 50 years in this country, Christmas mass can be on a public television station. Handel's Messiah can be on a public television station, as long as the operators of that public television station are serving primarily the educational needs of the community. However, under this amendment, Christmas mass can be on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, if that religion decides that that is the only thing that they want to put on. They do not have to any longer serve any of the educational needs of the community at all.

Under existing law, Christmas mass is on; Handel's Messiah is on. The educational needs are served. Under their

amendment, their bill, all day long, religion 24 hours a day, one particular religion operating the public broadcasting station in town with no requirement to serve the educational needs of the community in any other way, shape or form. The children in the community, the local institutions in the community, and no one else.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to correct the record.

Again, there are over 1,000 religious broadcasters who do religious broadcasting all day long, today. They do not do educational programming and also religious programming; they do religious programming all day long. Never in the history of that broadcasting has any government bureaucrat ever had the audacity to come in and decide which of that religious broadcasting was educational enough for their purposes, whether the mass was educational enough, a sermon was.

But I will tell my colleagues what this commission tried to do in December. They tried to say that if 50 percent of it did not meet their standards, then they are off the air. This bill will prevent that ever happening again. The Markey amendment gives them a back door to do exactly what they did in December, to come in and say, we decide that 50 percent of it needs to be religious broadcasting that we think is educational enough; and if it is not, they are off the air. That is why it needs to be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox).

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

We are all agreed here, I think, having listened to the debate, we are all agreed on both sides of the aisle and on all sides of this question that the Government should not regulate the content of speech of noncommercial broadcasters and that the Government should not discriminate against some religious speech in favor of other religious speech. Both sides of this argument are claiming that high ground and saying, vote for us and we will vindicate those principles.

The legislation that is before us says, and I quote, ''the Commission,'' referring to the Federal Communications Commission, ''should not engage in regulating the content of speech broadcasted by noncommercial educational stations.'' That is the principle of this bill, to keep the Government out of the business of regulating speech.

Now, the Markey amendment does something very straightforward, at least mechanically. It inserts a word, one word, the word ''educational,'' as an adjectival modifier in front of another word, ''religious,'' so that we have an adjective on an adjective, a modifier on a modifier, and we now have something called ''education religious programming.'' The term ''educational religious programming'' is nowhere defined in statute. It is nowhere defined in the rules or the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. I do not know what it is, and the author of the amendment does not know what ''educational religious programming'' is.

But let us do what a judge or a court would have to do faced with this language. A judge or a court would have to say, we have an adjective in front of ''religious.'' That means that we have something called ''educational religious programming,'' and presumptively something that is not ''educational religious programming.'' Two categories we have now created, this kind of religious programming and that kind of religious programming. Who decides which is which? Obviously, because of the way the statute is written and the way the gentleman has written his amendment, the Federal Communications Commission will decide which is educational religious programming on the one hand and which is the other category, presumably non-educational religious programming.

What does the bill do without his amendment? The bill, without his amendment, simply creates a presumption. It says, and I quote, ''Religious programming contributes to serving the educational and cultural needs of the public and should be treated by the Commission on a par with other educational and cultural programming.''

So the FCC has no decision to make. The FCC does not decide which religious programming is good and which religious programming is bad; it does not run afoul of the establishment clause of the first amendment to the Constitution as it would under the Markey amendment.

This new category that the Markey amendment would create of educational religious programming, which as I say, I have never seen, does not appear in statute, does not appear anywhere in the regulations, would create a lot of confusion. It would be a legal unicorn. Nobody having seen it before would not know quite what to make of it, or maybe it would be more like the Loch Ness Monster of the United States Code. We would see a vague apparition, but we would not quite know what to make of it. One court might decide one way; another court might decide another way.

I think that the colloquy between the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Massachusetts about the broadcasting of a church service makes the vagueness, the hopeless vagueness of this amendment's wording very obvious. Because the author of the amendment does not really know, at least I listened to his remarks and I inferred this much, does not really know whether or not under his standard, the broadcast of a church service would be acceptable or not. We ought not to put the FCC into that kind of legal muddle.

Remember the reason that we are here is that just 6 months ago the FCC said this, quote: ''Church services generally will not qualify as general educational programming under our rules.'' They tried to change the status quo. The Democrats said that was stupid, the Republicans said that was stupid, and so the FCC quickly backed down.

Mr. Speaker, that leaves but one question. If we reject the Markey amendment and we have this base text, why do we need this bill to make sure the FCC does not do again what they did in December? After all, they have backed down and that argument has been forcefully made by the gentleman from Michigan.

The answer is that the commissioners have let it be known, certainly one of them, that they would go forward in this course of action again, given the opportunity. So what we are saying in this legislation is the following: the Federal Communications Commission shall not establish, expand or otherwise modify requirements relating to the service obligations of noncommercial educational radio or TV stations, except by means of agency rulemaking conducted in accordance with the law.

Because the FCC not only did something that the Democrats thought was stupid and the Republicans agreed was stupid, a word used several times to describe their action during the course of this debate, but they did so without any, without any public notice or input, or any warning to the broadcasters whose licenses were at stake. The policy change was announced as part of an adjudicatory proceeding relating to the transfer, as we have discussed here earlier in this debate, of a Pittsburgh TV station. By acting in this manner, the Federal Communications Commission circumvented the Administrative Procedure Act which requires public review and comment before any major policy change is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation so that we will have a transparent process, so that we will not have bureaucrats run amok, so that we will not find ourselves 6 months from now on the floor of this House complaining that the FCC action directed towards broadcasters was stupid. I urge that we reject the Markey amendment so that we do not render this legislation unconstitutional and hopelessly vague, so that we keep the Government out of the business of regulating religious speech.

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

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill allows, allows the Federal Communications Commission to determine that a broadcaster's programming, which is primarily religious, is arbitrary or unreasonable. In other words, the FCC, under the bill as written, can step in and make judgments on religion. We are not getting away from the FCC making content decisions. We are simply letting the FCC into judging religious programming and whether it is sufficiently religious. We should not allow the FCC to become the Faith Content Commission.

The gentleman from California referenced the bill's findings, and I am sure Judge Scalia will appreciate the findings. However, the actual legislative charge to the FCC goes much further in the legislation. Let me read. It says under Service Conditions on Noncommercial Educational and Public Broadcast Stations: ''A nonprofit organization shall be eligible to hold a noncommercial educational radio or television license if the station is used primarily to broadcast material that the organization determines serves a religious purpose in the station's community of license, unless that determination is arbitrary or unreasonable.''

There is no requirement that the broadcaster has to have an educational content; there is no requirement that it has to have served the needs of the entire community. The FCC is put in a position where, if two particular religions want one station, that they have to determine, the Federal Communications Commission, the Faith Content Commission, has to determine which of the two religions can better serve a particular community without even judging whether or not either religion is going to serve the educational needs of the community. Only which one is sufficiently more religious.

So in fact, while the legislation's ostensible purpose is to remove the Federal Communications Commission from content-based decisions, in fact, what the legislation is about to do is to open wide the gates for religions all across America to begin to lay claim to individual educational public broadcasting stations all across America, and to argue before the Federal Communications Commission that their religion is more religious than another religion in taking over those public broadcasting stations. And, as part of the test, the Federal Communications Commission will not be able to look at whether or not the religion serves any educational need whatsoever in the community.

Now, that may be the goal, because I know that there is a latent hostility on the part of many Members on the other side towards the public broadcasting system. I understand that. They have never liked the public broadcasting system; they have never enjoyed at all their particular mission; they do not like the fact that they, in fact, do educate the entire community. I understand how many Members on the other side do not like the public broadcasting system. But we are going to have to set up an aquarium down here in the well of the House to deal with all of the red herrings that have been spread out here on the floor.

What, in fact, the majority is trying to do here today is to take public broadcasting stations and turn them into religious stations, plain and simple. That is the goal. So if you have a public television station back in your hometown and it has historically served the educational needs of the community, under this new language, they will no longer have to do so, and the FCC will have to intervene in order to determine which religion best serves the religious needs of that religion, of that community, but will be able to go no further.

So I say to my colleagues, if ever there was an unconstitutional piece of legislation out here on the floor, this is it. If ever there was a piece of legislation that is going to be struck down for violation of the establishment clause or the separation between church and State, this is it.

□ 1230

But for those who hate the Public Broadcasting System, this is just a natural further extension of their attempts to undermine its historic and thus far successful mission in every community in the United States. It will result ultimately, without question, in a transfer of stations over to individual religions with no educational goals whatsoever except for the proselytizing of their own individual sect.

That should be allowed. They should be able to purchase commercial TV stations. In fact, let us be blunt, under the existing clause, as long as the religion does serve primarily the educational needs of a community they can talk about their own religion on that public broadcasting station, but they cannot do so to the exclusion of all other educational content, of all other service to the community, of all other service to children within that community.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment which I am propounding is one which very simply ensures that the word ''educational'' is inserted before the word ''religious,'' that there is an educational component to any of this religious broadcasting which is going to be primarily broadcast on these public television stations.

If we do not do that, there is going to be a fundamental change in public broadcasting in our country. I know it is the goal of the majority, but it should not be the goal either of the Members of this House or of the American people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first let my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, know that I do not particularly like characterizing motives. I do not like it when we do this on the floor. I do not like it when my side does it or the gentleman's side does it.

However, if the gentleman wants to ask about motives, let me explain them. I do not think the gentleman can characterize the motives of people regarding public broadcasting. Many like public broadcasting but do not like the way it is being funded.

Many of us think there is enough diversity in television that we do not necessarily have to use tax dollars to fund a separate category of public broadcasting.

There are many who were offended when public broadcasting shared its donor list only with Democratic organizations. Members might look at that and see some real cause for anger and concern on this side. When a public institution funded with taxpayer dollars decides to help one political party to the exclusion of the other, I guess it is going to cause a little anger and upset on this side. It well should have.

But I have not accused nor would I question the motives of the gentleman's side in offering this amendment. I have not said the gentleman was against religious programming. I am not suggesting that the administration is out to shut down religious programming, or the FCC tried to shut down religious voices on noncommercial stations. There were some people saying that. I never said that.

What I have said, what I will continue to say, is that what the FCC did in December was stupid. It tried to inject government decisions into what was proper religious programming on a religious broadcast station. We ought to put a stop to that. It ought to be the decisions of the religious programmers themselves to decide what religious programming they are going to put on television and radio stations dedicated to religious programming.

Mr. Speaker, the FCC did something very different in December. Up until December, it was always the presumption that religious programming was presumed to be educational. I happen to think it is. The FCC thought it was for years and years, never questioned it.

Then in December it decided it was going to set up two categories of religious programming: educational religious programming and I guess noneducational religious programming. If there was not enough of one or too much of the other, they would shut them down.

What an offensive, arbitrary decision by the FCC, which is supposed to be carrying out the law, not making up their own law, not deciding as a matter of law what was good religious speech on television and radio and what was unacceptable. That is wrong. That is what is wrong. That is what is unconstitutional.

This bill will end it. It will not only say to the FCC, you cannot do it in the dead of night without public input and proceedings; it will say, you cannot ever do it again.

The gentleman's amendment will give them the right to do it again. The gentleman's amendment says, exactly as the FCC wanted to say, that there are two categories of religious broadcasting, one educational religious, and then something else. They do not define it, do not know what it is, and guess who defines it under the gentleman's amendment? The same FCC that did the stupid thing they did in December.

That is the reason the gentleman's amendment needs to be defeated; not

because the gentleman had bad motives, not because our side has better or weaker motives than the gentleman, but because the amendment is wrong. It gives the FCC the power to do the stupid thing they tried to do in December. That amendment needs to be defeated.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this issue is historic in its nature. Many on the other side contend that they support the historic mission of the public broadcasting stations across the United States. Yet, in their amendment, their bill, they are going to remove the educational requirement for public broadcasting stations across the country, remove it.

No longer will there be a mandate that as part of the stewardship, part of the responsibility of controlling a public broadcasting station, that those individuals must serve the educational needs of the entire community. They are removing that. It is without question the core principle, the constitution that underlies the foundation of the public broadcasting stations in our country.

That is why the national PTA opposes their bill and supports the Markey amendment, the national PTA, the teachers, and the parents; and the National Education Association as well, and the Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, the Interfaith Alliance, the National Council of Churches of Christ. All of them support the Markey amendment and oppose the underlying bill.

The reason is that they have removed the educational requirement from educational TV. They are going to allow for religion to be the only thing which is on a public broadcasting station all day long, regardless of whether or not it has any educational content whatsoever.

Even though we concede that under existing law, existing law, that religious organizations are able to run and do run very well public broadcasting stations across this country, and they include a religious component to the maintenance of those TV stations, and that is fine. That should continue. Whether it be Christmas mass or Handel's Messiah, it should stay on public broadcasting TV stations. We agree with that.

Where we disagree and where the Markey amendment is so important is that we must ensure that the religious component does not replace the educational role as the primary responsibility of public broadcasting stations in this country.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody has really given on this side much thought to what this legislation does. Let us take a situation where a religious broadcaster or person who would be a religious broadcaster puts in an application and a group of educational broadcasters or would-be educational broadcasters put in an application. Then we have this occurring, we have a comparative proceeding before the FCC at which the FCC has to choose between the educational purpose for that station and essentially a religious purpose, with literally no real review, with no criteria whatsoever.

I challenge my friends on this side to come up with any criteria that a religious or would-be religious broadcaster has to present to the FCC. So we have two situations, probably a priority given to the religious broadcasters, but certainly, in any event, a choice has to be made then between the FCC having to decide whether they are going to have a bona fide religious broadcaster broadcasting on that particular wavelength or some religious group broadcasting nothing, nothing, there is no requirement for anything but religion on that particular wavelength.

We are setting up a most dangerous situation here. I would simply point out to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, he is going to bear the guilt of having done this to broadcasting, for having stripped the American children of opportunities to have real educational broadcasting.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, to use a ploy to say he (Mr. TAUZIN) bears a guilt is incorrect. Remember, two-thirds of the Democrats and 100 percent of the Republicans already voted to overturn the decision. So if the gentleman wants to point guilt, then he should point it to the gentleman's side of the aisle—namely, Democrats where two-thirds of the Democrats of the FCC Commission supported what we are doing today.

I point out in closing to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), if the Christmas mass is broadcast at Fort Pierce, Florida, at midnight on Christmas Eve, and then suddenly that station decides, it wants to also broadcast it on New Year's Eve, what happens? Suddenly the FCC is going to call them up and say, no, and using the gentleman's words, the FCC would say there is primarily not enough educational TV so we are going to have to stop you from broadcasting on New Year's Eve.

Vote against the Markey amendment.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), a prime sponsor and supporter of the legislation.

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

I am afraid that some people over at the FCC have been holding their cell phones too close to their brains, because this winter they have come up with a decision and decided that they know what is best for the American people, that they understand the difference between what is religious and what is educational, so they have issued an edict.

They said, Hi, I am from the FCC. We would like to offer you additional guidance in determining what is religious versus what is educational, and if it is not religious, then it does not count as educational; thus, no license. The FCC has really done this. They have made a value statement by saying that religious broadcasting is not educational.

It was an unprecedented move by the FCC to become the arbiter determining what constitutes religion and what does not. Do Members know what? The American people have rejected the decision and the help and the additional guidance by the FCC. Today this House will reinforce the view of the American people by rejecting the FCC's notion that they know what is best.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill that is on the floor today takes the word ''education'' out of public broadcasting. The bill that is on the floor here today takes the word ''education'' out of nonprofit educational television stations. The bill that is on the floor here today changes 50 years of American history with regard to the public's relationship with public broadcasting stations and removes the word ''education'' as a requirement, as a mandate, with regard to how the managers of a particular public broadcasting station have to serve an individual community.

If this bill passes, never again will there ever be a test applied by the Federal Communications Commission that ensures that the educational needs of the community are being served by a public broadcasting station. Instead, they insert the word ''religious'' without any definition, without any restrictions in terms of how many hours a day, how many weeks out of the year, how many years in a row; the totality, the entirety of the broadcasting can be religious on a public broadcasting station.

Historically, religions have been able to run public broadcasting stations, but using the guidance that they must be primarily educational. That is what the Markey amendment does. It requires that the educational goals that historically have been the core of public broadcasting stations are maintained, while still allowing for there to be a religious component, but within the larger context of educating the entire community and not just a subpart of that community.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me read the bill without the Markey amendment. It says that these licenses are reserved to people who prove ''that their organization serves an educational, instructional, cultural, or religious purpose.''

We have not taken ''educational'' out. What the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) wants to do is take ''religious'' out. He wants to insert ''educational religious.'' The word ''educational'' is still in. ''Educational, cultural, instructional, or religious'' is what the bill now says.

□ 1245

Proof it is just not so. What we are doing in the bill, what the Markey amendment would undo, is to prevent the Commission from qualifying which religious broadcasting is permitted.

I just attended the D-Day Museum dedication in New Orleans where we celebrate the greatest generation, what they fought for in World War II. They were fighting to preserve our Constitution and our freedoms. Our Constitution says the government needs to stay out of the business of religion in our country. Yet, this FCC tried to get into it. This bill keeps them out. The Markey amendment lets government get back in.

We need to defeat the Markey amendment and adopt the original bill.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The substitute amendment by Mr. MARKEY will effectively gut the legislation before us.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, the goal of the substitute amendment is to require all public broadcasters to serve an ''educational'' purpose. It even creates a new category of programming serving an ''educational religious purposes.'' This sounds acceptable on its face as education is a very high priority and I commend the public broadcasters that focus on education.

However, a good number of public broadcasters use public television stations to provide religious programming to their communities. And the FCC tried quite unsuccessfully in December to restrict what type of programming could be done. They tried to put a clamp on programming that they viewed as not having an educational message, like church services.

Some people within the FCC want to be in the content regulation business. They want to be able to dictate to religious broadcasters what religious programming is acceptable and that which is not.

Picture, if you will, several of the over 2000 bureaucrats at the FCC watching and listening to religious programming and deciding which parts serve an ''educational religious purpose.'' To me, this picture is frightening and unacceptable.

This amendment would serve only to continue the confusion as to who is eligible for noncommercial licenses.

I do not want the FCC involved in content regulation of public television stations, especially those that provide a religious message and content.

The substitute amendment is clearly harmful to the original intent of the H.R. 4201 and would make the bill meaningless.

This is why I must respectfully oppose Mr. MARKEY's amendment and urge all Members to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 527, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 174, nays 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

YEAS—174

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stabenow
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—250

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Cook
Emerson
Ewing
McCollum
McIntosh
Roybal-Allard
Spratt
Vento
Weldon (PA)

□ 1307

Messrs. CUNNINGHAM, KUCINICH, BOSWELL, COSTELLO, and REYES changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DAVIS of Florida changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 264, noes 259, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—264

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Etheridge
Everett
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—159

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stabenow
Stark
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Conyers
Cook
Cunningham
Emerson
Ewing
Herger
McCollum
McIntosh
Roybal-Allard
Vento

□ 1327

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4201.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such record votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

□ 1330

DEBT REDUCTION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4601) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 213(c) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 to reduce the public debt and to decrease the statutory limit on the public debt, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4601

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Debt Reduction Reconciliation Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) fiscal discipline, resulting from the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and strong economic growth have ended decades of deficit spending and have produced budget surpluses without using the social security surplus;

(2) fiscal pressures will mount in the future as the aging of the population increases budget obligations;

(3) until Congress and the President agree to legislation that strengthens social security, the social security surplus should be used to reduce the debt held by the public;

(4) strengthening the Government's fiscal position through public debt reduction increases national savings, promotes economic growth, reduces interest costs, and is a constructive way to prepare for the Government's future budget obligations; and

(5) it is fiscally responsible and in the long-term national economic interest to use an additional portion of the nonsocial security surplus to reduce the debt held by the public.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to—

(1) reduce the debt held by the public with the goal of eliminating this debt by 2013; and

(2) decrease the statutory limit on the public debt.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF PUBLIC DEBT REDUCTION PAYMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§3114. Public debt reduction payment account

''(a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States an account to be known as

the Public Debt Reduction Payment Account (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'account').

''(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall use amounts in the account to pay at maturity, or to redeem or buy before maturity, any obligation of the Government held by the public and included in the public debt. Any obligation which is paid, redeemed, or bought with amounts from the account shall be canceled and retired and may not be reissued. Amounts deposited in the account are appropriated and may only be expended to carry out this section.

''(c) If the Congressional Budget Office estimates an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 in the report submitted pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in excess of the amount of the surplus set forth for that fiscal year in section 101(4) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 (House Concurrent Resolution 290, 106th Congress), then there is hereby appropriated into the account on the later of the date of enactment of this Act or the date upon which the Congressional Budget Office submits such report, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, an amount equal to that excess. The funds appropriated to this account shall remain available until expended.

''(d) The appropriation made under subsection (c) shall not be considered direct spending for purposes of section 252 of Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

''(e) Establishment of and appropriations to the account shall not affect trust fund transfers that may be authorized under any other provision of law.

''(f) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall each take such actions as may be necessary to promptly carry out this section in accordance with sound debt management policies.

''(g) Reducing the debt pursuant to this section shall not interfere with the debt management policies or goals of the Secretary of the Treasury.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3113 the following:

''3114. Public debt reduction payment account.''.

SEC. 4. REDUCTION OF STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''minus the amount appropriated into the Public Debt Reduction Payment Account pursuant to section 3114(c)'' after ''$5,950,000,000,000''.

SEC. 5. OFF-BUDGET STATUS OF PUBLIC DEBT REDUCTION PAYMENT ACCOUNT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the Public Debt Reduction Payment Account established by section 3114 of title 31, United States Code, shall not be counted as new budget authority, outlays, receipts, or deficit or surplus for purposes of—

(1) the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President,

(2) the congressional budget, or

(3) the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 6. REMOVING PUBLIC DEBT REDUCTION PAYMENT ACCOUNT FROM BUDGET PRONOUNCEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any official statement issued by the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government of surplus or deficit totals of the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President or of the surplus or deficit totals of the congressional budget, and any description of, or reference to, such totals in any official publication or material issued by either of such Offices or any other such agency or instrumentality, shall exclude the outlays and receipts of the Public Debt Reduction Payment Account established by section 3114 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) SEPARATE PUBLIC DEBT REDUCTION PAYMENT ACCOUNT BUDGET DOCUMENTS.—The excluded outlays and receipts of the Public Debt Reduction Payment Account established by section 3114 of title 31, United States Code, shall be submitted in separate budget documents.

SEC. 7. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—(1) Within 30 days after the appropriation is deposited into the Public Debt Reduction Payment Account under section 3114 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate confirming that such account has been established and the amount and date of such deposit. Such report shall also include a description of the Secretary's plan for using such money to reduce debt held by the public.

(2) Not later than October 31, 2000, and October 31, 2001, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate setting forth the amount of money deposited into the Public Debt Reduction Payment Account, the amount of debt held by the public that was reduced, and a description of the actual debt instruments that were redeemed with such money.

(b) REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—Not later than November 15, 2001, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate verifying all of the information set forth in the reports submitted under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4601.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important moment for the House of Representatives because with this bill we will be accelerating our effort to pay down the debt to give relief, badly needed relief to future generations. I am hopeful that in the end there will be a strong bipartisan vote for what is truly historic, and, that is, to reduce for the first time since 1917 the statutory debt limit.

In the past, the debt simply was an afterthought. While we were deficit spending, we spent and spent and frequently raised taxes, sometimes cut taxes. What was left over at the end of the year in deficit increased the debt, and we simply rubber-stamped that. Today in a time of surplus, we are doing the same thing. Everything that is left over at the end of the year in the surplus pays down the debt automatically. The problem is that once you satiate the spending opportunities during the year, what is left at the end of the year is much, much smaller to pay down the debt. So we are taking a step here to lock up the increase in surplus over and above what we anticipated when we passed our budget earlier in the year, lock that up in a special account in the Treasury which can be used only to pay down the debt. That is why we can reduce the debt ceiling.

The Debt Reduction Reconciliation Act of 2000 has been designed by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and myself, and it will put us on a path to pay off the debt by 2013 or sooner.

I have already explained what the bill does and how it works. It applies only, however, to this year's extra surplus, the year 2000. But once it is put in place, it will be a model for future years. That is why the Concord Coalition, one of the best known bipartisan groups that fights for balanced budgets and fiscal discipline, supports this bill. They said in a letter that this bill is fiscally responsible. It recognizes the benefit of using today's prosperity to improve the Nation's long-term fiscal health.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the full letter be inserted in the RECORD.

THE CONCORD COALITION,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2000.

Chairman BILL ARCHER,
House Ways and Means Committee, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ARCHER: The Concord Coalition is pleased to support ''The Debt Reduction and Reconciliation Act of 2000,'' which seeks to ensure that any increase in the projected FY 2000 on-budget surplus will be used to pay down the publicly held debt.

The Concord Coalition has long urged both Congress and the Administration to resist using projected surpluses as a treasure trove of money to be spent on any number of spending or tax cut proposals. ''The Debt Reduction and Reconciliation Act of 2000'' is a fiscally responsible measure that recognizes the benefit of using today's prosperity to improve the nation's long term fiscal health.

We are heartened by the improvement in the federal government's short-term fiscal position in recent years and encouraged by the prospect of continued projected surpluses. Members of both parties deserve a share of the credit for this dramatic turn around and the resulting projected surpluses. The Concord Coalition fully supports the commitment in this bill to use a portion of these surpluses for debt reduction. We further hope that Congress and the Administration will muster the political will to make good on this commitment.

At the same time, it is important to remember that our work is far from complete. Reducing the publicly held debt is a positive step, but is one of many steps required to bring about fiscal policies that are sustainable over the long-term. Welcome as it is, today's prosperity has not turned back the coming age wave or the growth in age-related entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Left unchecked, the inevitable growth in spending

on these programs will put pressure on discretionary spending, revenues, and public debt.

That said, in the absence of substantive Social Security and Medicare reform, the next best thing we can do to prepare for the future is to devote every penny of the surpluses that come our way to reducing the publicly held debt. Debt reduction will enhance net national savings, thereby freeing up resources for investments leading to greater productivity, which will lead to stronger economic growth in the future. A larger economy will, in turn, help ease the burden on today's children who, when they become working age taxpayers, will face the daunting challenge of financing the retirement and health care costs of a dramatically older population.

The Concord Coalition commends you for your effort to reduce the publicly held debt. We are pleased to support your efforts and look forward to working with you to take future steps to improve our nation's long term fiscal health.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. BIXBY,
Executive Director.

Mr. Speaker, when we balanced the budget and the budget surplus became a reality, Alan Greenspan told the Committee on Ways and Means that his first preference would be to pay down the debt. He also said the worst alternative would be more government spending. Today we are following his wise counsel. Paying down the debt is good for our country, good for working families, and good for the economy.

I strongly urge a bipartisan vote to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) so that he can further yield it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa will control the balance of the time.

There was no objection.

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

I say this in no disrespect to any of my colleagues on the floor of the House of Representatives, and certainly I intend to support this legislation; but I have to say that I think we are going to spend perhaps up to 40 minutes debating something that is not particularly relevant and it is probably somewhat a waste of our time.

The reality is that any surplus over and above the current surplus that we have, and most people predict that for this coming fiscal year it will be about $15 billion, will go into debt reduction in any event. The only thing that could change it is if the majority party decides not to show the kind of fiscal discipline that I think the rhetoric kind of indicates they intend to. And so we will be doing this, we are all probably going to vote for it, but again as I said this is more of a political act than it is an act of substance.

Under current law, if at the end of the fiscal year we do not spend any of the additional surplus that we have, it will go automatically for debt reduction. Under this bill, it is appropriated into a fund set up by the Treasury Department that will go for debt reduction. And so it will not hurt, but it does not really help either. If for some reason the Senate or the House or any party should decide through a majority vote that they want to spend more money, then obviously that would change the situation. But then that is a judgment to be made by Members as time goes on.

Again, as I said, we will vote for this; but it really does not do a lot of good. But it does give me an opportunity actually to bring out some things, if I may. Governor George W. Bush indicated earlier this year that he has a tax cut proposal and over the next decade his tax cuts will be $1.7 trillion. He also suggested individual Social Security accounts which would take away from the current beneficiaries. And he suggested somewhere in the range of 2 percent although he has not really elaborated on it. But assuming it is 2 percent, that basically then means that you would have to make that up for current beneficiaries, and that comes as somewhat a little over $1 trillion.

So we are talking about $2.7 trillion of additional debt or money out of the surplus over the next decade. Right now the projected on-budget surplus is $877 billion. And so essentially the Governor will spend over the next decade three times what that surplus will be. Now, we understand by the end of this month, OMB and CBO will come in with another $1 trillion worth of surpluses over the next decade, and so that means that you can actually say that actually he will only then be overbudgeted, or over the surplus by $1 trillion.

Now, if we were really being honest about this, what we would do is not just make it for this fiscal year but we would do it for the next 10 fiscal years. But this is only for the next 18 months or so.

So we will save $15 billion, but that money is going to be saved in any event. Obviously we are going to recommend that our colleagues vote for this; but the reality is again, it is a political act. It is not a substantive act. I am just kind of sorry that we are spending our 40 minutes of debate time on this legislation.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), the author of this legislation and somebody who does concern himself with debt reduction.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is really with a great privilege that I get to stand here and introduce this legislation. I recall back just after I was first sworn in, we heard the President of the United States stand up and say he wanted to spend 38 percent of the Social Security. We met in the Committee on the Budget, and we were able to save 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. We continue to exercise fiscal discipline. Because of that, we have surpluses now and will have paid off the publicly held debt by about $300 billion over the last several years.

This bill is about several things. One, it is about priorities, about setting our priorities. Are we going to spend money on more and bigger government? Let me say the minority and the President have offered continually budgets and amendments that would spend and spend and spend on more government programs, on larger government, not on paying down the debt or giving some relief to the American people. So this allows us to say, Look, we have a priority here, and our priorities are, yes, let's pay down the publicly held debt.

Some have said it is not significant but, believe me, I had a young lady, a Girl Scout here last week that came up and we talked about this bill. She figured her family's debt and how many boxes of Girl Scout cookies she would have to sell to pay off her family's portion of the publicly held debt. She would have to sell 19,000 boxes of Girl Scout cookies for her to pay off her family's publicly held debt. That to me is significant to folks back home. To somebody who thinks $16 billion is insignificant and to historically appropriate that to an account in the Department of Treasury, it is just beyond my belief that anyone would believe that that is not significant.

Lastly, this is historic. Why is it historic? Because it is the first time we have said, ''Let's appropriate money.'' We take it off the table. And if people who have been around Washington too long do not understand that, then it is clear they need to go back home and visit with their folks. This takes the money off the table and will allow us to pay down the debt.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, Groucho Marx said that the main requirement to be a good politician is to appear to be serious. The Washington Post recently commented on the performance of the majority in this Congress by calling this ''the pretend Congress.''

This is one of the new acts. This debt reduction bill here pretends to do something. We are all called here together, we are going to be serious, we are going to give pompous speeches about how we are going to reduce the debt, and we are saving America, and all those Girl Scout cookies and all that stuff will just be fixed by this bill.

Now, the chairman at least was honest, and I really acknowledge the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) honesty. This bill is effective from now until September 30, 2000. It does not quite make it all the way through the election. So it is not really a very good pretend item. It would be better if it

went at least until November 8. But this is a bill for 4 months.

Now, you ask yourself, why would anybody be doing such a thing? Well, if you come up to a new reestimate of the revenue estimates here very shortly, the CBO and the OMB are going to come out with a whole bunch more money. Clearly the majority is afraid that they are going to spend it. They cannot save themselves. They have all the votes. This is your problem. We have the votes, as the majority over there, and they are going to put more money on the table and if you do not pass this bill, you will not be able to stop yourself from spending it. That is what this is about, I guess. Or maybe it is not about that.

The fact is that we have a situation where the Treasury does not need this bill to pay off more debt. If we get to the end of the fiscal year and there is some money there, they reduce the debt. They do not have to borrow. It is real simple. They do not need us to pass H.R. 4601 to tell them what they have been doing for 200 years. If they have a surplus, they buy down some of the debt. But this is a symbolic act, as my colleague from California says. I thought this would be on Friday, because this is usually the news cycle on Friday, they want to have something that says the Republicans today have passed a bill to encourage reduction of the debt.

Now, if you think about it, if you want to reduce the debt, you do not give big tax breaks, because taxes bring in money. And if you cut the taxes, there will not be any money to pay off the debt. So when you come out here and vote for tax cut after tax cut after tax cut and then say, And we want to reduce the debt, you simply are not making any sense. There are only two ways to have the money to pay off the debt, either take the taxes and pay it off or reduce the spending and pay it off, one or the other.

□ 1345

I do not see any evidence so far in this appropriations process that we are actually reducing spending. In fact, we are going up a little bit, and probably we are going to need some of this money along about September the 15 to solve the problem to buy off this program or that program so we can get out of here. All we have to do under this bill, we do not have to repeal the act, we do not have to do anything, just pass the supplemental appropriation.

This can be violated by the most simplistic legislative act of all, just bring out another bill, spend some more money, in spite of the fact that we have passed H.R. 4601, the debt reduction bill. This bill will die in the Senate from laughter. There will not be anybody over there that takes this seriously.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, we on the majority side appreciate the very strong endorsement, bipartisan way of this debt reduction bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by the way, lowering taxes increases the revenue to the Government and, unfortunately, gives us a surplus, which is what has happened since the Republicans have been in for 40 years. The Democrats ran the House and the Democrats ran up the debt by spending your money like it was their own.

The Democrats used deficit spending to fund more and more Washington programs. The debt ballooned and they raised taxes over and over again. Paying down the debt was never on the Democrat agenda. Well, times have changed. In just 5 short years with the Republicans in charge, we have turned a billion-dollar deficit into trillion-dollar surpluses.

Under our plan, we are going to eliminate publicly held debt by 2013 or sooner; that is because we believe debt relief is a top priority. That is why this bill mandates that any increase in the surplus must be used to pay down the debt.

This year we believe that will be close to $40 billion. Paying down the debt is going to help all Americans. It will lower mortgage costs and interest rates. More importantly, the American people expect our books to be balanced and our debts to be paid. We have to do it in our own homes, and we must do it in the people's House.

The American people are fed up with 40 years of out- of-control spending by the Democrats, and they want Washington to get its house in order. Those who oppose this bill or believe it is not necessary are playing games with the American people and their money.

Today, we are going to tear up the Democrats' big-spending playbook and get serious about our children's future by eliminating our Nation's debt once and for all.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear some of the protests from the left. My good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), professionally trained as a psychiatrist, seemed to suggest that somehow this was pretend.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a common definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different outcome. And if we take a look at the history of the late 20th century, when this House was in different hands, Mr. Speaker, the folks on the left spent and spent and spent and spent and spent some more and raided Social Security and took everything not nailed down and added inflation and did the whole thing, the whole bit, spending money we did not have and yet would return home, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the importance of debt relief.

Let no one be mistaken. This is not delusional. This is not pretend. It is not a political stunt. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since 1916 we are voting to lower the debt ceiling.

We have heard loud and clear from our constituents that they are tired of seeing deficit spending; that as we have put our House in order, by reducing taxes and thereby increasing revenues to the Federal Government, by actually generating more business in the free market and more commerce, at the same time we need to get our fiscal House in order and the gentleman from Kentucky has offered a device to do exactly that.

It is not symbolic. In fact, it is historic, because we lower the debt ceiling. We signal our commitment to reduce deficit spending; and unlike those who have tried different outcomes over and over again expecting a different result, we make a difference today.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain why this is important: although most Americans assume that a Federal budget surplus in any year is automatically used to reduce the national debt or at least the debt held by the public, this actually is not the case.

The U.S. Department of the Treasury must implement specific financial accounting procedures if it is to use a cash surplus to pay down the debt held by the public. If these procedures are not followed or if they proceed slowly, then the surplus revenue just builds up in the Treasury-operating cash accounts.

This excess cash could be used in the future, yes, to pay down the debt, but only if it is protected from other uses in the meantime. Until the excess cash is formally committed to debt repayment, Congress could appropriate it for other purposes.

Consequently, the current surplus will not automatically reduce the publicly held national debt of $3.54 trillion, unless Congress acts now to make sure these funds are automatically used for debt reduction and for no other purpose.

That is exactly what this bill H.R. 4601 does; and, frankly, this offers a first step toward paying down the debt, because it protects the on-budget surplus for the remainder of this fixed fiscal year, and it appropriates it directly for debt reduction.

This money will be deposited in a designated public debt reduction account. Appropriators would be able to reallocate these funds only by first passing a law to rescind the money from this account.

Now, the debt is a huge drain on the Federal Treasury at a time when the impending Social Security crisis looms closer. Our current national debt problem pales in comparison to the unfunded liabilities already committed to current and future Social Security recipients. It is important we pay down this debt.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing today from our colleagues on the other side that perhaps this measure is more symbolic than substantive and might not really accomplish that much. I could not more strongly disagree. The previous speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), made it very clear, and quite rightly, that absent this measure, there is absolutely nothing to stop Congress from spending this money. Of course, if one knows anything about the history of Congress, one knows that that is indeed the proclivity of this body, as well as the other Chamber to do exactly that.

Let me touch on a specific situation and put this in some context. Where are we right now in the 2001 appropriations process? We are trying to pass a series of measures and the President is insisting that he needs another $20 billion or $25 billion above and beyond that record high level of spending that we are proposing.

We hear our colleagues from the other side come down here every time we debate an appropriations bill to tell us we are not spending enough money. One of the ways that this spending can occur is by a devious little budget gimmick which involves reaching back into the previous year, in this case that would be fiscal year 2000, and spending the money there so that we create the illusion of some modicum of fiscal restraint, when, in fact, it is not recurring.

One of the things we need to do is take this money off the table so that it is not available for that kind of gimmickry, so that the American public gets the budget that they are being told and so that we pay down this debt, this mountain of debt which we have made some progress on but need to make much more.

There is one other point that I would like to make on this. Why is it important that we not just spend this money? Why is it important to limit the growth and the spending of the Federal Government? It is important because we need to remember every dollar that is spent by the Federal Government is the political allocation of other people's money, and we need to minimize that whenever we can and allow the hard-working men and women across this country who are producing the wealth in this country to spend their own hard-earned money as they choose rather than the way that politicians choose. That is why this measure is so important.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, before I call on the next speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I might just point out to the gentleman and previous speakers on the other side of the aisle that the public debt for the fiscal year 2000 is $5.628 trillion, $5.628 trillion; and under the Republican budget in 2005, 5 years from now, the public debt will go to $5.936 trillion, so it is going to go up under the Republican budget.

I might just point out that instead of all of this talk about reducing it, it is actually going to increase. I might want to emphasize that it is going to increase. I just hope that they would look at the budget document; and perhaps they could clarify it if they so choose.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) for yielding me the time.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that one of our candidates for President is running under the theory that it is time to change the old concept that if it feels good, do it. But the bill that we have before us today fits into that. Now, I know my colleagues on the other side have this new-found desire to put their imprimatur on paying down the debt.

It is interesting, because over the last couple of years, they really have not been in that position. They wanted to spend the surplus as fast as they could get their hands on it. In fact, they wanted to spend it far into the future and not even knowing what it is.

I offered amendments, as my dear friend from Iowa (Mr. Nussle) will remember, when we marked up the budget resolutions over the last couple of years, just to have hard freezes and pay down the debt as fast as we could, and I was lectured by the other side that this did not make any sense, and we really should not do it, we should not shackle the Congress' future ability to make the investments that it needs.

Today, we have this bill before us; and we are all going to vote for it, because we all or at least most of us do believe in at least some form of debt reduction whether we do with the belts and suspender approach like this or just do it as it works automatically under current law, but it does not comport as well with the budget resolution that this House passed not too long ago. Because the budget resolution we passed not too long ago says that in future years, if the Congressional Budget Office finds that the surplus projections are actually higher than what was assumed earlier this year, then we could spend that money on additional tax cuts or spending programs or whatever.

Mr. Speaker, now we have decided in this midcourse correction that we are going to say, no, we are going to set this very static limitation on what we ought to be doing with this money.

I just have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very happy to welcome my Republican colleagues to the party of paying down the public debt. I do not think this bill is as well written as it could be. I do not think it comports with the budget resolution that my colleagues passed earlier this year. Hopefully, this will move them a little closer in the right direction of continuing what has been the greatest expansion in the American economy under this administration.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER).

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, let me address a few things. First of all, when it comes to the other side after years and years of running up deficits over $200 billion a year, I can think of no more amazing conversion than Paul on the road to Damascus.

We certainly have seen a conversion from the other side now that all of a sudden they are the party of fiscal responsibility wanting to pay down the debt. So we certainly appreciate that conversion and hope that as these appropriation bills come up that we do not see some of their regular antics.

□ 1400

As we close out this year, we have set aside this $16 billion, which is significant, very much different than any time before. The publicly held debt is not over $5 trillion, the debt limit is, the publicly held debt is $3.5 trillion. So let me correct that. Obviously, when you add up the debt we owe ourself and the other trust funds, Social Security, et cetera, it does exceed $5 trillion.

But the publicly held debt is $3.5 trillion. We pay interest on that, about 11 cents of every dollar that comes in in revenues. That would increase our revenue, if we paid that down, which we plan on doing with the principle of this bill. By the year 2013, we will pay it down. By 2013, that will increase our revenues by about $180 billion a year. So I wanted to rebut these misstatements.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we will support this bill because there is no reason to oppose it. All it does is enact the inevitable. You see, when Treasury takes in more money than it spends, it simply uses the surplus, the excess money, to pay off debt. It does not sit on the money. It has debt coming due at all times. It pays the debt off, retires the debt, uses the surplus in that manner. So I am

mystified when I read this bill by what substantively it is supposed to do.

The majority acts as though if we do not put this money in this debt reduction payment account and seal it off, we are going to spend it. But this just begs the question. This is June 20th. The fiscal year ends on September 30. We will not have the incremental additional surplus numbers until some time in July. We are out a whole week in July, we are out for the whole month of August. When are we going to spend it, and who is going to spend it?

Who controls the appropriations process? The majority does. They determine what comes to the floor, what is in it and what passes, because they have the votes. So it is hard to see how this money is going to be spent between now and September 30, when they control the process, unless they elect to spend it on a fast track.

That raises the next question. If debt reduction is such a good idea, and I think it is a good idea, why does this bill just apply to this fiscal year? Why does the bill present itself in this form applicable for just 3 months remaining in this fiscal year? Why does it just apply to the increase in the surplus, for that matter? There is a $24 billion base surplus already projected. If debt reduction is a good idea, why do we not set aside some of that surplus, allocate it to debt reduction?

Why not even go further? Why do we not take a bill and put it on this floor, a bill that does not just apply to fiscal year 2000, but to the next 10 fiscal years, until we have retired the total debt, which simply says out of every surplus we actually realize in the next 10 years we will set aside 50 percent, or make it 33 percent, or 65 percent, some fixed percentage every year allocated by law to debt reduction, if it is such a good idea?

I think it is, and I think it would be a good idea before we actually have that money and it is burning a hole in our pocket, some wanting to use it for tax cuts and others wanting to use it for spending increases, let us allocate a certain amount of it by black letter law to debt reduction. We could do that in this bill, but it does not do that. This bill only applies for 90 days.

If debt reduction is the majority's top priority, I am also mystified, because I was on the floor here when we presented the budget resolutions, our competing resolution and their resolution, which passed and which became the concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 2001. It allocates all of the additional surplus, all of the surplus that CBO finds over and above the baseline surplus they project now, it takes all of that additional surplus and allocates it to tax cuts. There is a specific clause in their budget resolution for this year under which we are now operating which permits and encourages them to use all of the additional surplus for tax cuts.

If it is such a good idea to use it for debt reduction, why did they not make the allocation there in the budget resolution, which is the operative resolution we have got?

As a result of that allocation in their budget resolution, we presented a budget resolution that would reduce debt over the next 5 years by $48 billion and over the next 10 years by $365 billion. Their budget resolution, by contrast, reduced debt by only $12 billion, because it allocated all of the additional surplus not to debt reduction, as this bill would imply, but to tax reduction.

So, what do we have here? We have a bill that is absolutely minimal in its impact on the national debt, if it has any at all. The chairman, whom I respect, the distinguished chairman said this could be a model for future years. If it is a model, let us take it and apply it to future years. Let us say a certain amount of the surplus every year is going to be set aside to debt reduction. Let us not fool ourselves and the American people by adopting something which will have little if any impact on the actual reduction in the national debt.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of very interesting discussion here today. You have the minority party rushing down here to support this legislation, but, boy it is tough. It is tough. I mean, the speeches we are hearing today, about, gee, we would really like to reduce the debt, but there are all these other priorities out here; and, yeah, we will vote for it, but, gosh, it is really tough.

You know, it is tough. I talked to a financial planner one time about how he counsels people that find themselves in debt, and the first thing he says when he counsels people is, when you find yourselves in a hole, stop digging. That is rule number one. It makes sense. And that is what we did a few years ago. We found ourselves in deficits, we were adding to the national debt, we wanted to end that 40-year practice, and we said stop digging, balance the budget, and that is what we did.

But then the second rule that the financial planner from Manchester, Iowa, taught me is he said start filling in the hole. Start filling in the hole that you dug. And you do not do that at the end of the year after you have bought all of the Girl Scout cookies; you do not do that at the end of the year after all of the things you want you have purchased and you have made decisions about. You put debt as a priority.

That is the difference with this bill. The gentleman from South Carolina is exactly correct. If we did nothing else this year, the Treasury at the end of the year will take what is in excess and they will pay down the debt. There is one problem: We do not know what that excess is going to be.

The difference with this bill and the difference with this Congress and the difference with this priority is that we are deciding today that debt reduction is a priority. Yes, we can wait until the end of the day, and the gentleman is correct when he said yeah, you are the majority party, you can decide whether or not you are going to spend it or not, whether you are going to use it for tax cuts or whether you are going to reduce the debt. We are deciding today. Let us reduce the debt.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: The gentleman from Iowa said that we think this is tough to vote for this. I do not think any Member on our side of the aisle said anything about this being a tough bill. If anything, this is one of the easiest pieces of legislation in my 22 years in this institution to vote for, because it does not mean anything, it is irrelevant, and it is, I guess, kind of fun sitting up here for 40 minutes talking about something that is meaningless, when we have all these appropriations bills we have to pass by the end of next week. But, nevertheless, I guess we will do it. There is nothing else to do here.

But I would like to just reiterate what my colleague said from South Carolina, that, you know, we should probably make this for 10 years, because if in fact we have the wrong presidential candidate elected, we are going to spend two or three times over the surplus here. As I said in my opening remarks, Mr. Bush intends to reduce the surplus, if there is a surplus, by $2.7 trillion over the next decade, and right now we only are projecting $877 billion in surplus. We may get another $1 trillion, according to CBO and OMB. So he will still be twice over the surplus.

So perhaps we should make this a proposal that will go for the next decade, because, after all, we saw what happened in the early 1980s when we let our emotions get ahead of our discipline. We finally got the budget under control under President Clinton. I would hate to see us lose control over it when he leaves office, but we very well could. So perhaps we should use some kind of gimmick like the debt limit to impose discipline, since it appears the majority party cannot use that discipline on its own.

I might just conclude by saying what Nancy Reagan said when it came to drugs: ''Just say no.'' That is leadership.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, we are about to just say no to more spending.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), the author of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly very pleased to have bipartisan support and bipartisan rhetoric on this floor. Let me first correct a few things though. This does do something different than what is done. Right now,

at this point, it is really contrary to popular convention. There is no Federal law that exists that requires surpluses at the end of the fiscal years to be used to reduce the debt. It is the stated practice of the Treasury. In reality, there is some cash the Treasury holds.

Let me give an example. Despite the surplus of $124 billion in fiscal year 1999, the Treasury reduced publicly held debt by just $87 billion. Even when accounting for the seasonal variation, the Treasury will have a cash balance of about $60 billion if this rate continues over the next 2 years.

What this piece of legislation does and what is historical about it is it will set a pattern for the next decade. It allows us, like we do every year when we are appropriating money, to have an account to which we can appropriate money for debt reduction, and certain instruction is given to the Department of Treasury to reduce the debt with that money in that account.

Now, the Treasury has the responsibility to reduce it in a responsible and efficient way, so that the taxpayer's money is used most efficiently, so that we buy the most expensive bonds and redeem those so that we reduce the cost to the taxpayers as much as possible.

This bill also reduces the publicly held debt limit and the total debt limit of government, the first time it has been done since 1916. This bill sets us on a pattern to totally eliminate the publicly held debt by the year 2013.

I think that is a noble goal. That will increase our revenues tremendously as more money goes back out into the economy to continue the economy's growth. Yet in this last budget, they have talked about tax reductions versus this debt reduction bill. Let me remind you, the President offered a bill that increased spending and programs, that offered 83 new programs. This money was going to be spent, and if we do not take it off of the table right now, it will be spent here in Washington before the end of the year.

This money is appropriated to a new debt reduction account in the Department of Treasury. That is historical. Every year we have this pattern by which when we go through appropriations we can set debt reduction as a priority and set aside that money into this debt reduction account. If the majority decides that they want to spend more on government, they have that option, or if they decide they want to make our taxes fair, which I think is important.

We heard the minority talk about when we tried and did pass out of this House the marriage penalty tax, how they spoke about it being unfair and about how it was too much to give back to the American people, and it really points out the difference in philosophy here.

Let me show you this check. Some have said it is insignificant. $16 billion. Look at the number of zeros on that. That is not an insignificant number that is going to be deposited in this debt reduction account to pay down the publicly held debt. Now, maybe some have been in Washington too long if they think that is an insignificant amount, and maybe some have been in Washington too long if they think if they do not take off the money it will be spent. But, believe me, I have only been here a year and a half, and I understand if you do not take it off the table, it will be spent.

I am very proud of this legislation, and I want to thank the leadership, the chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), and others that worked to write this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4601, a bill to pay down our public debt. I urge my colleagues to support this worthy legislation.

H.R. 4601 requires that at the end of fiscal year 2000, an amount equal to the non-Social Security surplus be used to pay down the public debt. These funds will be deposited in an off-budget account within the U.S. Treasury, referred to as the ''public debt reduction payment account.''

Moreover, within thirty days after the end of fiscal year 2000, the Treasury Department must report to Congress the amount of money deposited into the account, and how those funds were used to pay down the debt. The amount stipulated in this report must be verified by the Comptroller General of the United States.

While current law stipulates that surplus money at the end of the fiscal year must be used to pay down the debt, this legislation ensures that these excess monies are placed in a fund to prevent their use during the next fiscal year for any other purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has made great progress in the last three years with ending our long-standing pattern of deficit spending. This bill will further aid the effort to ''live within our means,'' and to avoid a return to spending more than the revenues raised. As we continue to make progress in reducing our overall level of public debt, we will free up billions of dollars that are currently being used to finance the interest on that debt. Lower interest leads to more discretionary dollars to use on investing for the future, and an avoidance of mortgaging the future of our children.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this timely and appropriate legislation.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4601, the Debt Reduction and Reconciliation Act of 2000. More importantly, I rise in support of paying down $14 billion of the debt that will otherwise be left to our children and grandchildren.

The fiscal restraint we can show today by passing this legislation is critical to avoiding the tax and spend trap that brought us into deficit in the first place.

Just five years ago, many in Washington, including the President, did not believe we could balance the budget by the year 2005, let alone 2002 or, as it turned out, 1998. But with the help of the American people and a strong economy, we did it.

Last year, we made another commitment—to balance the federal budget without spending one penny of the Social Security surplus in the year 2000. Once again, we were able to accomplish that goal one-year ahead of schedule.

Now, we have a new challenge—to find a way to pay back the mortgage of federal debt that we owe rather than leaving it to generations to come. We want to pay down the publicly held debt by 2013. Looking back at our track record, I think we can do it—maybe even ahead of schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to join this effort to eliminate the publicly held debt and pass this bill today with an overwhelmingly, bi-partisan vote.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4601, the Debt Reduction Reconciliation Act of 2000, and encourage my colleagues to enthusiastically pursue its enactment as soon as possible.

Since Republicans took over the majority in Congress in 1995, we have worked hard to bring fiscal responsibility back to Washington. H.R. 4601 is one more step on this long road. This bill will ensure that the federal government's days of spending beyond our means are really behind us.

Mr. Speaker, those who claim that this bill is irresponsible or merely a publicity stunt are way off-base. In fact, the Debt Reduction Reconciliation Act is an eminently sensible compromise that allows us to cut taxes for hard working American families and small businesses, reduce the federal debt, and protect 100 percent of our Social Security system for our seniors and retirees. At the same time, it also provides sufficient funding for important government programs—like allowing us to increase funding for such essential programs as education, national security, and prescription drug benefits for our seniors.

H.R. 4601 is very straightforward. It will take all of this year's federal non-Social Security surplus funds over and above the anticipated $24.4 billion surplus we were told to expect earlier this year, and lock it away in a new special ''off budget'' account that will be used exclusively for paying off the national public debt. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office is expected to announce this summer that this year's budget surplus will be at least $40 billion. That's $14.6 billion that, under this legislation, would be dedicated to debt reduction this year.

In addition, for every dollar locked away into this national debt-payment account, H.R. 4601 will lower the authorized federal debt ceiling that the federal government is allowed to borrow up to, dollar for dollar. This ceiling is like an authorized federal credit line and it currently allows the government to incur up to $5.95 trillion in debt. Can you imagine—$5.95 trillion of debt? Not too long ago, Democratic budgets projected this kind of debt as far as the eye could see. Now, Mr. Speaker, with enactment of this legislation, Congress for the first time since 1917, will lower the debt ceiling instead of increasing it.

Why should we care about reducing our national debt? Beyond the fact that past irresponsible government borrowing has mortgaged the future of our children and grandchildren and saddled them with a debt that they did not create—reducing our multi-trillion national debt will lower government interest

payments which currently consume hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars each and every year. Anyone who has a credit card knows, as long as you are only paying for the interest charges, you will never dig yourself out of the hold and can only find yourself at best treading water, and at worst sinking in to a quagmire of red ink. Thanks to decades of Democratically-controlled Congresses, America has been in the red for far too long. By dedicating these funds to paying down the debt, we will not only reach our goal to eliminate the public debt by 2013, we will also be able to continue to cut taxes to further relieve American workers of the heavy tax burden they bear and even increase savings. In addition, lowering the federal debt will also relieve the debt's upward pressure on interest rates, which means cheaper car loans, school loans, mortgage loans, and even home improvement loans for hardworking American families.

To be frank, Congress also needs this debt reduction legislation to remove the temptation to spend any unexpected budget surpluses. Let's face it folks, Washington is not known for keeping their hands out of the cookie jar. It's time to get the chain and padlock and secure these funds out of temptation's way and keep ourselves, and those who follow us here in Congress and in the White House, on this hard-fought road to fiscal responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this much needed legislation, and encourage an enthusiastic ''yes'' vote on H.R. 4601.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, deficit spending has run rampant for too long. The federal debt has ballooned to nearly $6 trillion. With this legislation for the first time since 1917 we are reversing this trend.

Uncle Sam will actually begin to pay off our $6 trillion credit card bill. Paying off our huge debt should be a top priority, not an afterthought.

Under current law, any money left over at the end of the year is used to reduce the debt. This bill makes debt reduction a priority by setting aside the money up front.

Reducing the public debt is good for the country. It increases national saving and makes it more likely that the economy will continue growing strong. American families benefit through lower interest rates on mortgages and other loans, more jobs, better wages, and ultimately higher living standards.

Reducing the public debt strengthens the government's fiscal position by reducing interest costs and promoting economic growth. This makes it easier for the government to afford its future budget obligations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4601, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1415

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE LOCK-BOX ACT OF 2000

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3859) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security and Medicare surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3859

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Social Security and Medicare Lock-box Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to—

(1) ensure that social security trust fund surpluses shall be used to pay down the debt held by the public until social security reform legislation is enacted; and

(2) ensure that the projected surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund shall be used to pay down the debt held by the public until medicare reform legislation is enacted.

SEC. 3. PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.—

''(1) CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, that would set forth an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

''(2) SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION.—Except as provided by paragraph (3), it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

''(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

''(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

''(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report,

would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

''(3) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply to social security reform legislation as defined by section 7(1) of the Social Security and Medicare Lock-box Act of 2000.

''(4) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'on-budget deficit', when applied to a fiscal year, means the deficit in the budget as set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301(a)(3) for that fiscal year.''.

(b) CONTENT OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET.—Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) the receipts, outlays, and surplus or deficit in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, combined, established by title II of the Social Security Act;''.

(c) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

(2) Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

SEC. 4. PROTECTION OF MEDICARE SURPLUSES.

(a) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by section 3) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—

''(1) CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, that would set forth an on-budget surplus for any fiscal year that is less than the projected surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for that fiscal year (as assumed in that resolution).

''(2) SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION.—Except as provided by paragraph (3), it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

''(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

''(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

''(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report,

would cause the on-budget surplus for any fiscal year to be less than the projected surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (as assumed in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget) for that fiscal year or increase the amount by which the on-budget surplus for any fiscal year would be less than such trust fund surplus for that fiscal year.

''(3) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply to medicare reform legislation as defined by section 7(2) of the Social Security and Medicare Lock-box Act of 2000.

''(4) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'on-budget surplus', when applied to a fiscal year, means the surplus in the budget as set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301(a)(3) for that fiscal year.''.

(b) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by section 3) is further amended by inserting ''312(h),'' after ''312(g),''.

(2) WAIVER.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by section 3) is further amended by inserting ''312(h),'' after ''312(g),''.

SEC. 5. REMOVING SOCIAL SECURITY FROM BUDGET PRONOUNCEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any official statement issued by the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government of surplus or deficit totals of the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President or of the surplus or deficit totals of the congressional budget, and any description of, or reference to, such totals in any official publication or material issued by either of such Offices or any other such agency or instrumentality, shall exclude the outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act (including the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund)

and the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) SEPARATE SOCIAL SECURITY BUDGET DOCUMENTS.—The excluded outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act shall be submitted in separate Social Security budget documents.

SEC. 6. PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SURPLUSES.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY.—(1) Chapter 11 of subtitle II of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding before section 1101 the following:

"§ 1100. Protection of social security surpluses

''The budget of the United States Government submitted by the President under this chapter shall not recommend an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year covered by that budget unless it includes proposed legislative language for social security reform legislation as defined by section 7(1) of the Social Security and Medicare Lock-box Act of 2000.''.

(2) The chapter analysis for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 1101 the following:

''1100. Protection of Social Security Surpluses.''.

(b) MEDICARE.—(1) Chapter 11 of subtitle II of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1100 the following:

"§ 1100A. Protection of medicare surpluses

''The budget of the United States Government submitted by the President under this chapter shall not recommend an on-budget surplus for any fiscal year that is less than the projected surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for that fiscal year unless it includes proposed legislative language for medicare reform legislation as defined by section 7(2) of the Social Security and Medicare Lock-box Act of 2000 or social security reform legislation as defined by section 7(1) of that Act.''.

(2) CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The chapter analysis for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1100 the following:

''1100A. Protection of Medicare Surpluses.''.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM LEGISLATION.—The term ''social security reform legislation'' means a bill or a joint resolution to save social security and includes a provision stating the following: ''For purposes of the Social Security and Medicare Lock-box Act of 2000, this Act constitutes social security reform legislation to save social security.''.

(2) MEDICARE REFORM LEGISLATION.—The term ''medicare reform legislation'' means a bill or a joint resolution to save Medicare and includes a provision stating the following: ''For purposes of the Social Security and Medicare Lock-box Act of 2000, this Act constitutes medicare reform legislation to save medicare.''.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment and the amendments made by this Act shall apply to fiscal year 2001 and subsequent fiscal years.

(b) EXPIRATION.—(1) Sections 301(a)(6) and 312(g) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall expire upon the enactment of social security reform legislation.

(2) Section 312(h) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall expire upon the enactment of medicare reform legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3859.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, for over 30 years, surplus dollars in the Social Security Trust Fund were raided and spent on unrelated programs. Last year, this Congress took the first step towards stopping the raid on Social Security bypassing legislation I introduced, the Social Security lock box, by an overwhelming 416 to 12 vote. Our efforts paid off, and last year, not one penny of the $124 billion Social Security surplus was spent.

But Social Security is not the only trust fund to be raided over the years. Over the next 5 years, taxpayers will pay an estimated $126 billion more into the Medicare trust fund part A which pays for in-patient hospital care than will be taken out for Medicare expenses. Without a Medicare lock box, those surpluses will be spent.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to raise the bar and protect Medicare. The 40 million seniors and disabled in this Nation that depend on Medicare deserve to know that their Medicare money is not being spent on anything else.

In March, I introduced the Medicare lock Box we are debating today. Through a point of order, this Medicare lock box prohibits the consideration of any legislation that spends any of the Medicare part A surplus. The Medicare lock box also prevents Medicare surpluses from being intermingled with the rest of the budget. Additionally, under this measure the protected Medicare surpluses will go towards paying down public debt, accelerating our efforts to pay off the public debt by 2013.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a win-win. It is a win for fiscal discipline, it is a win for fairness in budgeting and, most importantly, it is a win-win for our seniors.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for our seniors and vote for the Medicare lock box.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, last week, the Vice President introduced the idea of taking the Medicare part A Hospital Insurance Trust Fund off budget, putting it off budget completely. There was no such plan on the other side. Their budget resolution, which they pushed through 2 months ago, used all of the projected surpluses, including the Medicare surplus for tax cuts and a few program increases. To the extent that anyone deserves credit here, I think we should say the Vice President has initiated an idea which the Republican majority is today embracing, but in a different form. They do not go as far as he proposes.

The version of this bill that is before us now was not drafted until last night. It was not introduced or referred to the Committee on Budget, which has jurisdiction. Section 306 of the Budget Act gives us jurisdiction specifically over this kind of legislation. We have not held hearings, we have not taken testimony, and our debate is limited to 40 minutes without any amendments in order.

For that reason, I would like to put some questions to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), who is the sponsor of the bill, if he would answer them for clarification and for legislative history.

Why does the gentleman propose not to take the Medicare part A Trust Fund off budget as the Vice President proposed? Why has the gentleman elected not to take it off budget and have a clean separation between it and the rest of the budget?

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

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, my original bill actually did take it off budget. That is what I would like to see done eventually. However, as the gentleman knows, I did pass legislation last year, which I believe the gentleman supported, on taking Social Security off budget which we cannot even get out of the Senate, which the Vice President seems to be opposing his President on over there. So what we are doing is taking it one step at a time.

I might mention that even though it passed here overwhelmingly, and even though the Vice President, who brought this out 2 weeks ago, and I congratulated him, I authored it last March, it is better to come late than not come at all, and I am glad he is joining us.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman begs the question. If this is what we did with Social Security in order to protect it, why not do the same with Medicare? Has the gentleman made a compromise?

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, why do we not pass this first, and then we will do it next year.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, section 3(b) of the gentleman's bill adds a new requirement to the congressional budget resolution. It requires the resolution to show receipts, outlays, and surpluses of deficits in the Old Age and Survivors, OASDI Social Security Trust Fund. This is a new requirement, for since 1991, budget resolutions have excluded Social Security. Why does the

gentleman now require budget resolutions to show the Social Security surplus when, for a decade, they have been prohibited from showing the Social Security surplus?

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will again yield, I believe we need to do that, because as the gentleman knows, during the years that the Democrats controlled this House for over 40 years that these surpluses were spent, they were counted as part of the ongoing budget. So the intention is to separate them, to actually determine what is being spent and what is not being spent, so that we can hold each of our Members, 435 here in the House and 100 in the Senate, responsible if they vote for spending that goes into that. That is why we want it separate.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is not separating them. That is just the point. By putting them back in the budget, the gentleman is undercutting the whole idea of having Social Security off budget. It boggles my mind why the gentleman would want to do that, when the idea is to separate these accounts and treat them differently from the ordinary accounts of the budget.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was 1985 that we passed the law to take Social Security off budget; and as everybody is aware, even with that designation, we continued to spend the Social Security surplus. So it would seem to me, I would say to the gentleman, it is not how the gentleman might construct it where we put these numbers, but it is the final decision whether we spend the money or not.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the problem we have is that section 3(b) requires that the congressional budget resolution show receipts, outlays, and surpluses in the OASDI trust fund, while section 5 prohibits it. Am I correct? I had to ask staff to make sure I am correctly interpreting that. Why the contradiction? Is this a result of midnight compromises made on how this bill was to be drafted?

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further to me, again, looking back since 1935, almost all of those years were controlled by the Democrats. These were, number one, being spent and were included as part of the budget.

My ultimate goal is to do as we did last year with Social Security and take it completely off budget. My concern is, because of opposition on the gentleman's side and the fact that the Vice President evidently, and Senator DASCHLE, a Democrat from South Dakota, are not allowing us to vote on it over there, we thought we would take it one step at a time.

The first step would be that at least we were not going to count it, that it would be secluded, that we would see the number and it would have to be reported as a separate number, taking that as a half a loaf, and then come back next year, which I can assure the gentleman I am going to do, and go with the rest of the loaf to make sure it is completely off budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, just to say in conclusion that we will take the whole loaf. If the gentleman wants to go with setting it off completely, we will vote for that; and we do not understand why the gentleman has not gone that far.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Members are reminded that they should not criticize positions of Members of the other body during the debate.

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

What our goal is, since 1935, we have been spending both Social Security and the Medicare part of Social Security on ongoing programs. I am very grateful that we have a bipartisan bill here, we have Members of the other party; and I am very grateful for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), who has been working with us on our last bill last year and this one this year; and the goal is that we not spend it, and that is what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who has spent many, many hours working on Social Security; and I appreciate the gentleman's efforts.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is a good start. We need to remind ourselves that simply not spending the money does not fix the solvency problem of Social Security or fix the solvency problem of Medicare. Mostly because of demographics, the actuaries have determined that both of these programs are going broke, the challenge is, where do we get that money to keep the commitment we have made to seniors that those promised benefits are going to be there.

I think all Members can support this kind of legislation that encourages not spending any of the Social Security or Medicare surplus money on other government programs. This commitment is going to help some with the huge problem of keeping Social Security and Medicare solvent.

I was hoping in this presidential election that we could come debate real specifics in terms of how we are going to save Social Security and Medicare. Sadly, it would be demagogued because it is so easy to scare the seniors that depend on these programs. This President, I think, had a unique opportunity to lead us, in the last three years to keep Social Security solvent forever. That did not happen, and now we are hoping that the next President will do that. I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for moving us ahead, at least in the effort to encourage this Congress to have some fiscal responsibility, fiscal discipline, of not using the Social Security surplus or the H I trust fund surplus for either tax cuts or for spending on other government programs. That is good.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, I have introduced legislation that provides a sequester if we were to use either of these trust fund surpluses for either of those purposes. So anybody that would like to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 4694, I welcome their cosponsorship. Let us pass Mr. HERGER's bill. Let us make it unanimous, and let us have the courage and fiscal discipline we need to save these two important programs.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is always fun to come out here on press release day and to see what the majority has got in mind for press releases for the weekend.

As I look at this, this is a bill that reminds me of an automobile. I remember there was an automobile called the Pinto, and it was out there and it kept exploding and burning and people got in a terrible mess, so they had a recall.

□ 1430

Now, this is a recalled bill, because the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) passed the bill last year to protect social security. By George, we passed it 414 or whatever it was out of here. Now here we are back fixing it.

What was the matter with the one we did last year? Was it the fact that they left out Medicare, and the Vice President said that we ought to take Medicare off-budget, too, like the President said in his State of the Union message? Was it those issues that finally lead to, well, as soon as the Vice President said it, the next thing we know we have this bill here? It is the history of this bill.

I think, Mr. Speaker, and I am really serious about this, the reason this is a pretend Congress is because nobody on the gentleman's side takes this Congress seriously and its procedures when we have a bill introduced and it never has a hearing, never has a hearing, no testimony whatsoever, and then suddenly the Committee on Rules meets all by itself and they pop a bill out that is not even the one that was introduced into the Congress, so it has had no hearings in the Committee on the Budget, who is going to have to work with us in the future.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and I have sat there and watched this process, and this is going to make it even worse because we are having bills introduced affecting that committee by members of the Committee on Rules who apparently, I do not know, they must have had some

revelation come down from heaven in the dark of the night that this was the bill.

The Congressional Budget Act prohibits that, specifically prohibits bills being considered on the floor of the House that have not been considered in the committee that handles them, the Committee on the Budget. So they broke the rules of their own Congress. It is like, well, those are just rules, who cares, right?

In doing so, they do things that make no sense at all, because they have section 3(b) that says we have to show the social security surplus, and we have section 5 that says we cannot show it. Now, we cannot have it both ways. We cannot show it and not show it. So they did not even take the time last night to even proofread the bill.

This is a travesty and a joke. The other body will consider it the same.

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

Just to quickly respond to the gentleman, again, this legislation was authored last March 6. I am pleased that the Vice President came out 2 weeks ago and does not want to spend social security-Medicare trust funds now.

Really, that is what it is all about, are we going to continue, as the last Congresses have for over 30 years, spending social security and Medicare trust funds, or are we going to save it just for that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who serves on the Committee on the Budget and has worked on this issue very diligently.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for all his hard work. He and I have worked on this issue quite a bit in the last Congress, and the gentleman has worked on this in prior Congresses. Let us clear this issue up and bring it out of the process and the mechanistic talk. What we are talking about here is stopping the raid on social security, stopping the raid on Medicare, and equipping Congress with the tools to do that.

Does this bill go all the way and save social security and Medicare? No. We are not suggesting it does.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, as a new Member of Congress, I dedicated my time this year to trying to change the culture in Washington. For the last 30 years there has been a culture in Washington which has basically said this: If we are going to pay our FICA taxes off of our paycheck for social security and Medicare, Washington does not care if we pay it for social security and Medicare, because Washington is going to take it and spend it on other government programs that have nothing to do with social security and Medicare.

We need to stop those days, Mr. Speaker. We need to stop the days of raiding social security, of taking money from Medicare and social security and spending it on programs that have nothing to do with it. What this bill does is fix the rules in Congress so we do not consider that kind of legislation.

We have a point of order saying we are not going to consider legislation if it attempts to raid social security and Medicare. We are going to make sure that when we analyze our budgets, when we total up the numbers of the Federal Government's budget, we are not counting the social security and Medicare trust fund against our deficits or against our debts. We are saying, honest accounting, stop the raid on the program.

I have a bill which has some of these provisions in it which stops the raid on the social security program indefatigably, stops it by law. This bill changes the culture in Congress, a culture that has occurred here for 30 years where people would vote for legislation that would raid social security.

The President gave us a budget 2 years ago that took 38 percent of social security out of social security and spent it on other government programs. We are saying no to that.

This Congress, this Committee on the Budget, last year stopped the raid on social security for the first time in 30 years. We are following up on that promise. We are following up on that policy by saying that we are changing the culture in Washington. We are changing the rules in Congress so when we do legislation here from now on, we are not going back to those old days of raiding social security and raiding Medicare. If we pay our FICA taxes off of our paycheck, that money will go to social security and will go to Medicare, period, end of story.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Lockbox Act. I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for his work in introducing the legislation.

I was proud to join him in sending out Dear Colleagues twice to our colleagues encouraging them to support this legislation. But I must say, I am rather disappointed that the gentleman's leadership chose to change the legislation significantly last night between the time we wrote the letter encouraging them to support it and what we have before us today.

Why they did that only the gentleman and they know. That is not a reason for us not to vote for the legislation today. It is still a step in the right direction. By creating a firewall around Medicare trust fund surpluses to protect these revenues for exclusive use in the Medicare program, this bill will take another step forward in maintaining fiscal discipline and improving our ability to meet the fiscal challenges of the future.

For the last several years I have joined with my Blue Dog colleagues to offer budgets that would truly balance the budget without counting either Medicare or social security surpluses. As has already been discussed, recently the Vice President put the issue on the national agenda by proposing that the newly calculated surpluses be used to take Medicare off-budget.

I want to congratulate those, now the House leadership, for endorsing the wisdom of the Blue Dog position and following the Vice President's lead on the issue, and following the lead of the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), although I must say, I wish the gentleman on this side of the aisle would have seen the wisdom, and more on our side of the aisle would have seen the wisdom, in voting for our Blue Dog budget earlier this year in which we would have already had this done.

While congratulating my Republican colleagues for bringing this legislation to the floor today, I also remind them that this legislation applies to both spending increases and tax cuts that would dip into the Medicare surplus. Every Member who votes for this legislation today and brags about protecting Medicare should keep that in mind when talking about either large tax cuts or new spending proposals later this year.

At the moment, the Medicare trust fund is running a surplus. That story will change drastically in the next decade when the baby boom generation begins retiring and depends on Medicare for their health coverage. Rather than consuming current surpluses through large tax cuts and new government spending, we should use them to prepare for the challenges Medicare faces. That is what we do with this legislation today.

I again repeat, I am disappointed the bill before us was changed last night so it no longer excludes the Medicare trust fund from calculations of the on-budget surplus, and would allow us to continue the practice of using the Medicare surplus to inflate surplus totals. It is not as good a bill as the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) introduced or that I cosponsored, but it is still a good bill.

Whether we technically take Medicare off-budget or not, I hope all Members will honor the spirit of this legislation and not count the Medicare surplus when talking about the amount of surpluses available to be divided between tax cuts, increased spending, and debt reduction.

We are headed in the right direction. We are headed in the right direction by agreeing to save the Medicare trust fund surpluses to pay down the national debt and protect the long-term solvency of both social security and Medicare. However, we should go further by walling off some of the on-budget surpluses beyond social security and Medicare for debt reduction. Doing so would represent a much stronger commitment to paying down our $5.7 trillion national debt.

Saving a portion of the non-social security and Medicare surpluses for debt reduction would start to make up for the years in which we borrowed from those surpluses instead of saving them, as we should have done. In addition, walling off a portion of the on-budget surplus for debt reduction provides a cushion if budget projections change for the worse.

We should not kid ourselves that this legislation alone solves the long-term challenges facing Medicare, but until we can reach agreement on comprehensive Medicare reforms to put the program on a stronger financial footing, the next best thing we can do is pay down the debt by saving the entire Medicare surplus.

I encourage all Members to support this legislation, which is a good step forward, and continue to move toward further fiscal responsibility. Again, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for his leadership in this endeavor.

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

Again, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), for his longtime support and work on walling off both social security and Medicare.

Let me just point out again that this does take Medicare off the table. It would require a special vote in order to spend anything above that. It does not go quite as far as the gentleman from Texas and I want to go. Hopefully next year in further Congresses we will do that, but I do thank the gentleman for his help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), and I want to again thank him for his tireless support in working in this area.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I thank him for his great leadership on this issue.

In fact, the gentleman is such a great leader that the Vice President has adopted the Herger position for his campaign, which I think speaks to the power and potency of this issue.

Last year, the Republican Congress did the right thing. We said that we are going to rope off social security and make sure it does not get spent for other purposes, because for far too long in this Congress social security and Medicare surpluses and trust funds have been Washington's cookie jar to fund all these other programs in government.

We said last year, categorically, this has to stop. The American people deserve better, our seniors deserve better. We made that commitment with social security. Unfortunately, the legislation has been stalled in the Senate, yet we need to move forward to ensure that we have the same level of protection for Medicare, and that is what this legislation would do today. Hopefully we can get action on the social security lockbox as well as the Medicare lockbox.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Federal government dipped into Medicare by about $21 billion to fund unrelated government spending in other areas. We do not need bigger government and we do not need to finance bigger government with social security and Medicare payroll taxes, taxes that people pay with the expectation that those programs are going to be there some day for them.

What we need is fiscal responsibility, and to provide more security for all of Americans' retirement. This bill does just that, and it provides the basis and foundation upon which we can build the Medicare reform that the gentleman from Texas was talking about.

Mr. Speaker, my State of South Dakota is a very rural State. It is not uncommon in South Dakota to have in a hospital 70 percent of the patient load being Medicare-dependent. When Medicare funding is used to fund other programs of government, it deprives that important program of those funds that are necessary to fund the investment in technology to make sure that grandfathers and grandmothers and parents in rural areas have access to critical hospitals and to the other health care requirements that they have to deal with. So it is important that this funding in the Medicare trust fund be protected for just that purpose.

I signed onto this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because it is the right thing to do for America's seniors and it is the right thing to do for America's taxpayers. We need to continue to be guardians of these trust funds. Before last year, they were raided for some 40 years. It is time that we stop the raid on these trust funds and ensure that we are doing everything that we can to end the waste, fraud, and abuse in government, and to put the additional safeguards in place to ensure that social security and Medicare dollars are not stolen to pay the other government bills that are wrapped up by this Washington government, but that they are locked away and put to the use for which they were intended. That is to provide health care for our parents, our grandparents, and hopefully some day for our children.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill walls off the surplus in the Medicare Part A trust fund. It says in effect that the surplus in the President's budget and in the congressional budget resolution should be at least as large every year as the Medicare Part A surplus. In addition, of course, tax cuts and spending increases could not reach that target.

The idea of taking the Part A trust fund off the table, not off the budget, is a small step forward, because it means that a slightly higher share of the projected surpluses over the next 10 years are going to be devoted to paying down publicly-held debt. That is good for social security, that is good for Medicare, that is good for the economy. That is why I voted yes.

But this is just a small step, a token step, since preserving the Medicare surplus does not really extend Medicare solvency for one day. Our long-term fiscal situation implies that over the course of the next 10 years, while we are generating these on-budget surpluses, we should be devoting a significant share of them to Medicare solvency, to debt reduction, and to social security solvency for the long run.

□ 1445

That is why I said earlier on the previous bill that we ought to have a piece of legislation here which simply says we resolve that now, and into the future; we will set aside some fixed percentage of our own budget surplus every year for debt reduction or for contribution to these trust funds.

The Clinton administration and our congressional Democratic budget resolution devoted more than 40 percent of the projected on-budget surplus to debt reduction; and we took $300 billion out of the general fund, that is out of the on-budget surplus, and put it in the Medicare trust fund in order to extend the solvency of the Medicare program into and past 2020. The Blue Dog budget, which was offered as an alternative, committed 50 percent of the projected on-budget surplus to debt reduction.

But the Republican plan devoted essentially none of the surplus to debt reduction and took none of it, none of it, and put it into Medicare where it would ensure, at least extend the solvency of the program.

Unlike the proposal made the other day by Vice-President GORE, as I have noted, this bill fails to take the Medicare trust fund off budget. It simply takes it off the table or out of the calculation. In addition, it has something in it that I would call a trap door. In fact, it was in the Social Security legislation, too. Specifically, any legislation that identifies itself as Social Security reform or Medicare reform, it only has to recite those magic words, ''is automatically exempt without further proof from the provisions of this lockbox.''

This is very much like the emergency spending exemption that we have got in current law. Any legislation that is designated an emergency by somebody, no matter how routine, is exempt from the spending caps. The same can happen with Medicare reform and Social Security reform.

The bill itself says in black letters, all one has got to do is recite ''this bill is for Medicare reform, this bill is for Social Security reform,'' and, bang, these provisions no longer apply to one.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if the majority were really serious about using projected surpluses to reduce debt and save and protect Medicare and Social Security, then I think they would take this bill, this occasion, to repeal section 213 of the budget resolution which they passed weeks ago. In just a few weeks, the Congressional Budget Office

is going to increase its estimate of the projected on-budget surpluses by $800 billion, a trillion dollars, maybe $1.2 trillion, maybe more.

Section 213 of their budget resolution will allow the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to commit, give, devote as much as 100 percent of that increase in the projected surplus to the Committee on Ways and Means for additional tax cuts instead of debt reduction, instead of saving Social Security, instead of protecting Medicare, use 100 percent of it for tax reduction.

If my colleagues were serious about debt reduction, serious about protecting Medicare and Social Security, surely, surely we would say some of these additional surpluses will be retained, set aside, and protected for these essential programs and this essential purpose, and that is debt reduction.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just briefly responding to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), who mentioned this is at least a small step, I really believe this is a major step. It is the first step, because it is saying that, for the first time in more than 40 years, we are not going to do as previous Congresses have done, the party of the gentleman from South Carolina did, for all the years it controlled this House, in that they spent it all. They counted it, included it as part of the ongoing budget and spent it.

What we are saying is that this money is being removed from the table. We are not going to spend it. We are dedicating it as the first step to be used to saving and preserving and improving Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP).

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, as a relative newcomer on the block in Washington, people ask me all the time in my district if it seems different to be in Congress, if Washington is different, if it is different than our State legislatures, if it is different than our local councils. I always tell them it is astoundingly different; that, in fact, there is a culture of spending in Washington that is really unmatched anyplace else around this country.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it is an everyday take-your-breath-away experience as I see one amendment after another to spend millions, hundreds of millions, billions more dollars.

In fact, last week, there was an all-day markup that, that day alone, Members made proposals to raise spending $10 billion. The culture that there is no limit to the dollars, that there is no pain, that there is no working family at the other end of those tax dollars that paid that money in, in tax dollars and took it out of what they could spend for their children has been just an amazing culture for me to behold.

I am proud to be part of a Congress that is trying to change that culture that has been with us for 40 years, that one could spend every dollar one could take, and that one could spend it when it is meant for future obligations in what feels good today or programs that we have today or new ideas that people have, that there is no limit.

So we are maybe making beginning steps, but they are powerfully important. One of them is to take the Medicare dollars off the table from what we consider as surplus. For years, we have used Medicare dollars to fund new programs and programs that exist that we want to put more dollars into.

What we have done, in essence, is to put an IOU in the cookie jar and said, someday, when Medicare needs this money, they can take it out. But of course when Medicare opens the cookie jar, there are no assets there to pay the bills. We are not going to be able to sell off our assets, our airports, our schools, our roads in order to recoup this money for Medicare.

So this bill today, it is for our fathers and our grandparents. It is for those who put the money in for so many years when it was not respected for the purpose it was expected to be spent for. But it is also for our children, our children who want the best for their grandparents and for their parents who want to know that they can live up to their responsibilities and who we owe them the possibility of a program that is solvent enough that they can assume their responsibilities.

I am lucky; I have both of my parents who are 78 who, for years, contributed to this country and made their contribution. Let us recognize that as we pass this bill today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the colleagues that have come to the floor today to support this incredibly important first step toward protecting Medicare surpluses. Over the next 5 years, an estimated $126 billion more will be paid into the Medicare trust fund by taxpayers than is currently being taken out for Medicare expenses.

Our seniors deserve to know that these Medicare surplus dollars are not being spent on unrelated programs. The Medicare lock box prohibits legislation that spends the Medicare surplus from being considered and separates Medicare funds from future budget projections.

Last year, we locked away the Social Security surplus. Today we have the opportunity to take it one step further and protect our seniors' Medicare surpluses.

I urge my colleagues to support this.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill because I think basically we should segregate the part A trust fund. But I am going to plead the abuse of process before acceding to the bill, because this is not the way to make important law.

As I said earlier, this bill was not drafted, to the best of my knowledge, until last night. We did not see it this morning until 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock. It was not introduced or referred to the Committee on the Budget. It did not come through the Committee on Rules. The Committee on the Budget has jurisdiction, but we have held no hearings on it. We have taken no testimony.

Now the debate is limited to 40 minutes, and there are no amendments in order. That is too bad. The House ought to be able to come out here and work its will on a piece of legislation this important. If we were allowed to, we could have corrected some of the flaws in the bill. I think if we put it to the House as a whole, do we want Medicare taken cleanly off budget, it would be an overwhelming yes. We still do not know why that compromise was made.

Secondly, there are glitches in this bill that honest, open debate, an amendment, could, number one, ferret out and, number two, correct. For example, as I pointed out, section 3(b) adds a new requirement to congressional budget resolutions. It requires the resolution to show the receipts and outlays and surplus of the Social Security Trust Fund.

Then section 5 of the same bill flat prohibits any agent or instrumentality of the Federal Government from including the Social Security surplus in any document that shows the Federal surplus or deficit. Any instrumentality. What if we were to do that in a newsletter? Are we an instrumentality of the Government? This is a kind of drafting error that we could wash out of the bill if we had an opportunity to do; but we do not, not on the House floor today.

This bill requires that Medicare part A be set aside, but it does not require the congressional budget resolution specify exactly how much is being set aside. That seems to me elementary. Why would it not provide that this is the part A trust fund, this is the amount we expect, and we are setting it aside, taking it off the table, out of calculation.

So the House has not had an opportunity to do its will, and we are passing a bill that is a lot weaker than it could be if we had an opportunity to make it better.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is not a complicated bill. It is very simple. It is basically saying that, for the first time in more than 40 years, that we are not going to spend the surplus, whatever that surplus is. That is, in Medicare and Social Security, we are not going to spend it. Very simply, whatever it is, we are not going to spend. It brings about a point of order to ensure that we do not.

Look how far we have come. It was only a few years ago that we were looking at deficits of $200 billion and $300 billion, and that did not even include the surplus of Social Security or Medicare. Then a few years ago, we were reporting $80 billion, $90 billion, $100 billion surpluses; but that did include, I am afraid, Medicare and Social Security.

But guess what, those surpluses were only half true. Every penny of those surplus dollars were really Social Security dollars. So what did we do? We passed a Social Security lock box last year that said that we would not spend any of the surplus of Social Security, and that passed. Now Congress and the President speak of budget surpluses without Social Security being included in it. This amount is estimated to be $40 billion this year.

Now we are raising the bar one notch higher. We are saying that we are now going to stop raiding Medicare, just as we stopped raiding Social Security last year. What we are doing is ensuring that Social Security recipients deserve to know that their Medicare dollars are not being spent on anything else except Medicare.

This bill is a win-win. It is a win for fiscal discipline. It is a win for Medicare. Most importantly, it is a win for our seniors.

I urge all my colleagues to support this Medicare and Social Security lock box.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that most of today's American families can no longer live comfortably on one sole income, in fact, most households depend on at least two incomes, and as if that wasn't enough, today's American employees average more hours at work than employees from other nations.

It is crystal clear that Americans work hard for their paychecks, which is why it is disheartening to know that when a significant percentage of their hard earned money is involuntarily removed for a Medicare fund, our government will use it as a slush fund to operate completely unrelated programs from which our seniors will never benefit.

Our nation's population is rapidly aging and in response to this, Congress must make the protection of Medicare dollars a high priority in order to deliver healthcare for seniors.

Our seniors deserve the health care benefits they were promised.

Our seniors need to know that they will receive adequate healthcare when they need it most.

They need not be terrified, as many are, about whether their doctor visits, treatments and even prescriptions will be covered.

Today, the House of Representatives hopes to put seniors' worries at ease as we will vote on H.R. 3859, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act.

I thank my colleague, Congressman WALLY HERGER for creating this legislation which will reserve Medicare surplus dollars only for responsible debt reduction or spending on the Medicare program.

Soon after today's vote, seniors will no longer need to fear that the money set aside for their Medicare and well being will be used as a big government slush fund.

Similarly to the Social Security lock box which passed by a vote of 417–2 last year, this Medicare lock box is the right thing to do; the responsible thing to do.

Today's vote is the first step in ensuring our nation's seniors that they will no longer need to fear about whether they will be taken care of in their old age.

Today, Congress will make history because today we begin the guarantee of security in healthcare for our senior citizens.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3859, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 2000, and urge my colleagues to join in support of this bill.

H.R. 3859 amends the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect the net surplus of the Medicare Part A or Social Security trust funds by moving them ''off budget.'' Specifically, they may not be counted as part of the overall federal surplus by either the President or the Congress. The bill further amends the Budget Act of 1974 to allow a point of order to protect Social Security surpluses in both the House and Senate from legislation whose enactment would either cause or increase an on-budget deficit for a fiscal year, with the exception of Social Security reform legislation.

Moreover, H.R. 3859 also makes it out of order for either chamber to consider any measure whose enactment would cause the on-budget surplus for a fiscal year to be less than the projected surplus of the federal hospital insurance trust fund for that fiscal year. This provision makes an exception for Medicare reform legislation.

Finally, H.R. 3859 requires that any statement or official estimate issued by the Congressional Budget Office or the Office of Management and Budget must exclude any surplus in the Social Security trust fund when issuing totals of the surplus or deficit of the United States Government. The legislation applies to fiscal year 2001 and future years.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has made significant strides in the past three years with regards to ending the practice of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund to mask the true size of the Federal outlays. This legislation will ensure that our practice of fiscal restraint will continue.

By approving this bill, the House will demonstrate to the American people its commitment to protecting the long term solvency of both the Social Security and Medicare systems. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to lend it their strong support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3859, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1500

CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ASTRONAUTS NEIL A. ARMSTRONG, BUZZ ALDRIN, AND MICHAEL COLLINS.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2815) to present a congressional gold medal to astronauts Neil A. Armstrong. Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, the crew of Apollo 11.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2815

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Astronaut Neil A. Armstrong, as commander of Apollo 11, achieved the historic accomplishment of piloting the Lunar Module ''Eagle'' to the surface of the Moon, and became the first person to walk upon the Moon on July 20, 1969.

(2) Astronaut Buzz Aldrin joined Neil A. Armstrong in piloting the Lunar Module ''Eagle'' to the surface of the Moon, and became the second person to walk upon the Moon on July 20, 1969.

(3) Astronaut Michael Collins provided critical assistance to his fellow astronauts that landed on the Moon by piloting the Command Module ''Columbia'' in the Moon's orbit and communicating with Earth, thereby allowing his fellow Apollo 11 astronauts to successfully complete their mission on the surface of the Moon.

(4) By conquering the Moon at great personal risk to their safety, the three Apollo 11 astronauts advanced America scientifically and technologically, paving the way for future missions to other regions in space.

(5) The Apollo 11 astronauts, by and through their historic feat, united the country in favor of continued space exploration and research.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, gold medals of appropriate design to astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, in recognition of their monumental and unprecedented feat of space exploration, as well as their achievements in the advancement of science and promotion of the space program.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 2 at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. PROCEEDS OF SALE.

Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

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

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, on a clear sunny Wednesday in July 1969, the first human journey to the surface of the moon began at Launch Complex 39 of the Kennedy Space Center in Florida. With the liftoff of Apollo 11, Commander Neil Armstrong, Commander Module Pilot Michael Collins, and Buzz Aldrin were about to make history.

These three men accomplished what others had been dreaming about for centuries and what President John F. Kennedy declared was a national priority during the height of the Cold War. In response to the Soviet Union's stunning surprise with the first manned flight into space, the Americans astonished the world by surpassing the Soviet Union's space program in a few short years. This accomplishment demonstrates the greatness of the American spirit, one based on free enterprise, determination and patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, we should have honored these three men years ago. It has been over 30 years ago since this accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), and I want to commend him at this time as the sponsor, the originator, of this legislation to honor the Apollo 11 astronauts. I would like to thank him on behalf of the entire House for bringing this legislation forward.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank first my good friend from Alabama, the distinguished subcommittee chair, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I was 11 years old on July 20, 1969. For anybody of my generation, particularly who was a young person on that date, and who can remember, as I do, sitting in front of a somewhat flickering black and white television to see the grainy image of a human being coming down the ladder of the lunar module and setting foot on the moon, that was an incredible moment, not just in our Nation's history but in the history of all mankind. Because Americans were the ones to first do what people for generations and for centuries and for a millennia had merely dreamed about: Setting foot on the surface of another celestial body.

As the distinguished subcommittee chairman noted, this is about 30 years too late. The Congress of the United States, in 1969, should have taken the step of awarding these three heroes, these three explorers, these three great patriots Congress' highest award, the Congressional Gold Medal, and the time has come to recognize these three extraordinary individuals, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins with this honor. Together, these three pioneers propelled America ahead in the space race. They united a country and a Nation and a world torn in conflict, and inspired future generations to continue the pursuit of space exploration.

Who were these men that did this monumental feat? Neil Armstrong was born on August 5, 1930 in Wapakoneta, Ohio. He received his bachelor's degree in aeronautical engineering at Purdue and a master's degree at USC.

Neil made seven flights in the X–15 program, reaching an altitude of over 207,500 feet. He was then the backup command pilot for Gemini 5. He was the command pilot for Gemini 8. He was the backup command pilot for Gemini 11 and the backup commander for Apollo 8. And, finally, the reason we are here today, he was the commander of the epic Apollo 11 flight on that day in July, 1969.

Following the mission, Neil worked as Deputy Associate Administrator for Aeronautics at NASA. He then became professor of aeronautical engineering at the University of Cincinnati. He served on the National Commission on Space from 1985 to 1986, and on the Presidential Commission on the Space Shuttle Challenger Accident in 1986.

Buzz Aldrin, the second man to walk on the moon, was born in 1930 in Montclair, New Jersey. He received his bachelor's degree at the U.S. Military Academy in 1951 and a Ph.D. in astronautics at MIT in 1963. Buzz's study of astronautics contributed to the perfection of space walking.

His spaceflights included also piloting a Gemini 12 mission in 1966, and piloting the Apollo 11 lunar module in 1969. Buzz was backup pilot for Gemini 9 and backup command module pilot for Apollo 8.

He resigned from NASA in 1971 to become Commandant of the Aerospace Research Pilot's School at Edwards Air Force Base.

Buzz retired from the Air Force in 1972 and became a consultant. Currently he resides in Southern California and lectures and consults on space sciences with Starcraft Enterprises. He has authored two books, Return to Earth and Men From Earth.

The third member of that historic mission, Michael Collins, was born in 1930 in Rome, Italy. He received his bachelor's degree at the U.S. Military Academy in 1952.

He piloted the Gemini 10 space flight in 1966. He served as a command module pilot for Apollo 11 in July 1969. Mike also served as backup pilot for Gemini 7 and pilot for Gemini 10. He had been assigned to Apollo 8 but was removed to undergo surgery.

He resigned from NASA in 1970 and was appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. In 1971, he became Director of the National Air and Space Museum here in Washington, and became Under Secretary of the Smithsonian in April 1978.

Mike retired from the Air Force with the rank of Major General. He later became vice president of the Vought Corporation. He currently heads Michael Collins Associates, a Washington, D.C. consulting firm.

Mr. Speaker, I never dreamed that 31 years ago, as a young boy watching that flickering screen at my Great Aunt Della's house, that I would have the incredible privilege of serving as a Member of this body and sponsoring legislation for our Nation and our Congress to recognize the contribution of these three great heroes. They are Columbus, Galileo, and Lindbergh all rolled into three, the three pilots of Apollo 11. They served our country, they served the cause of peace, and the spinoffs in technology that emanated from that massive Apollo program are being felt every day today in our country, in biotech, in medicine, in health care, in computers. The list goes on and on.

We owe it all to the men and women who put their time and their efforts and their belief into our space program, and that is symbolized in the person of the three men who boarded Apollo 11 on that day, almost 31 years ago, soared off into space, and did as Neil Armstrong proudly proclaimed from the moon, made one small step for man and one giant leap for mankind.

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

Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives would honor with a Congressional Gold Medal to three American heroes, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, the crew of Apollo 11. Together, these three astronauts conquered territory that countless generations of astronomers and philosophers gazed at from afar but considered unconquerable; the surface of Earth's only satellite, the Moon.

On July 20, 1969, President Kennedy's dream of seeing American astronauts exploring the moon became a reality when the brave groundbreaking crew of Apollo 11 landed on the moon's surface and proclaimed to a spellbound America, in the words of Neil Armstrong, ''One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.'' By awarding them with a Congressional Medal, we honor their bravery and valor and their major contributions to humankind's greatest technological achievement: sending humans into outer space to set foot on a celestial body outside Earth.

The Apollo 11 landing ushered in a new era of space exploration, thereby contributing to the advancement of scientific inquiry and the improvement of the human condition. We owe much of NASA's and the United States' space program's current success to the pioneering efforts of the Apollo 11 crew.

Our now routine space shuttle flights and the scientific experiments in weightlessness that they have facilitated are a direct outgrowth of the Apollo 11 mission to the Moon.

Many of us recall that July day in 1969, when the Apollo 11 crew mesmerized the Nation and the world as they took that historic leap for humankind. As the entire Nation watched their television sets in amazement, the Apollo 11 crew undertook their simple mission of performing a manned lunar landing, collecting lunar samples, and returning to Earth with utmost professionalism and care. It was a greater success than anyone could have hoped for, not to mention a major milestone in human history. And the successful mission will forever remain etched in our collective conscience as a national symbol of our unity.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this long overdue honor to the crew of Apollo 11, three great American heroes who will forever remind us of the greatness of our country's pioneering spirit.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL), who has in his district the headquarters of the U.S. Space and Missile System Command.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I, like one of the earlier speakers, can sit back and remember what I was doing that night. For me, it was in the evening, as I recall, and I remember laying on the floor over at my girlfriend's apartment. She and her mother were sitting there; and we were watching that on television, watching these three pioneers, three people that nobody really knew who they were other than they were astronauts. But here we were watching on TV what they were doing, landing on the moon. I remember I was almost more astounded at the fact that I could watch them do it than I was that we technologically had figured out how to send them there and bring them back in one piece.

That was during a time of strife in our Nation. In my case, I was en route to Vietnam. Yet here was an action taken by three heroes who stepped up, and when they made that trip the whole country could focus on them. The whole country could. It did not make any difference whether a person was for or against that war, or whether they were involved in college or whether they were a little kid or an elderly member of our society, everybody watched. Everybody did.

We all remember what we were doing that night, what we were doing when these three men soared away and they stepped down off of that module and we could see the dust kind of kick up from his steps on the moon. There are footprints up there that will be there for eternity because of what these three men did. I think we all will remember that as probably the most important thing many of us have ever watched on TV.

We soared above any strife we had in our country, and that was the power of that mission. Not only did we prove our dominance to the world, as far as technologically being able to accomplish it, but we proved to ourselves as a Nation that, even in the midst of this terrible war we were in, we could coalesce behind a cause that would better this place we live in and expand our horizons as Americans to look for in the future.

I am pleased to be here supporting and recognizing their actions. This is one of the best things we can do as a country.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of H.R. 2815, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, the crew of Apollo 11.

When a young president named John Kennedy described his vision in 1961 of landing a man on the moon, he encountered many skeptics. Some said it could not be done; others said it would cost too much money. But when I watched Neil Armstrong take his first step on the moon 8 years later, I knew that the naysayers were wrong, and so did my high school students, who huddled around that television set we have heard about on that unforgettable day.

□ 1515

I saw the gleam in their eyes that inspired them to become our future engineers and scientists.

The Apollo 11 lunar landing is one of the events in American history that stands out as a moment that connects every American who was alive in July of 1969. Six hours after landing on the surface of the moon on July 20, with less than 30 seconds of fuel remaining, Commander Neil Armstrong took the ''one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind'' when he stepped off the lunar module onto the surface of the Moon.

Minutes later, joined by Buzz Aldrin, the two astronauts spent a total of 21 hours on the lunar surface. After their historic walk on the Moon, they successfully docked their lunar module with the command module, piloted by fellow astronaut Michael Collins, who made the mission possible by providing the crucial communications link between the Moon and the Earth.

Public opinion polls, the universal tool of politics today, tell us that the lunar landings are seen by Americans as one of the greatest achievements during that century, on the level of winning World War II. Together, these men propelled America ahead in the space race, united a country torn over the conflict in Vietnam, and inspired future generations to continue the pursuit of space exploration.

The time has come to recognize these three extraordinary individuals, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, with the Congressional Gold Medal. And here we are, 31 years after Apollo 11, nearing the completion of the construction of the International Space Station, having seen a remarkable record of NASA accomplishments, the first space plane, the space shuttle, capable of carrying a crew and payload into space to do research, new wing designs for civilian aircraft, a revolution in Earth science as we have begun to recognize the need to understand the changes occurring in the Earth's lands and oceans and atmosphere and new views of the universe.

Space exploration has evolved over the past 30 years to more than just romantic notions of collecting Moon rocks and taking pictures of other planets in our solar system, and now is the time to award a Congressional Medal to three individuals who contributed to our Nation's knowledge of space.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1969, after a 4-day trip, the three Apollo astronauts arrived on the surface of the Moon. Upon arriving, Armstrong announced ''Houston, Tranquility Base here. The Eagle has landed.''

These words ushered in a new era of human exploration as the first man flight to the Moon touched down with less than 40 seconds of fuel remaining in its tanks. The astronauts had managed to make one last-minute maneuver to avoid landing on a field of boulders and a large crater, demonstrating the importance of manned space flight, the human ability to adapt to demanding circumstances.

After hours of exploring and experiments and those famous words ''one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind'' uttered by Neil Armstrong, the astronauts left a plaque stating: ''Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon July 1969, A.D. We came in peace for all mankind.'' The plaque was signed by Armstrong, Collins, Aldrin, and President Richard Nixon.

The final phase of President Kennedy's challenge was realized on July 24, 1969, when these three astronauts safely returned to Earth, splashing down aboard the Columbia, 812 nautical miles southwest of Hawaii. Prior to splashdown, Buzz Aldrin summarized their magnificent accomplishments with these words: ''We feel this stands as a symbol of the insatiable curiosity of all mankind to explore the unknown.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), my good friend.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the author of this piece of legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN).

Landing on the Moon has been considered to be the crowning achievement of the 20th century. I am proud to say that, in my congressional district, Kennedy Space Center was the departure point for this incredible adventure.

On July 20, 1969, the culmination of man's dream to go to the Moon was realized. For the first time, people were taking their first steps on a new world. America led the way and showed the world how a republic can harness its power for scientific and peaceful purposes.

Thirty years ago, American know-how and technology and its technological might was demonstrated in a way that benefited every human on the planet. Thirty years ago, we aimed higher than ever and accomplished that goal.

The names Michael Collins, Buzz Aldrin, and Neil Armstrong will forever be etched in the edifice of human history next to the names of Columbus and Lindbergh.

We all know by heart the phrases oft repeated this afternoon, ''The Eagle has landed'' and ''That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.''

Every one of us who was of age at the time can recite to our children and grandchildren where we were at that historic moment. The magic of television helped take the whole world on that most fantastic of voyages. We all thought that by now, in the year 2000, we would have bases on the Moon and people on Mars. Sadly, we are not at that point.

And it is even more sad that today we will be taking up the funding bill for NASA, the VA–HUD bill, and there will again be attempts by some to cut our investment in the space program, keeping us further bound here on Earth.

Our efforts into space have an uncanny ability to unite all peoples and excite the imagination like nothing else, particularly the imagination of our young people. We should be proud of our space program and continue to support it to the fullest extent possible, supporting this effort to award these three historic pioneers in this very, very appropriate way.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the chairman, for yielding me the time. I want to also congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), my friend, for moving forward with this important legislation to finally present our Apollo 11 astronauts Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins with a much deserved Congressional Gold Medal.

I am particularly interested in this legislation because it involves a constituent of mine, a friend of mine and a neighbor of mine, Neil Armstrong, who inspired all of us by becoming the first person to set foot on the Moon.

Facing tremendous personal risks and very difficult technological challenges, Neil Armstrong and his fellow astronauts left an indelible impression on those of us on Earth. And the Apollo mission will certainly go down as one of the most memorable achievements of the 20th century.

I certainly remember it. I was a 13-year-old exchange student living with a family outside of Malmo, Sweden. We all crowded around a TV set in an apartment complex outside of Malmo that night. I was the only American in the apartment complex. But we all watched it, as citizens of the world, to watch that memorable mission. And the success of it when we heard ''the Eagle has landed'' was the cause for celebration and applause. I remember it well.

Neil Armstrong has certainly compiled a remarkable record of legacy of service to our Nation as a fighter pilot, as an astronaut, a test pilot, a NASA official, a scientist, a teacher, and now a successful businessman. And although his name has been forever linked with that historic Apollo 11 mission and his famous words announcing ''a giant leap for mankind,'' Neil Armstrong has never sought the limelight and he has never exploited his fame for personal gain.

Instead, he has quietly and effectively found ways to give back to others. He has helped NASA in their space program. He has worked with another famous Cincinnatian, Dr. Henry Heimlich, to develop a miniature heart-lung machine, the forerunner of the modern Micro Trach machine that is used to deliver oxygen to patients.

He has become a civic leader in greater Cincinnati, including enriching our community as chairman of the board of the Cincinnati Museum of Natural History, where he led the successful effort to give the museum a rebirth in its new home at our Union Terminal.

Neil also owns a small farm in Warren County, Ohio, outside of Cincinnati; and there he has been an active participant in civic activities. He has assisted with the annual Warren County Fair livestock auctions to support local 4–H programs. He has participated in local Boy Scouts troops. He has worked with other community leaders to establish an impressive YMCA, called the Countryside YMCA, outside of Lebanon, Ohio. And, yes, he has even helped coach the high school football team. This is the Neil Armstrong I know.

Neil Armstrong and the brave men of Apollo 11 deserve this special congressional recognition for the remarkable accomplishments over 30 years ago and their amazing legacy that inspires future generations.

My constituent, Neil Armstrong, also deserves recognition for his continued efforts to make our world a better place.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent example of bipartisan cooperation. I want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) for introducing this resolution.

I rise today in support of the resolution to honor three American heroes with the Congressional Gold Medal: Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins. They inspired a generation of Americans, and their accomplishment continues to stand as a testament to bravery and determination.

''Houston, Tranquility Base here. The Eagle has landed.'' Almost 31 years ago, these words were uttered and the world was forever changed. Just a few minutes later, Neil Armstrong, commander of the Apollo 11 mission, descended down the ladder of the lunar module and took the first step in the powdery surface of the Moon, the first person to walk on another world. Shortly after, he was joined on the dusty landscape by the mission's lunar module pilot, Edwin Buzz Aldrin.

The journey began 8 years earlier when President Kennedy issued the decree before Congress: ''I believe this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth.''

America answered the call.

Among the thousands of dreamers who applied for the handful of positions in the newly created astronaut corps were Neil Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Buzz Aldrin. Already brilliant pilots and engineers, these men came to NASA to do a job as best they could.

Neil Armstrong served in 78 combat missions in Korea for the Navy before joining NASA in 1955 in the high-speed flight research program. He participated in cutting-edge flight tests, pushing the envelope to go faster and higher. He was selected in the second group of astronauts and commanded the Gemini 8 mission, which first accomplished the task of docking with another spacecraft in orbit. The lunar missions would have been impossible without the ability to perform this task.

□ 1530

Buzz Aldrin was also a combat pilot in Korea. He graduated from West Point third in his class before receiving his commission in the Air Force. He attended MIT, receiving a doctorate after completing his thesis concerning guidance for manned orbital rendezvous. He flew as the pilot of the Gemini 12 mission, setting the record at the time for the longest space walk, testing important mobility characteristics of his space suit, essential for future astronauts to walk on the Moon.

Michael Collins also graduated from West Point before receiving his commission in the Air Force. He was a test pilot at Edwards Air Force Base, like Neil Armstrong. He stayed at Edwards as a flight test officer until he was selected as an astronaut. He flew on Gemini 10 which docked with an Agena spacecraft and he successfully used that spacecraft's power to maneuver into a higher orbit and rendezvous with another Agena target space craft. He also conducted two space walks.

These three men were already heroes when they were selected to be astronauts for the Apollo 11 mission. The dazzling success of Apollo 8's 10 orbits around the Moon on Christmas the previous year and the successful tests of the lunar module in Earth's orbit on Apollo 9 and in lunar orbit on Apollo 10 set the stage for the first mission to land on the Moon.

On July 16, 1969, these brave astronauts lifted off the launch pad in Florida aboard a Saturn 5 rocket and began the 4-day journey to the Moon. On July 20, the lunar module Eagle left Michael Collins behind in the command module Columbia and began its descent to the lunar surface. Missing the landing site, it took all the courage, determination and skill of the astronauts to set the Eagle safely in the ground in the Sea of Tranquility with only a few seconds of fuel left.

It was their ability and their bravery that saw America accomplish its dream. The work of thousands of people culminated in those few moments of suspense just before the Eagle touched down. Many words can be said to express the grandeur of the moment but just a few hours later, Neil Armstrong said it best: ''That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.'' One small step for men and women, one giant leap for people.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday was Father's Day. Yesterday we passed a resolution honoring fatherhood.

It is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) the father of young Meredith Bentsen who is present today.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. I can remember 31 years ago at the time that this event occurred, it was a typical steamy Saturday afternoon in the summer in Houston. As a young boy as we often did on Saturday afternoons, we were at a movie. I do not remember the title of the movie. As I recall I think it was about a tidal wave hitting an island. Anyway, it was a great action film that young boys and girls would like at the time. I can remember they stopped the film and they said, ''Apollo 11 has landed on the Moon.'' It was the most amazing event for a young boy and my friends and I sitting there to see that this had happened. This was the crowning event of our childhood, to grow up in Houston with the Johnson Space Center right there, and we had all visited it as children in school, that this really showed that America could do something if America wanted to do something. It was under the guise of NASA but also these three astronauts, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, who instantly became American heroes, particularly to this young Houston boy at that time.

I want to commend my colleague from California for having the foresight to introduce this bill. I am not going to add to what has already been said. But as a native Houstonian, I am particularly proud to have had the opportunity and now as a Representative for part of Houston to be able to speak in favor of this bill and vote in favor of it.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama will control 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) for yielding me the time. Let me say before I yield that time to another speaker that I am wearing a Father's Day gift from my oldest son. I am sure my colleagues have been admiring it and his good taste.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) who has in his district Buzz Aldrin as a constituent.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to rise in strong support of this resolution which will present the Congressional Gold Medal to the three astronauts who flew in the historic 1969 Apollo 11 mission. I want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) for bringing this to the floor and to the attention of the Nation. Those three men who first set foot on the Moon's surface and flew to the Moon, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, stand out as heroes to us now and in even greater relief after the passage of so many decades.

We are now in a new century. We can look back to the events of the mid-20th century and see what were the great events and what were the minor ones. This is truly an outstanding achievement not only of the 20th century but of all time. So it is appropriate that we are here today to recognize and honor these three American heroes.

These men were tasked with a mission that was never before attempted by men or women. They participated in a space program that was then and is now still fraught with danger. My brother-in-law, Mike Gernhardt, is an astronaut. I have had the opportunity to watch him go up on the space shuttle more than once, and even today that is an extraordinarily risky venture. But think what it was like for those first astronauts, think what it was like for the Apollo astronauts and those on the Apollo 11 mission who were supposed to carry out all that had been tested before them.

They proved to the world that we were still a Nation that when it sets its mind to something can do almost anything. With those few minutes of videotape, of Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin skipping across the surface of the Moon and planting the American flag, confidence in American ingenuity was reborn. Landing on the Moon may have been an American feat, but more than that it was a pioneering event for the entire world, an achievement of humanity, and it opened to the entire world a whole new realm of possibilities.

As was mentioned, I have had the privilege of representing Buzz Aldrin as a constituent. I would like to say a few words in particular about him. Buzz's own life can be best illustrated by his impressive resume and his dedication to government service. He was a graduate of West Point. He distinguished himself flying combat missions in the Korean War. After his military service, he earned an advanced degree from the prestigious Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He then returned to serving his country when he piloted one of the first manned rockets into space before joining NASA and the Apollo program.

Although it is hard to eclipse being one of the first men to set foot on the Moon, Buzz has continued to contribute to the advancement of space exploration and become a nationally recognized advocate for the space program. Even today, he earns national attention for his humanitarian efforts and his efforts with Sharespace, an organization which advocates human space travel. It is Buzz's notion that we can raise money for the space program by letting Americans participate in the opportunity to be in space. He is convinced that someday soon, sooner than later, that will be a real opportunity for ordinary Americans. But it is not just Buzz Aldrin, it is each of these three men, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins that deserves the recognition that Congress is seeking to bestow upon them today.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the three astronauts who flew in the historic 1969 Apollo 11 mission.

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

Today we not only honor the three astronauts, we also honor those other heroes at NASA, for their achievement is a tribute to the thousands of engineers, scientists and others at NASA whose extraordinary efforts made the journey possible. It is fitting that we do so this year as we begin both a new century and a new millennium. America again faces new and bold challenges both in space and here on Earth. As we

do so, the ingenuity, courage and determination shown by the astronauts can be our guide. Their love of freedom and pursuit of knowledge for the betterment of all mankind symbolizes the greatness of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding me this time. I also want to thank the distinguished ranking member and all of my colleagues for their support in this most worthy legislation and for their comments today.

We have spent the last few minutes reflecting upon the feat of the Apollo 11 astronauts that occurred 31 summers ago. Yet their greatest gift to mankind was not the footprints they left behind on the Moon. Their greatest gift was what they brought home. They brought home a limitless concept of what Americans are capable of doing and a limitless potential of what sheer imagination can bring. Their bravery, their humility, and their contribution to man has brought unending honor to our people and to our Nation. And now it is the day and the time for the Congress on behalf of the American people to honor them in this most appropriate manner.

I urge adoption of this resolution. I once again thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their graciousness in supporting this.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Buzz Aldrin and I went through flying school together. I just want to make that comment. He is a true American hero. Probably a little known fact about him is his mother's name was Moon. Quite a coincidence. He graduated from West Point with honors, third in his class, but just to show how really smart he is, he ended up in the Air Force. I could not resist that.

He is working on a spacecraft system now that would make perpetual orbits between Earth and Mars. I hope Members will join me in honoring these three American heroes.

Buzz Aldrin is a true American hero. A perhaps little-known fact about Buzz is that his mother's maiden name was Moon. Quite a coincidence. But Buzz Aldrin was a great patriot long before he ever set foot on the moon!

He graduated from West Point with honors in 1951, third in his class. And to show you just how smart he really is, he ended up in the Air Force after West Point.

I first met Buzz Aldrin when we were in flying school together in 1951 in Bartow, Florida. And we were sent off to fight in Korea together. Buzz flew 66 combat missions in Korea as part of the 51st fighter interceptor wing, where he shot down 2 MiG–15s.

Buzz earned his doctorate in astronautics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the manned space rendezvous techniques he devised were used on all NASA missions, including the first space docking with Russian cosmonauts.

Buzz was selected as one of NASA's original astronauts in October of 1963. And on July 20, 1969, the world watched in amazement as Apollo 11 touched down on the moon and Buzz Aldrin became the 2nd man to set foot on another world.

I was in solitary confinement in a Vietnam prison with no news from the outside world. But, Buzz Aldrin, paused to remember me that day. He took a POW bracelet with my name on it and an American flag to the moon to remember all the prisoners of war in Vietnam. And we will never forget that, Buzz.

You would think that after a man walks on the moon, he could sit down and rest for awhile.

But not Buzz Aldrin. Today, having retired from NASA, from the Air Force as a colonel, and from his position as commander of the test pilot school at Edwards Air Force Base, he is still working tirelessly to ensure a leading role for America in manned space exploration.

He is working on a spacecraft system that would make perpetual orbits between Earth and Mars.

Buzz has received numerous awards and medals, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest honor our country bestows.

So, I believe this Congressional Medal of Honor is long overdue for my friend Buzz Aldrin and other Apollo 11 astronauts—Neil Armstrong and Michael Collins.

I hope you will join me in honoring these three American heroes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored and excited to join Congressman JIM ROGAN and my colleagues today in authorizing the President to present astronauts Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins—the crew of the historic Apollo 11 mission—with a congressional gold medal. As a cosponsor of this legislation and as Chairman of the House Science Committee, I have observed how these three leaders of America's space program continue to inspire generations of Americans to dream beyond Earth and entertain the infinite possibilities of space exploration.

I doubt any American alive on that memorable day in late July of 1969—the 20th to be exact—will ever forget the image of Neil Armstrong first stepping foot onto the Lunar surface. Commander Armstrong presciently declared, ''That's one small step for man; one giant leap for mankind,'' and America and the rest of the world watched in awe of the greatest feat in space history.

These men provided courage and service to the U.S. beyond this memorable and daring mission. Mr. Collins co-piloted the Gemini 10 mission and later served as assistant secretary of state for public affairs. Mr. Aldrin flew over 60 combat missions in Korea and survived a 5½ hour space walk on the Gemini 12 mission. Mr. Armstrong left NASA in 1971 but continued his service through the National Commission on Space and helping lead the presidential commission investigating the Challenger explosion.

Mr. Speaker, these outstanding leaders embody the values, principles, and dedication that make our country the greatest in the world. I'm proud to join my colleagues in working to recognize Buzz Aldrin, Neil Armstrong, and Michael Collins with a congressional gold medal on behalf of the Congress and the people of the United States.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to speak in tribute of three of our country's bravest—pioneers who united this nation through their heroic feat: the astronauts of the Apollo 11 mission.

Thirty-one years ago next month, Commander Neil A. Armstrong, Lunar Module Pilot Edwin E. ''Buzz'' Aldrin, Jr., and Command Module Pilot Michael Collins completed what was an almost unthinkable task: a successful manned moon landing. It is often noted that each one of us remembers where we were when Neil Armstrong spoke the words, ''The Eagle has landed.'' Indeed, a part of each of us traveled with these adventurers into space on their record-breaking mission.

I am especially honored to salute the visionary Neil Armstrong, born in Wapakoneta, Ohio, which I am privileged to represent. Wapakoneta boasts the recently renovated Neil Armstrong Air and Space Museum, which has on display various Apollo 11 artifacts, a moon rock, and the Gemini 8 spacecraft Armstrong commanded in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of these three heroes are too numerous to compile. All three had distinguished military flying careers prior to their NASA days. All three were part of the monumental Gemini program, which saw the first spacewalk by an American and the first docking with another space vehicle. In the heart of the space race, these pioneers set the stage for today's continuing exploration of the new frontier. They conquered the moon despite the many unknown dangers of doing so, and thereby paved the way for NASA's space shuttle program and the International Space Station. Their bravery has inspired thousands of young people around the nation to pursue their hopes and dreams.

Indeed, their bravery cannot be heralded enough. Before the mission, Michael Collins commented: ''I think we will escape with our skins . . . but I wouldn't give better than even odds on a successful landing and return. There are just too many things that can go wrong.'' Despite the obstacles and potentially fatal problems, the Apollo 11 astronauts did achieve a successful landing and return, bolstering the adventurous spirit of all Americans.

Neil Armstrong once noted, ''We were three individuals who had drawn, in a kind of lottery, a momentous opportunity and a momentous responsibility.'' Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins fulfilled this opportunity with dignity, courage, and honor. It is right that we recognize their supreme accomplishment today by presenting them with a congressional gold medal in commemoration of their sacrifice. They ''came in peace for all mankind,'' as reads the plaque they left on the moon. Their achievements in the advancement of space exploration have revolutionized America, and renewed our sense of unity, pride, and hope for the future.

□ 1545

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2815.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2815.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN BRADEMAS POST OFFICE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2938) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 424 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, as the ''John Brademas Post Office''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2938

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 424 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, shall be known and designated as the ''John Brademas Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''John Brademas Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2938.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have before us today, as the Clerk just designated, a bill that will name the facility of the United States Post Office located at 424 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, as the John Brademas Post Office.

As is the practice under the government reform procedures of this bill, I am proud to state it does carry the cosponsorship of the entire Indiana delegation. Mr. Speaker, as I do on all of these bills, I have had the opportunity to read the real life story of Mr. Brademas, and it is a remarkable one.

I am very proud of the record that the House Subcommittee on the Postal Service has accrued and are working in partnership together. I want to thank certainly the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a very distinguished Member of that subcommittee, thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his efforts, not just on this bill, but in all of our work and, of course, for his managing the minority side of the discussion here this afternoon. The ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and, of course, the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), for what is yet another demonstration of bipartisanship in advancing this bill.

I particularly want to pay tribute to the main sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Indiana, (Mr. ROEMER) for really his tireless efforts in ensuring that we have this moment today.

As I mentioned, Mr. Brademas has just a remarkable career that expands over so many years, and I do not want to take away from what I expect will be rather thorough comments by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) to whom I will yield to his side in just a moment. So I will not recount all of the many, many achievements of this distinguished gentleman, but let me say in relationship to the others who have received similar tributes on this House floor, that even by those very, very high standards, Mr. Brademas really excels.

Mr. Speaker, of course he was a colleague and Member of this great body from 1959 to 1981, more than 2 decades, 22 years, in fact, of distinguished service to the people of his district in Indiana and, of course, to the people of this country; and he achieved so much that it is hard to define them all.

Certainly, I think as we take an overview, his efforts on behalf of education particularly stand out. It is a dedication that he brought virtually to every effort that he made, and it is a dedication that predated his time here in Washington and certainly continues even past that to this moment.

I want to say as someone who has the honor of representing one of the districts of New York, we are particularly pleased that we can claim a bit of a piece of Mr. Brademas. Certainly, that becomes possible through his exemplary service as the president of New York University, the largest private university in the United States, where he led that great institution for some 11 years, transforming it from what was then really a regional commuter school into a national and international residential research university.

Even today, he continues to serve as the president emeritus of that great facility and a trustee of the university. As I mentioned, we have before us today a distinguished gentleman, one for whom I think we can all direct a great deal of admiration and from whom we can draw a great deal of inspiration.

Again, to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a great deal of thanks for bringing this very, very fine nominee to our attention; and I would certainly encourage all of our colleagues here to support this very, very fine bill.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on the Postal Service, I am pleased to join my colleague in the consideration of H.R. 2938, legislation designating the United States Postal Service facility located at 424 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, after the Honorable John Brademas, a former Member of Congress.

H.R. 2938 was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) on September the 3, 1999, and reported unanimously from the Committee on Government Reform on September 30, 1999.

This measure is supported and cosponsored by the entire Indiana congressional delegation. Mr. John Brademas was born in Mishawaka, Indiana, in 1927 and graduated from South Bend Central High School in 1945. He joined the Navy and was a Veterans National Scholar at Harvard University from which he graduated in 1949 with a BA magna cum laude and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

He was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University and received the doctor of philosophy in social studies degree in 1954. Dr. Brademas, the first native born American of Greek origin to be elected to Congress, represented with honor and distinction the 3rd Congressional District of Indiana for 22 years, from 1959 to 1981.

He served on the Committee on Education and Labor and was House majority whip for his last 4 years in Congress. As a Member of the Committee on Education and Labor, Congressman Brademas played a key role in authorizing legislation concerning student financial aid, elementary and secondary education, vocational education and support for libraries, museums and the arts and humanities.

After serving in Congress, Dr. Brademas became president of New York University, the largest private university in the United States, for 11 years, transforming NYU from a regional commuter school into a national and international residential research university. He is currently serving as president emeritus of this university.

Dr. Brademas has been awarded honorary degrees by 50 colleges and universities and serves on numerous boards of nonprofit and for-profit organizations. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is to be commended for seeking to honor the caliber of a man such as former Congressman John Brademas.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me the time and for his kind comments about our colleague, Mr. Brademas. I want to thank also the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), from the great State of New York, for his help in putting up with my tireless efforts and helping us pass this legislation here today.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and special gratitude goes to the entire Indiana delegation, who not only agreed to cosponsor this legislation, but also to help push this legislation and see the success that we have today. I also want to thank all nine of the other members of the Indiana delegation for their help.

I am joined today by a distinguished Member, the gentlewoman from Indianapolis, Indiana (Ms. CARSON), who also will say some words about John Brademas.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise in support of H.R. 2938, a bill I introduced several months ago to designate the United States Post Office located at 424 South Michigan Street in my hometown of South Bend as the John Brademas Post Office.

John Brademas is one of the most distinguished people to serve in Congress from the 3rd Congressional District of Indiana, as a matter of fact, from the State of Indiana and probably in the country. While John Brademas was serving in the House, I briefly worked as a staff assistant in his congressional office. His guidance has been a constant source of inspiration to me, and I have always tried to serve in Congress with the same degree of honor and integrity and respect for the institution and the office to which I have now served and which John Brademas served for 22 years.

John Brademas helped teach me the importance of family and community and the value of public service. John Brademas graduated from South Bend Central High School in 1945. After service in the U.S. Navy, he was a Veterans National Scholar at Harvard University from which he graduated in 1949 with a Bachelor of Arts. He also served as executive assistant to the late Adlai Stevenson in 1955 and in 1956.

Dr. Brademas was in charge of the research on issues during that 1956 presidential campaign. Three years later, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives for the 3rd district of Indiana.

Over the years, John Brademas has made numerous enduring contributions for the great State of Indiana and for our Nation. His accomplishments and contributions are as impressive as they are numerous. As those of us who served with John know, he was for 22 years a particularly active member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, where he earned a highly distinguished reputation for his leadership in promoting education.

He also worked tirelessly in support of landmark legislation, such as the Higher Education Acts of 1972 and 1976, which cleared the way for more Americans to gain access to financial aid. Dr. Brademas was also the primary sponsor of legislation improving elementary and secondary education, vocational education, as well as services for the elderly and the handicapped.

Following his retirement from Congress, Dr. Brademas served by appointment of the House Speaker Tip O'Neill on the National Commission on Student Financial Assistance and chaired its Subcommittee on Graduate Education. Upon leaving Congress, John Brademas became president of NYU, New York University, our Nation's largest private university, a position in which he served for 11 years.

In 1984, he initiated fund-raising campaigns that produced a total of $1 billion over 10 years. The New York Times headline from that time read, ''A decade and a billion dollars put New York University in first rank.''

Now, president emeritus, Dr. Brademas is also chairman, by appointment of President Clinton, of the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities. In 1997, this committee released Creative America, a report to the President recommending new and innovative ways to strengthen support and improve on private and public education for these two fields.

In addition to his responsibilities at NYU, Dr. Brademas is currently the chairman of the board of the National Endowment for Democracy and serves on the Consultants' Panel to the Comptroller General of the United States.

□ 1600

I am proud to sponsor this bipartisan legislation, and am pleased that all 10 members of the Indiana delegation of the House of Representatives are original cosponsors.

This measure is a fitting tribute to one of the great leaders and educators to have served in Congress, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2938.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise in support of H.R. 2938, a bill I introduced with the entire Hoosier delegation to designate the United States Post Office located at 424 South Michigan Street in my hometown of South Bend, Indiana, as the ''John Brademas Post Office.''

John Brademas is one of the most distinguished predecessors as the U.S. Representative in Congress of the Third Congressional District of Indiana. While John Brademas was serving in the House, I worked as a staff assistant in his congressional office. In that time, I learned a great deal from him about the importance of family and community and the value of public service. His guidance has been a constant source of inspiration to me, and I have always tried to serve in Congress with the same degree of honor and respect for the institution and the office to which I was elected.

John Brademas graduated from South Bend Central High School in 1945. After service in the U.S. Navy, he was a Veterans National Scholar at Harvard University from which he graduated in 1949 with a Bachelor of Arts, magna cum laude and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He wrote his doctoral dissertation at Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar. As Executive Assistant to the late Adlai Stevenson in 1955–56, Dr. Brademas was in charge of research on issues during the 1956 presidential campaign. Three years later, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives to represent Indiana's Third Congressional District.

Over the years, John Brademas has made numerous enduring contributions for the great state of Indiana and our Nation. His accomplishments and contributions are as impressive as they are numerous. As those of you who served with John Brademas know, he was for 22 years (1959–1981), a particularly active member of the Committee on Education and Labor, where he earned a highly distinguished reputation for his leadership in promotion education. He also worked tirelessly in support of landmark legislation such as the Higher Education Acts of 1972 and 1976, which cleared the way for more Americans to gain access to student financial aid. Dr. Brademas was also the primary sponsor of legislation improving elementary and secondary education, vocational education, as well as services for the elderly and handicapped. I am very proud to follow John Brademas' as a member of the same committee, now known as the Committee on Education and the Workforce. He served his last four years in the House as the Chief Majority Whip.

Following his retirement from Congress, Dr. Brademas served, by appointment of House Speaker Thomas P. ''Tip'' O'Neill, Jr., on the National Commission on Student Financial Assistance and chaired its Subcommittee on Graduate Education. In 1983, the Commission approved the Subcommittee's study, Signs of Trouble and Erosion: A Report of Graduate Education in America. Upon leaving Congress, John Brademas became president of New York University, our nation's largest private university, a position in which he served for 11 years (1981–1992). During that time, Dr. Brademas led the transition of NYU from a mostly regional school to a national and international residential research university.

In 1984, he initiated a fundraising campaign that produced a total of $1 billion over ten years. The New York Times headline from that time read, '' A Decade and Billion Dollars Put New York University in [the] First Rank.'' Now president-emeritus, Dr. Brademas is also chairman, by appointment of President Clinton, of the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities. In 1997, this committee released Creative America, a report to the President recommending new and innovative ways to strengthen support, private and public, for these two fields.

In addition his responsibilities at NYU, Dr. Brademas is currently the chairman of the board of the National Endowment for Democracy and serves on the Consultants' Panel to the Comptroller General of the United States. He is co-chairman of the Center on Science, Technology and Congress at the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

He earlier served on the Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology and Government and chaired its Committee on Congress.

I am proud to sponsor this bipartisan legislation and am pleased that all ten members of the Indiana delegation in the House of Representations are original cosponsors of the bill. This measure is a fitting tribute to one of the greatest leaders and educators to have ever served in Congress. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2938.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), as well as the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate my support for the designation of the South Bend Post Office in honor of a former colleague, Mr. John Brademas.

Throughout the 22 years Mr. Brademas' devoted to representing Indiana's Third District in the United States Congress, his demonstrated commitment to improving our country's education system was extremely significant. As former House Majority Whip and a former member of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Brademas led the efforts to enact much of the legislation regarding education produced during his tenure in Congress. The State of Indiana is quite proud to have been represented by a man of such distinction and intellect.

After his Congressional service, Mr. Brademas led New York University as its president from 1981 to 1992 and was appointed by President Clinton to chair the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities in 1994.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this measure that will honor a very accomplished former Member and will make tangible our appreciation for his tireless commitment to serving the public.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have had this matter before us today for consideration. Certainly again I commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for giving us the opportunity to pay tribute to such an outstanding American.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, briefly and in closing, let me add my words to that of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and thanks to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and, as the gentleman so graciously noted too, his colleagues within the Indiana delegation, for providing us with this opportunity.

As we have certainly heard here today, this nominee, I think, demonstrates the kind of achievement, the kind of devotion and dedication that should make all of us very proud for this moment and this opportunity to extend to him a very deserving recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud as well of the initiative and the efforts of all of the Members of this body to take ourselves into sometimes unchartered water. However, I would note on occasion it is worthy and I think comforting to note that we follow others.

I think it is significant as sort of a capstone to the very gracious things rightfully said about Mr. Brademas, that over the course of his very distinguished career and lifetime he has been awarded 50 honorary degrees by distinguished colleges and universities such as the University of Athens; Brandeis; the City College of New York; my father's alma mater, Colgate; the University of Cyprus; Fordham University; the University of Southern California; Indiana University; Notre Dame; and just on and on and on. So we follow perhaps rather well-trod, but I think very, very fine ground here today. I would urge all of our colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 2938, which will designate a post office in South Bend, Indiana, as the John Brademas Post Office.

I had the honor of serving with John Brademas from 1965 through 1976. We served together on the Education and Labor Committee, and I remember well his leadership in developing legislation to improve education, to provide services for the elderly and handicapped, to support libraries, museums, the arts, and humanities, and to help develop early childhood education.

Dr. Brademas was a major sponsor of the Higher Education Acts of 1972 and 1976, which greatly expanded college opportunities by strengthening student financial aid. He was the chief House sponsor of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, the Humanities and Cultural Affairs Act, the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act; the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Act; and the Museum Services Act, which created the Institute of Museum Services. The impact of his vision and leadership in education, culture and the arts, and seniors issues is evidenced by the centrality of these programs in the work of the Education Committee a quarter century after he left the Congress.

John Brademas served as chair of the Education Subcommittee which heard countless witnesses on the subject of comprehensive early childhood education. This was an area of my greatest personal interest and priority. In fact, Congress passed such a bill in 1972, which was vetoed by President Nixon. Since that time, Congress has failed to legislate in this critical area.

I also remember John as a valued mentor and friend. His integrity, his dedication to providing America's children and young people with the best possible educational opportunities, and his concern for the most vulnerable members of our society—children, the disabled, the elderly—were deeply inspiring to me.

After leaving Congress, Dr. John Brademas further distinguished himself as president of New York University from 1981 to 1992. Under his leadership, New York University went from being a regional commuter school to a national and international residential research university. Dr. Brademas is currently president emeritus of NYU, chair of the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities, co-chair of the Center on Science, Technology and Congress, and board member of Americans for the Arts, Kos Pharmaceuticals, Loews Corporation, Oxford University Press-USA, and Scholastic, Inc. He is also chair of the Board of the National Endowment for Democracy and serves on the Consultants' Panel to the Comptroller General of the United States.

The people of the Third District of Indiana can be justly proud of this great man whose legacy deserves to be memorialized in the designation of The John Brademas Post Office.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2938.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4601, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 3859, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

DEBT REDUCTION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R 4601, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4601, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 5, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Baca	Barcia
Ackerman	Bachus	Barr
Aderholt	Baird	Barrett (NE)
Allen	Baker	Barrett (WI)
Andrews	Baldacci	Bartlett
Archer	Baldwin	Barton
Armey	Ballenger	Bass

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

NAYS—5

Cardin
Nadler
Oberstar
Sabo
Thurman

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Cook
Davis (VA)
Emerson
Ewing
Klink
McCollum
McIntosh
Roybal-Allard
Vento

□ 1626

Mr. SABO changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, PORTER, and HINCHEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE LOCK BOX ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3859, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3859, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez

Roemer	Skelton	Toomey
Rogan	Slaughter	Towns
Rogers	Smith (MI)	Traficant
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Turner
Rothman	Smith (TX)	Udall (CO)
Roukema	Smith (WA)	Udall (NM)
Royce	Snyder	Upton
Rush	Souder	Velazquez
Ryan (WI)	Spence	Visclosky
Ryun (KS)	Spratt	Vitter
Salmon	Stabenow	Walden
Sanchez	Stark	Walsh
Sanders	Stearns	Wamp
Sandlin	Stenholm	Waters
Sanford	Strickland	Watkins
Sawyer	Stump	Watt (NC)
Saxton	Stupak	Watts (OK)
Scarborough	Sununu	Waxman
Schaffer	Sweeney	Weiner
Schakowsky	Talent	Weldon (FL)
Scott	Tancredo	Weldon (PA)
Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Weller
Serrano	Tauscher	Wexler
Sessions	Tauzin	Weygand
Shadegg	Taylor (MS)	Whitfield
Shaw	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Shays	Terry	Wilson
Sherman	Thomas	Wise
Sherwood	Thompson (CA)	Wolf
Shimkus	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Shows	Thornberry	Wu
Shuster	Thune	Wynn
Simpson	Thurman	Young (AK)
Sisisky	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
Skeen	Tierney	

NAYS—2

Nadler	Sabo

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell	Ewing	Miller, George
Cook	Klink	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis (VA)	McCollum	Roybal-Allard
Emerson	McIntosh	Vento

□ 1634

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 297, I was unavoidably detained. If present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 297.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunately unable to be here earlier today, and should I have been present, I would have voted in the affirmative on Roll No. 296 for H.R. 4601, the Debt Reduction Reconciliation Act. I would have also voted in strong favor of Roll No. 297 for H.R. 3859, the Social Security and Medicare Lock-Box Act.

CORRECTION OF PRINTING ERRORS IN HOUSE REPORT 106–645 ACCOMPANYING H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the following statement to correct a printing error in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the report to accompany the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, House Report 106–645, includes a printing error. On page 204, roll-call vote number 4, the amendment dealing with ergonomics, under the column for Members voting ''nay,'' there is a name ''Mr. Lextra.''

That name should not be in that column. There is no such person on the Committee on Appropriations or in the House of Representatives.

Under the column for Members voting ''present,'' the name of the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) appears. The report the committee filed with the House shows that the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) voted ''nay,'' not ''present.'' His name should not have been printed in the ''present'' column but in the ''nay'' column.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this statement reflecting the accurate vote of the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) on the ergonomics issue appear not only in today's RECORD but in the permanent Record for the day that this legislation was initially considered, June 8, 2000.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would just like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida how many other times has Mr. Lextra voted in this or any other committee, even though he is not a member of the committee and, to my knowledge, is not a Member of the House?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman is well aware, he and I read every word and every comma of each report. I have not seen the name Mr. Lextra ever, and I doubt the gentleman from Wisconsin has.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 4635, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 525 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4635.

□ 1640

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4635) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, June 19, 2000, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) had been disposed of and the bill was open to amendment from page 9, line 1, to page 9, line 3.

REQUEST FOR EN BLOC CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS NUMBERED 40, 28, AND 26

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at this time that the Ney amendment No. 40, the Guttierez amendment No. 28, and the Tancredo amendment No. 26 be considered en bloc.

I further ask unanimous consent that after disposition of these amendments, that the House return to the reading of the bill on page 9, line 8.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to object to the request at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WAXMAN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WAXMAN. I have another amendment on the same subject as yesterday, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to inquire if this is the appropriate time in the bill to offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Committee proceeds further on page 10 the gentleman will be in order in the reading, but at the moment another Member of the House, a member of the committee, is seeking recognition to strike the last word.

After that the Clerk will read to the proper point in the bill.

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

I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, to see that a number of Members have recognized that the VA medical research account is underfunded in this bill, and that they want to increase this funding through amendments that we are going to consider soon. The chairman and the ranking member have done a good job

under tough constraints on this legislation, but this is one item that we really need to tend to here today. I am glad to see that we will have the opportunity to do so.

I have been a strong proponent of VA medical research, and I offered an amendment during the full Committee on Appropriations markup that would have increased that account by $23 million. I want to take just a minute today to explain why I support increasing the VA medical research account and why it is so important for us to find a way of doing so.

The original request from the VA to OMB was to fund the research account at $397 million. Outside supporters of the program believe the program should be funded at $386 million. These recommendations are both well above the current bill's level of $321 million.

Most of us have heard about the Seattle foot, that remarkable artificial limb that has been depicted in television commercials by a double amputee playing pick-up basketball or by a woman running a 100-yard dash. It is not obvious that she has two artificial legs until the camera zooms in at the end of the commercial. The technology for this prosthesis was developed by VA researchers in Seattle.

Research at VA hospitals is important because it is clinical research, mainly. The researcher, who is almost always affiliated with a neighboring teaching hospital, also treats patients, veterans. The VA research program is the only one dedicated solely to finding cures to ailments that affect our veteran population. It is not interchangeable with other research efforts.

At the Durham, North Carolina, VA, which is affiliated with Duke University, there is a great range of research being done, from working to find a cure for AIDS to finding a shingles vaccine to important advances in brain imaging and telemedicine. This work, of course, assists veterans, but it also helps the population at large.

The VA does a great job of leveraging its funds. Dr. Jack Feussner, the director of the VA medical research program, testified that for every dollar of increase that the program has received over the last 5 years, it has received $3 from other sources. Therefore, if we were to add $23 million here today, it could translate into $92 million more for research.

What will these additional funds be used for? Eleven million dollars is needed just to maintain current services, to keep up with medical inflation. Another $12 million could be used for any number of research projects.

The VA is starting a research oversight program vital to the integrity of the human-based research programs. It could be a model for other federally-assisted research. This program needs $1 million.

To bring the program back to the high water mark of 1998 would take $43 million. Dr. Feussner has listed four areas that would benefit particularly from additional research dollars: Parkinson's Disease, end-stage renal failure, diabetes, and Post-Traumatic Shock Disorder. Additional research into the treatment and cure for hepatitis C would also be looked at carefully.

□ 1645

We also need to increase the commitment to training the next generation of clinician and nonclinician investigators. To keep that program on track would take an additional $10 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, difficult decisions will need to be made on these upcoming amendments, and there are several of them. They all offer an offset of some sort. Most of the offsets I would not support if they stood alone. But the overall allocation for our VA–HUD subcommittee is just not sufficient, and these difficult trade-offs must be made.

I am hopeful that, at the end of this process, an additional allocation will be available and that we will be able to fund VA medical research at close to $386 million and that any offsets that we adopt can largely be restored. However, it is very important to raise the appropriations level here today for medical research before this bill goes any farther in the appropriations process.

I hope this is helpful, this overview of how these monies might be spent and why we need them. Additional funding for VA research will benefit our veterans and our country, and I hope Members will pay attention closely to the arguments on the amendments to follow.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. FILNER:

Page 9, after line 3, insert the following:

In addition, for ''Medical Care'', $35,200,000 for health care benefits for Filipino World War II veterans who were excluded from benefits by the Rescissions Acts of 1946 and to increase service-connected disability compensation from the peso rate to the full dollar amount for Filipino World War II veterans living in the United States: *Provided,* That the Congress hereby designates the entire such amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available only to the extent of a specific dollar amount for such purpose that is included in an official budget request transmitted by the President to the Congress and that is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to such section 251(b)(2)(A).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I have an issue which has been before this House before, an issue of, I think, great moral urgency but financially responsible; and that is to right a wrong that was committed in this country by the Congress of 1946, which took away the veterans' benefits that had been promised to our Filipino allies who were drafted into World War II, fought bravely at Corregidor and Bataan. Many died. But were ultimately extremely helpful, if not responsible, for our slowing up of the Japanese advance and then our ultimate victory in the Pacific.

What we did do to these brave men was to take away their benefits after the war, and they have yet to be recognized in this way. Many are in their late 70s and early 80s. Many will not be here in a few years. I think this is an emergency item that ought to be considered by this House.

My amendment would provide $35,200,000 for health care benefits to these veterans of World War II. This is the benefit that they need the most in their twilight years.

Like their counterparts, they fought as brave soldiers. They helped to win the war. Many of them marched to their deaths, in fact, in the famous Bataan death march. Yet we rewarded them by taking away their benefits. We owe them a fair hearing. We owe them the dignity and honor of considering them veterans. My amendment would restore just some of those benefits to these veterans.

I think all of my colleagues know that veterans are entitled to, under certain conditions provided by law, certain preventions and certain medical care. But this amendment divides the benefits from the pensions from the medical benefits and says let us at least now, within our budget means, give health care to those brave Filipino soldiers.

My amendment would make available monies for care in this country, a small portion also for our VA clinic in Manila to serve the Filipino World War II veterans and U.S. citizens there alike. What we are saying here is that the honor and bravery of veterans of World War II will finally be recognized by this Congress 54 years after they were taken away.

I would ask this body to recognize the bravery of our allies, the Filipinos who we drafted, provide them with eligibility for benefits, health care benefits that are given to American soldiers who fought in the same war for the same honorable cause.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is being challenged on a point of order because authorization has not been given. I would make the point that, not only did these veterans earn this benefit in the war, not only are there dozens of programs in this bill that are not authorized, but that, through the regular legislative process, we have not been allowed to bring this bill up.

I ask the floor, I ask the Chair to allow us to finally grant honor and dignity to these brave soldiers, many of whom, as I said, are in their 80s, and finally right a historical wrong of great proportions.

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

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, let me first begin by applauding the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. FILNER), for his efforts. I know he has done this over many years, trying to fight for the justice of many of the veterans for World War II who fought under the flag of the United States, in fact fought at the insistence of this country.

Simply put, what the gentleman is trying to do is trying to restore benefits to which these individuals as veterans were entitled to but were stripped of by affirmative action by this Congress back in the late 1940s. But for the action of this Congress, some 50-odd years ago, these individuals would be receiving these benefits that the gentleman from California are now trying to restore.

So I would like to add my voice to the many in this Congress who are supportive of the gentleman's efforts, and, unfortunately, at this time is unable to proceed with this particular amendment. I would hope that my colleagues would recognize the efforts of the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. FILNER), and at some point soon recognize that we must do something for the ladies and gentlemen who fought in the 1940s to defend this country and are now at the point of passing on. It is time for us to recognize their effort and recognize that this Congress some 54 years ago or so denied them the rights that they had under this Constitution.

So I applaud the gentleman for what he does.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order against the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand that this amendment may be struck on a point of order. Many of us have been trying for many, many years to get this through, both under Democrat and Republican administrations.

I served in the United States military, and a large portion of that was in Southeast Asia, eight different deployments on carriers all going through the Philippines, and based there for training. I was also stationed there at San Miguel for some 18 months.

I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I would hope that the conference chairman, in some way, even though this may be struck with a point of order, see that the gentleman is correct, there was a promise made by the United States Government, if these individuals fought on the side of the allies, that we would give them certain benefits. The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is not asking even for the full-blown benefits that were promised, but even a neck-down version so that the cost is not too high. This does not affect the health care of American veterans; this will actually enhance it.

I hope there is some way that in the conference when additional monies from revenues come into the coffers that we can find some way in the conference to support the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

The Negridos were like the Native Americans to the United States; they were native to the Philippines. They are infamous on their ability to disrupt the enemy's lines during World War II in the Philippines.

The Filipino people, as the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) mentioned, actually walked in the Bataan death march with us; and many of those people died right alongside of Americans. Many of them died trying to free Americans in hiding and protecting them. They were executed. I mean, there is movie after movie depicting their heroism.

I also want my colleagues to take a look at the involvement of the Filipino Americans in this country and what they have done for the United States of America. Every university we see is filled with Filipinos. Why? Because they believe in education. They believe in patriotism. They believe in the family unit. There has been no better group to immigrate to this country.

Secondly, the United States Navy for many, many years used the Filipinos. They would give up their lives, in some cases actually give up their lives, to serve in the military.

During Desert Storm, they would volunteer to serve in the military, even though they were killed, their spouses may have been shipped back to the Philippines, giving their life. We thought that that was wrong also.

But I rise in support, and I would say to the Filipino community—(the gentleman from California spoke in Tagolog)—which means I will love the Philippines forever. I was stationed there, so I speak a little Tagolog.

But in this case, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is absolutely correct. I hope we can work in a bipartisan way to bring about this amendment. It is a very small measure of what we have been trying to do for a long time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. The gentleman from California is adjacent to me in San Diego. He is a powerful voice for our Filipino American citizens. I thank him. There are no two people I would prefer to have talking on this from the other side of the aisle than the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), and I appreciate the support.

This is a bipartisan effort. It is a matter of historical and moral righteousness and truth. I so appreciate the statement of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) for espousing the cause of our Philippine veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this amendment to provide $35.2 million in VA health care benefits for our Filipino nationals who fought with our American troops against the Japanese in World War II.

For almost 4 years, over 100,000 Filipinos of the Philippine Commonwealth Army fought alongside the allies to reclaim the Philippines from the Japanese. Regrettably, in return, what did Congress do? Congress enacted the Rescission Act of 1946. Despite President Truman having approved all of this, that measure limited veterans' eligibility for service-connected disabilities and death compensation and also denied the members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army the honor of being recognized as veterans of our own Armed Forces.

A second group, the special Philippines Scouts, called New Scouts, who enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces after October 6, 1945, primarily to perform occupation duty in the Pacific were simply excluded.

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

(On request of Mr. FILNER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CUNNINGHAM was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

I believe it is long past time to try to correct this injustice and to provide the members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army and the Special Philippine Scouts with a token of the appreciation for the courageous services that they valiantly earned during their service in World War II.

Given the difficulty in extending full veterans' benefits without adversely impacting other domestic veterans programs, health benefits are the most appropriate to extend. With this in mind, the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), with the support of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), provides funding for such benefits which are sorely needed by an aging population of veterans well into their twilight years.

I commend both gentleman from California, Mr. FILNER and Mr.

CUNNINGHAM, for supporting this amendment. I urge our colleagues to lend their full support.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming the balance of my time, I would say that this is a promise made by the United States Government.

Most of us were not here when that promise was made, much like our friends from Guam. But there is a promise, and that promise was taken away after the war. They fulfilled their contract, and this government reneged on that particular contract.

I ask my colleagues on this side of the aisle and the chairman to give this consideration in the conference even though it will probably be struck with a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is worth standing here for the next few minutes to continue this dialogue. I want to congratulate the words of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) who just spoke, along with those of the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. FILNER), as well. Both of the gentlemen from California have spoken very righteously about this particular issue.

□ 1700

And while we know this amendment will be ruled out of order in the next few minutes, it does bear saying.

I do not know if all my colleagues are aware of what we are talking about here, nor perhaps the American people who might be watching; but what we are talking about here is the fact that during World War II Americans encountered a very rough time in the Pacific. There was a point there where it was not clear how the battles would turn and how the war would turn; and in the Philippines, things were tough. It got to a point where our President, President Roosevelt, called upon the Filipino people to come forward and fight under the American flag. In fact, it was an edict. They were to serve under the American flag. And, sure enough, they did, and they did so with honor.

These were individuals from the Philippines who were fighting not just for their country but for the United States of America. They were under the command of U.S. forces. They were under the direction of generals of the United States of America. When they were told to go to battle, it was by American generals; and it was to provide for the security and safety not just of Philippine soldiers but of American soldiers. When many of these Philippine soldiers died, they died under the American flag.

At the conclusion of the war, these Filipino veterans who fought so valiantly were entitled, because they had fought under the flag of the United States and at the direction of our President, to receive the benefits of Americans who had served under our flag. And had everything proceeded as it normally would, these Filipino veterans would have received every single type of benefit that an American soldier received having fought for this country at the direction of this government. But in 1946, Congress affirmatively took steps to rescind those rights that those veterans from the Philippines had. The Rescission Act of 1946 stripped Filipino veterans of any rights they had as American veterans.

Last session, this Congress, working in a bipartisan manner, actually restored a modicum amount of those benefits. It allowed some of those Filipino veterans who were in this country, had been here for the last 50-some-odd years, and who actually decided to go back to the Philippines, to retain their SSI benefits, these are folks that are in their 80s, at reduced levels. In fact, we ended up saving money having them do that. Because rather than having them collect supplemental security income at the price of what it would cost by their staying here in America, if they did it in the Philippines, it would cost even less. That was, in a way, a token to those Filipino veterans, but it actually saved us money.

What the two gentlemen from San Diego are talking about is trying to restore some semblance of decency, who are now in their 80s and dying away, and it is the right thing to do. It is something we owe them. Because when it was time to take to that battle and they were charged to do so, they did not ask what would happen; and they did not ask what would be the return, they just did so.

For that reason, we should try to work in support of the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), which would simply say give these veterans, now in their 80s, for the most part, access to health care that most American veterans are entitled to receive. That is the right thing to do. And I would join with my two friends from San Diego who are fighting for this, to say that it is something I hope that the conference committee will take up, that the chairman and ranking member will consider, because we should do this. At a time when many of these veterans may not see the next year, as we come closer to doing this, it is the right thing to do.

In the last session of Congress, in the 105th Congress, we had 209 Members of Congress who cosponsored legislation that contained these precise provisions. Just eight sponsors away from having a majority of this House saying they wanted to see this happen. We are very close. Most Members do support this when they are told about this, but it is just so difficult bureaucratically, procedurally, to get this done. I would hope that the chairman and the ranking Members and the committees of jurisdiction, when in conference, would consider this.

I join with my colleagues from California who have spoken, along with the many others who would like to speak on this, to say it is the right thing to do and we should move forward.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must remind all Members that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and not to a viewing or listening audience.

Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

I too rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), that would provide health care benefits for Filipino World War II veterans that were excluded from benefits by the 1946 Rescission Act.

For all the reasons that have been stated by the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), this is an issue that is really a no-brainer. It is an issue that when people hear the entire story, they will support full equity, full World War II benefits for Filipino World War II veterans.

These veterans are comprised mostly of Filipino volunteers and recruits, augmented by American soldiers, who were the defenders of Bataan and Corregidor and who delayed the Japanese effort to conquer the western Pacific. This enabled U.S. forces to adequately prepare and launch the campaign to finally secure victory in the Pacific theater of World War II.

Filipino veterans swore allegiance to the same flag, wore the same uniforms, fought, bled, and died in the same battlefields alongside American comrades, but were never afforded equal status. And even after the surrender of American forces in the initial part of the battle of the Philippines, they continued to fight on in guerilla units.

Prior to the mass discharges and disbanding of their unit in 1949, these veterans were paid only a third of what regular service members received at the time. Underpaid, having been denied benefits that they were promised, and lacking proper recognition, General MacArthur's words, ''No army has ever done so much with so little,'' truly depicts the plight of the remaining Filipino veterans today as they certainly did a half century ago.

In terms of my own people of Guam, since we are closest to the Philippines, I guess of all the areas that are represented in Congress, and the people of Guam share deep cultural and historic ties with the Philippines, we also understand the trauma and the tragedy that they endured because we too suffered horrendous occupation, a long and painful and brutal occupation under the Imperial Japanese Army.

And we certainly appreciate, understand, and support the efforts of peoples who are trying to resolve the issue of Filipino World War II veterans.

I urge my colleagues to support the Filner amendment. I know that I certainly will probably be ruled out of order here before too long, but the issue will not go away until we certainly see justice for these veterans no matter how many are left. And I must remind the Members of the House that they continue to pass away as we continue to not address this issue fully.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know we cannot fix this problem here today, but I want the gentlemen to know that we are sympathetic on this issue.

These Filipino veterans enlisted in the United States Armed Services during World War II to fight against the Japanese. At the time, the Philippines were a protectorate of the United States and not an independent country. They fought bravely, at great sacrifice, under the orders of the U.S. military commands, and had every reason to expect full veterans benefits.

For the reasons which I do not fully understand, however, in 1946, the law established for this particular group of veterans a two-tier system with less benefits. In particular, they have less health care and lower rates of disability compensation, even when they now live in the United States.

I would hope that the authorizing committee could look into this situation, and hopefully look into it expeditiously, and make appropriate adjustments for these Filipino veterans who fought both for their country and for the United States.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman very much for his remarks, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) for the amendment, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for his support, and the others who have spoken on this amendment.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. Unfortunately, I guess a point of order has been raised against it. But I agree, I would hope that the authorizing committee would report this legislation out so that these Filipino veterans would get what is in fact due to them under the promises that we have made, and I look forward to working with the others supporting this matter.

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

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for his warm support of this. He is absolutely right.

And, again, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) indicated that well over 200 Members of the House signed onto legislation. I would point out to the House that that legislation was for both health care and for pension benefits. So if 209 Members of this body supported a bill which was costed out at roughly $500 million or $600 million, surely this session of Congress could approve just the health benefits at $35 million. But I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just say that I think the authorizing committee has been invited to bring that legislation to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Filner amendment.

I do not quite understand the legislative precedence which, in some instances, allow appropriation bills to come to the floor with a waiver of points of order which would allow the inclusion of appropriations for matters that have not cleared the authorizing committee. When so many Members of this Chamber support this legislation, it seems to me in order for the rule to have come out allowing this amendment to be made to correct this very, very grave injustice that has been permitted to exist for these numbers of years.

These Filipino veterans, if they were aged 20 at the time they were enlisted to help the United States Government, if they were 20 years old, today they are at least 80 or 85. There will not be much more time for this Congress to rectify this injustice, so I plead with the people who are taking this bill over to the other side to give consideration to the emergency of this situation and to find a way to at least provide the health care which the Filner amendment allows this Congress to permit these individuals.

A lot has been said about the sacrifice that these individuals made. I want it to be made perfectly clear that it was 5 months before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor that President Roosevelt issued an Executive Order calling upon the Filipino Commonwealth Army into the service of the United States Forces in the Far East. The date was July 26, 1941, long before Pearl Harbor. The Filipino soldiers complied without hesitation. They were part of the United States in their hearts and in their minds.

The Philippines was considered a possession of the United States. In fact, perhaps they had no choice but to agree to enlist and become a part of the U.S. forces. They had grown up under the U.S. rule. They spoke English. They knew a lot about our government and about our democracy. And so when they were called upon to defend this freedom for which we fought and died, they willingly signed up, stood in line and gave of their lives. And it seems to me that the promises made to them at the time that they went into service should be honored.

The fact of the matter is that there is almost a concession that the promises were made. Why else do we have a rescission, which is a cancellation, of benefits that were promised? We do not have a rescission if there is not an acknowledgment that there were promises made and commitments given to these veterans. But, anyway, in 1946, the Congress of the United States passed a rescission bill and took away all possibility that the promises made to the Filipino veterans would be honored by the United States Government. And that is the shameful act that we are seeking at least partially today to correct.

These veterans are very old. They are in their 80s, 85, perhaps 90s. Many of them live in my district. I see them every time that there is a veterans holiday or a Memorial Day or a gathering in the community, and I know how deeply they feel about this issue. They see the Congress dealing with it, and yet due to some legislative thing there is a point of order and the matter cannot be brought to a vote.

I think it is a very, very sad travesty that we are permitting, through a parliamentary situation, not to bring up to the House of Representatives. Because I feel sure, as the previous speaker from California indicated, that more than 218 Members of this House would vote for this measure. This is not the full measure that we feel they are entitled to, but it is the most urgent piece of this promise, and that is the health care that they so desperately need.

Many of these veterans have returned back to the Philippines because that is probably the only way that they could be cared for by their families or some friends, or perhaps the health system there would permit them to be cared for.

□ 1715

But for those few thousand veterans that are here in the United States, the delay of a day, a month, a year means a delay in perpetuity.

So I call upon those who will be working on this matter, taking it to conference and discussing it, not to wait another day but to call the compassion and the commitment and the moral obligation that this country has to these veterans and enact it into law this year.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) now insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do. I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

Mr. Chairman, there are any number of Members who sympathize with the intent of this language. The problem is it is unauthorized. This decision needs to be determined in the committee of authorization, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, not in the context of an appropriation. And, therefore, I insist on my point of order.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) in not insisting on the point of order until we had a chance for those who wanted to speak on it, and I sincerely thank him for that courtesy.

But I would point out to the Chair of our committee and to the Chair of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that this insistence on this point of order is rather arbitrary. The same argument could be made, as I have said earlier, to dozens of programs in this bill.

Under FEMA there are many programs not authorized. The whole NASA, apparently, is not authorized. The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation is not authorized. Major projects of construction in the veterans' affairs budget are not authorized. And I can go on and on.

The point here is that this House can pick and choose which items to protect in a point of order in an appropriations bill. I think that is not only illogical, but it does not show the reality. In this case, we have had to face really the obstruction of only one person that would prevent this from even coming to the floor and being authorized.

So I would ask at some point in the future that the chairman and the ranking member look kindly on this amendment, this legislation. We only have a few years left before these brave veterans are no longer with us. And so, I understand his insistence on the point of order, but I wish he would grant the same latitude that he had to dozens of other programs in this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo the words of the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER). This is not a partisan issue. The 40 years following the war, the Congress was controlled by the other side. We have gone through 5 years of Republican control of this House; and it is time, especially with the cosponsors, that we bring this to fruition.

I would like to repeat to the ranking member and the ranking minority member of the committee on authorization, there is a determination here by both sides of the aisle to see this through to fruition. Whether we do it this time or we do it the next time, this will pass. I would ask the chairman to consider it in the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The amendment earmarks funds in a manner not supported by existing law. The amendment also proposes to designate an appropriation as an emergency for purposes of budget enforcement procedures in law. As such, it constitutes legislation, in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I again rise to ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider at this time the Ney amendment No. 40, the Gutierrez amendment No. 28, the Tancredo amendment No. 26, and that they be considered en bloc.

I ask further that after disposition of these amendments that the House return to the reading of the bill on page 9, line 8.

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just want to clarify that amendments under the Medical Research paragraph are still eligible with the unanimous consent request of the gentleman. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, our intention is not to preclude anyone's ability to comment on these amendments or offer amendments.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to see, before I pursue the objection, whether amendment No. 19 would be in order, given this unanimous consent agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot prejudge an amendment that has not yet been offered.

Mr. FILNER. Then I will have to object. I want to know if it is eligible for offering at the point of line 8, as the amendment requests. I have to ask this, otherwise I will have to object to the unanimous consent request.

I think the intent is to keep my amendment eligible. I just want to make sure that it is.

The CHAIRMAN. First of all, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) should understand that reading is to commence at page 9, line 4, not line 8. His request is a bit premature.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would, then, amend that we return to reading of the bill on page 9, line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read, as follows:

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 73, to remain available until September 30, 2002, $321,000,000, plus reimbursements.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been no unanimous consent agreement in the Committee, nor is there an amendment pending.

Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) wish to offer an amendment or a unanimous consent request?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, may I restate my unanimous consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that I may offer Ney amendment No. 40, Gutierrez amendment No. 28, and Tancredo amendment No. 26, and that they be considered en bloc; and I further ask that after disposition of the amendments the Committee return to the reading of the bill on page 9, line 4.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. WALSH

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 4635

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY: MR. NEY

Under the heading ''MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH'' of title I, page 9, line 8, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)'' after ''$321,000,000''.

Under the heading ''ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT'' of title III, page 59, line 6, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)'' after ''$1,900,000,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY: MR. GUTIERREZ

Page 9, after line 8, insert after the dollar amount the follwoing: ''(increase by $25,000,000)''.

Page 73, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY: MR. TANCREDO

Page 14, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $30,000,000)''.

Page 73, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hard job that the distinguished chairman and the members of the committee faced as they drafted this bill. It is a good bill, and I intend to support it.

The amendment has been agreed to by the parties involved. It is about giving our veterans the facilities they need as they grow older and the care that they were promised as they chose to defend the country.

Our bipartisan amendment will restore the State Extended Care Facilities Construction Grant Program funding to the FY 2000 level of $90 million. Currently the bill cuts the funding in this program to $30 million.

In 2010, one in every 16 American men will be a veteran of the military over the age of 62. That is an amazing statistic. The increasing age of most veterans means additional demand for medical services for eligible veterans as the aging process brings on chronic conditions needing more frequent care and lengthier convalescence.

This surge of older veterans will undoubtedly put a strain on our Nation's veterans' health services. At the current pace of construction, we will not have the necessary facilities to meet veterans' extended care needs.

The Veterans Millennium Health Care Act, passed by this House and signed into law in 1999, places new requirements on State care facilities that must be funded immediately. With the ranks of those requiring VA care growing on a yearly basis, States already face huge financial burdens in helping to care for our veterans.

Finally, State care facilities are cost effective. In Fiscal Year 1998, the VA spent an average of $255 per day on long-term care nursing home care for residents, while State veterans homes spent an average of $40 per resident. This economic trend continued in 1999.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment. It is about nursing home care for our veterans.

Unfortunately, when the administration came forward with its budget this year, they proposed a significant cut in State grants, grants to our States to provide veterans nursing homes.

As we have seen growing need, as particularly our veterans of Korea and Vietnam and World War II-era veterans need nursing home care, there is tremendous demand. And State care facilities operated through the State of Illinois and others have proven cost effective.

The VA spends on average $225 a day for care for long-term nursing care residents, whereas State nursing homes provide about $30 a day. They are effective and they provide quality care.

I am proud to say that in Illinois we have four veterans homes. Two are in the district that I represent. One of them, the LaSalle Veterans Home, has a waiting list 220 veterans, veterans having to wait as long as 18 months in order to obtain nursing home care. Imagine that, if they need nursing home care and they have to wait 18 months. That is an eternity for veterans.

Other veterans homes in Illinois, Manteno is owed a million dollars for its compliance with ADA. The State of Illinois is owed $5 million for other home updates. The bottom line is this money is needed.

I want to salute the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) for accepting this amendment. I also want to salute my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), for his leadership in fighting for veterans.

The bottom line is this legislation deserves bipartisan support. Let us support our veterans. Let us ensure the dollars are there to ensure nursing home care for our veterans and their needs.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly discuss the amendments that the chairman proposes to merge here. I want to begin by expressing my agreement with the premise of these amendments that the Veterans Medical Research account and the State Grants Account for extended care facilities are both underfunded.

Two of the amendments in this unanimous consent request, those of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), would together increase the VA Medical Research Account by $30 million.

As I said before, VA research has been widely praised for its quality and medical advances. Indeed, this Congress has clearly demonstrated its interest in medical research, specifically in the National Institutes of Health, which received a $2.2 billion increase last year, an increase of over 14 percent.

We should be doing the same for VA medical research. And although these amendments do not get us to that point, they are a good start.

In addition, the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) would increase the State Grant Account for the construction of extended care facilities by $30 million, for a total of $90 million, the same level as was enacted for Fiscal Year 2000. The need for extended care facilities is great, and this increase will help meet that need.

All that being said, I do have concerns regarding the offsets of these amendments. One offset would take $25 million from NASA's Human Space Flight Account. It is a small cut relatively, but I am a bit apprehensive about making any cuts to this account, particularly at a time when we are literally months away from establishing a permanent human presence in the Space Station.

This account also funds the Space Shuttle Program, and reductions could either force delays or cuts in the mission manifest or, even worse, force cuts to important shuttle safety upgrades planned by NASA.

The other NASA offset is also somewhat distressing. It would take $30 million from NASA's Science Aeronautics and Technology Account.

□ 1730

This account funds almost all of NASA's activities other than the Space Shuttle and the Space Station, such activities as space science, aeronautics, earth science and NASA's academic programs.

This account was also the only NASA account in this bill to receive less than the President's request. Mr. Chairman, NASA's budget has been cut for years and this amendment cuts an already anemic account.

Finally, the last of these amendments would take $5 million from EPA's operating programs account, which includes just about all the agency's activities other than science research and Superfund. Although this is a very small cut, the relevant account is already 10 percent below the President's request.

All that being said, I supported the gentleman's unanimous-consent request and the acceptance of the underlying amendments. I do look forward to working with the chairman and the other body in conference to restore the NASA and EPA funding as we move forward.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today for an amendment that I believe is critically important to the health and well-being of our veterans and to the future of the VA health care system. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment and make a strong statement of support for an effective, cost-efficient, and important program, the VA medical research program.

Unfortunately, the appropriation bill before us calls for no increased funding, zero, in the VA medical research program. Given inflation and increased program needs, this amounts to a significant reduction in the amount of work and research the VA will be able to perform. This is a shortsighted and extremely damaging budget decision.

Few government programs have given our Nation a better return on the dollar than VA medical research. The VA has become a world leader in such research areas as aging, AIDS-HIV, women's veterans health, and post-traumatic stress disorder. Specifically, VA researchers have played key roles in developing cardiac pacemakers, magnetic source imaging, and in improving artificial limbs.

The first successful kidney transplant in the U.S. was performed at a VA hospital and the first successful drug treatments for high blood pressure and schizophrenia were pioneered by VA researchers. Quite simply, VA medical research has not only been vital for our veterans, it has led to breakthroughs and refinement of technology that have improved health care for all of us. Given this record of accomplishment with a very modest appropriation, the reduced commitment to the VA medical research budget is unjustified and unwise.

At the proposed level of funding, the VA would be unable to maintain its current level of research effort in such vital areas as diabetes, substance abuse, mental health, Parkinson's disease, prostate cancer, spinal cord injury, heart disease, and hepatitis. In fact, research projects currently in progress would be put in jeopardy.

I am asking for a very reasonable increase, enough to save the current level of research and to allow for a modest improvement. My amendment

calls for a $25 million increase in funding. Approximately $10 million is needed to maintain the current research level and approximately $15 million will help to fund new research projects in such vital areas as mental health and spinal cord injury. This is money well spent on proven, effective research projects that benefit not only our Nation's most deserving population, our veterans, but that eventually benefits us all.

Again I believe in this Congress, we must reexamine our priorities and in our current economic climate, $25 million is hardly a budget-breaking commitment. We cannot in any honest fashion say the money is not there. The money exists. It is simply a question of what we want to invest it in, what priorities are most important to us. What better choice, what better investment than the health care of our veterans? The average research grant is $130,000. My amendment will help pave the way for as many as 250 new ones. Which of those grants will help to find a cure for Parkinson's disease? Or ease the pain of post-traumatic stress? Or discover new ways to prevent prostate cancer or protect against heart disease? Or which of these grants will never be funded because we were not willing to make this reasonable and effective appropriation? Which grant will we lose because once again we made speeches praising our courageous members of the Armed Forces when they fought and sacrificed to keep our country safe only to make them sacrifice again when we turn our backs on their health care needs?

This amendment shows us that we do not have to sacrifice any of these research projects. The amendment has the strong support of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans and Vietnam Veterans of America. I urge my colleagues to join these veterans advocacy groups and please support the funding. It is effective, it is necessary, it is reasonable, and our veterans deserve it. I hope Members will stand with me in support of VA medical research.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for including this amendment in the en bloc package that he has offered to the House and to wish him a belated happy birthday.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for including my amendment in the en bloc.

My amendment reduces the EPA's program and management budget which is $1.9 billion by $5 million and transfers the dollars to medical research in the VA. The EPA's account in this section encompasses a broad range of things, including travel and expenses for most of the agency. I believe the EPA can tighten their belts on some travel to the tune of $5 million so that our veterans can continue to receive the medical care that they need and deserve.

With passage of Public Law 85–857 in 1958, Congress gave official recognition to a research program with a proven record of contributing to the improvement of medical care and rehabilitation services for the U.S. veteran. The law formally authorized medical and prosthetic research in the VA and led to the establishment of four organizational units, medical research, rehabilitation research and development, health services research and development, and the cooperative studies program.

There are over 75 some groups which I have listed here that, in fact, support the increase for VA medical research. I want to again thank the gentleman from New York for his indulgence to support the veterans.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe with the allocations made by the leadership, and I appreciate the $30 million additional in terms of nursing homes for veterans, but still we need $80 million to take care of existing costs. I feel compelled to speak out on this amendment which would inadequately fund the State Veterans Home Program. It is imperative that the veterans and their families be able to be taken care of in the twilight of their years.

Getting the funding increase is only the first step. While I am primarily concerned about the dire need of these homes in Texas, veterans all across the country need these services. The key to strong recruitment into our military is a strong evidence of helping veterans throughout their life. On behalf of the nearly 1.7 million veterans in Texas, I want to boost this appropriation for the Department of Veterans Affairs' grants for construction of State extended care facilities to $140 million for fiscal year 2001. The $30 million would only give us $90 million. We need $80 million additional to bring us up to $140 million to be able to take care of existing costs.

This increase of $80 million, if you add $50 million to your request from the VA, was recommended by both the chairman and the ranking member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in their letter to the House Committee on the Budget expressing our views and estimates of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from New York in securing necessary resources to fund this crucial program which is very important. Providing for the long-term health care needs of veterans remains one of our most important commitments to those who have served our Nation. I feel that providing this stepped up level of funding for 2001 sends a strong signal to our veterans and their families across this country that Congress is committed to serving veterans in the twilight of their years.

Texas has only received 3 percent of the funding from these types of programs in the past since its inception even though we have over 7 percent of the Nation's veterans. As they get older and are in more need of nursing home care, we must be there for them and be able to provide that service. Texas has been a newcomer to this program, and we have not taken advantage of it in the past which provides funding for State nursing homes for veterans.

We have begun construction of four sites in Texas. Those sites are in Floresville, Texas; Temple, Texas; Bonham; and in Big Spring. The reality is that the way it is structured now, Texas will not be entitled to a red cent, to not a single penny of the resources that are there unless we go beyond the existing resources because of the wording that you have for renovation and not for new construction.

I am hopeful that we can continue to work on this to provide the additional resources that are needed. Once again, it was unfortunate the administration had only recommended $60 million. Your $30 million will bring it up to $90 million. We really need to look in terms of bringing it up to $140 million to meet the needs. That is one of the recommendations that was made from our committee.

I want to ask the committee to please consider the possibility of increasing these resources beyond the $30 million that is there before us.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that our veterans population is aging. In fact, in 2010—over half of the veterans population will be over the age of 62. Currently, 36 percent of all veterans are over the age of 65 and that number is expected to increase exponentially over the next eight years.

The increasing age of most veterans means additional demands for medical services for eligible veterans. This surge of older veterans will undoubtedly put a strain on our nation's Veterans Health Services.

The House and Senate approved $90 million in funding for the State Extended Care Facilities Construction Grant Program for FY99 and FY00. This year, however, the Committee has funded the program at $60 million—$30 million below last year's funding.

This amendment would increase funding for these States Care Facilities by $30 million to the fiscal year 2000 level of $90 million.

Last year, 354 Members of Congress voted to support our aging veteran population by voting for a similar amendment to restore funding the State Nursing Homes Construction Grant Program in the VA–HUD Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Once again, this amendment must be offered to prevent a massive, 33 percent cut in funding to this vital, cost-effect program for our veterans.

The Veterans Millennium Health Care Act, passed by the House and signed into law in 1999, places new requirements on state care facilities that must be funded immediately. With the ranks of those requiring VA care growing on a yearly basis, states already face huge financial burdens in helping to care for our veterans.

In fiscal year 1998, the VA spent on average $255.25 per day to care for long term nursing care residents, while, state veterans homes on average spent $40.00 per resident. This economic trend continued in 1999—proving that state care facilities are in fact cost-effective.

Mr. Chairman, taking care of our nation's veterans is clearly one of the government's prime responsibilities Congress has a track record of supporting veterans program as we have increased the President's request for VA funding for several consecutive years now.

At the current pace of construction, we will not have the necessary facilities to meet veterans' extended care needs. The State Nursing Homes Construction Grant Program is an important program that meets our veterans health care meets. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Tancredo amendment and to the Gutierrez amendment. I would like to say straight out, though, that I certainly am very sympathetic to the idea of plussing up these veterans accounts. I believe I have the fourth largest number of veterans in my congressional district and the veterans in my congressional district have been historically very underserved. I believe the gentleman from Texas just related a very similar story to what has gone on in Texas and many other Sunbelt States that have not been receiving the appropriate amount of veterans care for their communities.

My objection is based on the issue of cutting funding out of NASA. NASA, unlike most Federal agencies here in Washington, has actually seen its budget decline in real dollars over the past 8 years. NASA from the time period of about 1982 to 1992 saw its budget double and then over the past 8 years of the Clinton administration, it has actually gone down by several hundred millions of dollars.

When we factor in inflation on this, it is actually about a 30 percent reduction in the purchasing power of the agency. I would like to point out to my colleagues because there have been many eloquent comments about the need to plus up veterans research, the funding that has gone to NASA has played a critical role in enhancing our breakthroughs in medical technology and medical research. I would just point out to my colleagues that much of the technology that goes into current pacemakers currently employed by hundreds of thousands of veterans, the technology used in scanning, MRI scanning, CAT scanning, the technology used in cardiac catheterization, many of the material science that goes into the prosthetic devices which some people have been talking about today, it is all actually a spin-off from our space program.

So what we are really talking about doing here is the proverbial borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. We have an agency that has been cut year after year after year and now for the first time we are actually talking about plussing it up. I think it would be very, very inappropriate for us to go into this agency. There are many other places in this bill where we could find the appropriate reductions to be made.

I would certainly hope that if this amendment considered en bloc passes that the subcommittee chairman and the full committee chairman work in the conference process to get these NASA reductions plussed back up. I would like to also point out that some of this money that is being cut is going for flight safety for our shuttle program which is very, very critical to making sure that the Space Station program succeeds.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding. This amendment will basically require, or almost make it assured that the 30 Members from Texas will have to vote no despite the fact that we feel very strongly about the need for nursing homes because they are taking it from NASA and not only that they are taking it from NASA, but in addition to that $30 million that is going to nursing homes, none of that with the exception of $10 million would be qualified to where we could even begin to participate because we cannot even get that first $80 million for Texas for nursing homes. So not only are they taking the money from there but we are not going to be able to benefit from that, either.

□ 1745

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would just like to point out to my colleagues here that my congressional district has no veterans nursing home, even though it has needed one for years; and I certainly would support increasing funding for veterans nursing care, veterans medical research. I just object to the place where these reductions are being made.

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

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

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, the Tancredo-Weller-John-Ryan-Hilleary and others amendment to the VA/HUD appropriations bill. I want to personally thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for his work on this issue that is so critical to our Nation's veterans across America.

Mr. Chairman, veteran State homes are the most cost-effective programs in the Veterans Administration. These homes receive Federal funding of 65 percent for construction costs and the remainder is provided by the different States. Once the home is constructed and ready to go, the Veterans Administration pays on an average only $40 a day for its patients. However, the other long-term facilities drain the Veterans Administration of some $250 per day.

This amendment would save the Veterans Administration lots of money, over $200 a day to provide long-term health care for our veterans. This amendment will prevent a massive 33 percent reduction in the State Nursing Home Construction Grant Program at a time when the number of elderly veterans are dramatically rising.

Mr. Chairman, in just a very, very few short years, half of the veteran population of this Nation will be over the age of 65, and we must have the facilities to provide them this quality care. There is already a long list of States on a waiting list for these homes. In fact, many of the States have already appropriated dollars and allocated funds for these homes. Yet Washington has failed to uphold its end of the bargain.

This is a win-win situation for the Federal Government and for our Nation's veterans. By agreeing to this amendment, we will renew our commitment to America's veterans.

Our amendment maintains, does not increase, but maintains the past 2 years' level of funding of $90 million in order to ensure our continued investments in our veterans health care facilities. If you remember, Mr. Chairman, last year, a similar effort to increase funding for this account was supported by over 350 Members of this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I support the increase of $30 million as provided in the Tancredo amendment, and I urge my fellow Members to support this much needed amendment to help out the people that have helped us out so many times, the veterans of America.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tancredo, Weller, John, Ryan, Hilleary amendment to the VA/HUD Appropriations Bill.

I would personally like to thank the cosponsors for their work on our amendment, especially Mr. TANCREDO. This is a critical issue to our nation's veterans.

As you know Mr. Chairman, Veteran State Homes are one of the most cost-effective programs within the Veterans Administration, and there is an ever-growing list of grant requests from states working to fulfill the health care needs of our veterans. While I appreciate all the difficulties associated with constructing this bill, it is not the time to ignore the needs of our senior and disabled veterans.

State Homes receive federal funding for 65 percent of the construction costs, and the remainder is provided by the state. Once the home is providing care, the Veterans Administration pays an average of $40 per day for patients. However, other long term nursing facilities drain the Veterans Administration of over $250 per day. By comparison, the State Extended Care Facilities Program saves the federal government approximately $200 per day per veteran.

This amendment will prevent a massive 33 percent reduction in the State Nursing Homes Construction Grant Program at a time when the number of elderly veterans is dramatically increasing. In a few years, half of the veteran population will be over the age of 65, and we must have facilities available to provide quality care. There is already a long waiting list for state veterans homes, and we cannot prolong this necessary action.

Mr. Chairman, this is a win-win situation for the federal government and for our nation's veterans. Many states have already approved and allocated funding for their homes; yet Washington is failing to uphold its end of the bargain. By agreeing to this amendment, we are renewing our commitment to this successful federal-state partnership.

I need not remind this body that this Congress and our President acted decisively in improving the quality of health care when we passed the Veterans Millennium Health Care Act last fall. Just as that bill improved the quality of care that our nation's veterans receive, so then this amendment would ensure that those veterans have adequate facilities through which such care can be rendered. More simply, we must not fall short on our commitment to our nation's veterans by not building the facilities that provide for their care. Our amendment will maintain the past two years' funding level of $90 million in order to ensure continued investment in our veterans' health care facilities.

Last year, a similar effort to increase funding for this account was supported by 354 Members of this House. Once again, we have an opportunity to address an inadequacy in VA funding by leveraging much needed, scarce federal resources in a very successful program.

I support the increase of $30 million as provided in the Tancredo, Weller, John, Ryan, and Hilleary amendment, and I urge that my fellow Members join me in adopting this amendment.

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

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is unusual that I follow my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN), because the gentleman and I normally are of the same mind. Maybe the river that separates Texas and Louisiana might have more than that.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment. While I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to increase funding for a number of important satisfactory veterans programs, I cannot support the way in which they are going about obtaining the funding.

To pay for these worthwhile programs, the amendment seeks to transfer funds from the Human Space Flight account of NASA and also NASA Science, Aeronautics and Technology.

While the contribution of our veterans to the greatness of our Nation should never be forgotten, and while we fulfill our special obligations to care for those who fought for these freedoms that we enjoy and sometimes we take for granted, this amendment is not right the way it goes. In fact, my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), who has fought many years not only in the State legislature, but now here in Congress for veterans nursing homes, tells me that Texas will not benefit from this plus-up yet with the cuts from NASA. The men and women at NASA run an exceptional government agency that has always done innovative work with limited funds that Congress appropriates.

They have been leaders in cutting expenses and making their agency more financially streamlined and we should recognize that. If anything, I fear that perhaps they carried their zeal for faster, cheaper, better, a step too far.

With the recent high-profile setbacks, particularly in the Mars missions, I think we need to prod NASA in the other direction, to ensure that in their efforts to do more with less that they have not sacrificed safety to save money. Again, this amendment has benefit but not in this area.

NASA is a fine example of an effective agency. If we wish to have the world's preeminent space program, we must work to fund it, not to cut their budget.

Our space program is the envy of the world. Despite recent stumbles, NASA continues to expand the frontiers of knowledge and probe the vast unknown reaches of outerspace.

Space exploration will play a critical role in our Nation's future both for technology development and for health care, and we need to push for the development of these new technologies.

It will push our children, our students, to learn more math and science; and we need to make sure that responsible agencies like NASA have the necessary funds to carry out their mission and to continue to provide us with the invaluable source of innovation and information.

I support veterans nationwide, but I also want to make sure our Texas veterans can benefit. Again, this amendment does not go that far, and so I would hope in their effort to support veterans nationwide that we would come up with an amendment that not only would not cut NASA, but would help veterans in all 50 states instead of 49 of them and not just punish the ones in Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, this discussion and the amendments show a couple of things about the processes which we are undergoing in discussing this bill. Number one, it shows that everybody agrees that there are accounts in the veterans budget that are underfunded, and the chairman of the committee seems to agree that we should plus-up the research account in this case by $30 million, plus-up the construction of the State veteran homes by $30 million, and I support that and would go even further.

It also makes the point that many Members are caught up in a conundrum here. The absurdity of our rules where we have to do something good in order to do something good in the veterans budget, we have to do something bad in the space budget. This at a time when we have surpluses.

I do not think the public understands why we should go through such an exercise that we have to cut $60 million out of the space program in order to fund $60 million in the veterans account when we have the money to do both, and this is what we should be doing.

We should be plussing-up the account in research, as an amendment I had on the floor to do. We should be plussing-up the account for the State veterans homes, which I have an amendment to do, without having to take from NASA.

My colleagues, we all know, we all know we have the money to do this. This is an absurdity. This is a game we are playing here that puts us in very low esteem with our constituents who say, when the gentleman from Florida said he represents the place where they have the fourth highest veterans and he also is strongly in support of the space station, his constituents have to say well, why not do both, and they are right.

We should be doing both, and though I support the plus-up of $30 million in the State veterans home account, I would have to underline what my colleagues from Texas said, this does not allow us to make up for previously approved projects and projects that have already been approved by their States which, with appropriated funds, we cannot make up that backlog with this plus-up.

We need an additional $50 million more. The amendments are absolutely right in that we need these plus-ups, and I am glad the chairman of the subcommittee understands that we were falling behind in those accounts and this House has catched up, but I need to point out the absurdity of the rules we are under, which force us to take money from another account which is absolutely vital also to our future as a civilization.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge somehow that the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations would put us into realistic situations without forcing us to make these kinds of choices which are not mandated by the reality of our funds today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ney-Gutierrez-Tancredo en bloc amendment that adds funding for VA medical research and for grants to states for extended care facilities for our aging veterans.

This bill before us tonight demonstrates the effect of poorly-placed priorities created when the majority voted for a budget agreement that spent too much on military largesse and tax breaks for the wealthy. We did not place a sufficiently high priority on our nation's veterans programs in this year's budget allocations. As my colleague BARNEY FRANK observed, we are suffering from a self-inflicted wound.

In fact, this VA–HUD bill provides $2.5 billion less than the Administration's FY 2001 budget request. We have a responsibility to keep our promises to our veterans.

As a nation, we have special obligation to our veterans. They have earned benefits that they receive from a grateful nation. The service and sacrifice, blood, sweat and tears of men and women who have served in our Armed Forces has allowed for the historic prosperity we now enjoy. Caring for our veterans is a legitimate cost of national security, yet we do not seem willing to spend an adequate amount on that care.

This year, we are spending 52% of our discretionary budget on the military but not enough on those who have already served: our nation's veterans whose funding is dependent on this much smaller appropriations bill that is before us tonight.

We are spending $46.8 billion for veterans' health care, research, and medical facilities. Funding for military activities, including our nuclear weapons stockpile, will total some $311 billion this year. We owe our veterans more than they are receiving.

We are spending $22 billion more in this year's defense appropriations bill than we did in last year's; by comparison, funding for Department of Veterans Affairs medical and prosthetic research is the same in this bill before us last year's funding: a mere $321 million.

The $62 million for major construction and improvement of VA facilities is 5% less than we spent last year. ''Minor'' construction projects—those costing less than $4 million per project—and extended care facilities are each given a third less funding than they received last year.

This budget falls half a billion dollars short of the level called for in The Independent Budget, proposed by Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and other veterans' groups. Over the past decade, federal spending for veterans' health care has fallen dramatically short of keeping pace with medical inflation. These shortfalls have forced VA medical facilities nationwide to cut services, delay and even deny care to veterans in need.

Without adequate funding, the VA, created to meet our nation's obligation to its former defenders, will be unable to meet its obligations to veterans. It is time to acknowledge the sacrifices our veterans made and to honor our commitment to them. They answered their call to service long ago; now we must answer back by ensuring them a secure and stable future.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to commend Chairman WALSH for the hard work he and his staff put into crafting such an excellent bill. I would also like to thank him for including this, as well as the other important amendments in his en bloc request. For the second year in a row, he has made astounding and much needed increases in many veteran's programs.

Today I rise in support of this amendment to increase the funding for the veterans state-extended care facilities. These facilities in my opinion are imperative to the mission of providing quality health care to those who dutifully served our country.

These veterans homes are the largest provider of long-term nursing care to our veterans. They enable the Veterans Administration to ensure quality nursing care to veterans that cannot receive proper treatment through any other means. Many of the men and women who served our country are bedridden due to service-related injuries. It is these veterans that the state-extended care facilities will serve.

Not only are these homes, nursing care units and hospitals necessary for proper care, they are also cost effective. If a veteran is forced to go to a private nursing home, the VA will reimburse that home on average $150 dollar per diem. Contrast that with the approximately $51 dollar per diem reimbursement to the State veterans homes for the same care. The same care for approximately one-third of the cost. I think you will agree that for this reason alone we should vigorously support these facilities.

Even with the Tancredo, Weller, Johns, Ryan, and Hilleary amendment enacted, we will fall far short of the funding commitment we have made to the States. The Federal Government has agreed to fund 65 percent of the construction costs for the state-extended care facilities. At this time, many States have already appropriated their share of the construction costs.

Aside from the current $126 million backlog of work due to years of underfunding, the Federal Government could be responsible for over $200 million in additional construction money, if all pending applications, as well as those that were grandfathered in under the Veteran's Millennium Health Care Act, are approved. Even with this amendment, we may still owe various States across the Nation up to $236 million.

There are approximately 10 million veterans over the age of 65. Our almost 67 million World War II veterans continue to require extensive health care that we are proud and obligated to provide. This country and the VA must be adequately prepared through proper funding to handle the challenge of ensuring the best possible care for the men and women who bravely served this Nation.

I ask that we strongly support this amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Being fiscally responsible sometimes means making tough decisions. The gentleman from Colorado's amendment presents one such choice. It requires us to choose between spending more money to help states construct extended care facilities for veterans versus funding NASA research programs at the appropriated level.

Certainly, we own our veterans a great debt, and nursing home facilities for men and women who served this country are important. But I urge my colleagues to remember that H.R. 4635 already provides funding for this grant program. So even if this amendment fails, these grants will still be available for veterans' care.

I oppose this amendment because I believe it sacrifices one of our Nation's most important investments in order to achieve the amendment's goals. This investment, in science and engineering research, is critical to developing the technologies and know how that save lives, strengthen the economy, and help keep our defenses strong and our troops protected. Veterans are alive today because of past investments in science and technology. Don't we owe the veterans of tomorrow the same advantages? I think we do, which is why I oppose the amendment.

Investments in research and technology rarely pay off right away—certainly they cannot compete with the construction of a new building in terms of clearly recognizable short-term accomplishments—but they do pay off. The evidence for long-term payoffs from research and technology investments is impressive.

The research programs this amendment would take away from represent part of this long-term investment in research and technology. I urge my colleagues to protect them, and to vote ''no'' on the amendment.

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

NASA's science programs are a critical component to enabling many of the technological breakthroughs that all of us enjoy. The importance of research and development and scientific discovery on our every day lives cannot be overstated. NASA in partnership with industry, academia, and other federal agencies perform research and develop technology which is fundamentally important to keeping America capable and competitive. Our nation's economic growth and prosperity are tied more closely than ever to technological advancement. We must ensure that NASA gets the funding necessary to continue to maintain America's leadership in technology.

The White House's recently released report on Federal R&D investment challenges the Congress to ''demonstrate strong bipartisan support for R&D'' and ''instead of slashing science and technology, we should accelerate the march of human knowledge by greatly increasing our investments in R&D.'' It took Congress five years to convince the Administration that past cuts to the space program were counterproductive. Now that the Administration has seen the light, I hope Congress will maintain its past commitment to science and technology by rejecting this amendment.

The amendment proposes to cut $23 million from NASA's Human Space Flight program. Although the amendment appears to save money by reducing a program's budget, in reality it only increases costs in the future by stretching out the program and delaying the scientific results and advances that the research promises.

We must continue to make investments in research and development, so that everyone will benefit from the discoveries and innovations which will improve our quality of life. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Gutierrez amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 525, further proceedings on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) will be postponed.

Pursuant to a previous order of the House, the Clerk will resume reading at page 9, line 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research

and development as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 73, to remain available until September 30, 2002, $321,000,000, plus reimbursements.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities, $62,000,000 plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That technical and consulting services offered by the Facilities Management Field Service, including project management and real property administration (including leases, site acquisition and disposal activities directly supporting projects), shall be provided to Department of Veterans Affairs components only on a reimbursable basis, and such amounts will remain available until September 30, 2001.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; not to exceed $25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail, $1,006,000,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed $50,050,000 shall be available until September 30, 2002: *Provided further*, That funds under this heading shall be available to administer the Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN:

Under ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Departmental Administration'', on page 10, line 10 after the number $1,006,000,000, insert: (increased by $4,000,000 for transfers authorized by law; decreased by $4,000,000 from general administrative expenses)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, last night we spent several hours debating the tobacco rider in this bill. As I explained last night, this rider defunds the VA lawsuit against the tobacco industry. I offered an amendment last night that would have allowed the VA to use funds from the VA medical care account to pay for the lawsuit. In opposing my amendment, I heard Member after Member say that they were not opposed to VA's tobacco litigation, rather they were just opposed to the source of funding.

My amendment today addresses this point. It lets VA fund the litigation from its general operating expenses, such as salaries and travel, not the medical care account.

Let me just quickly review the situation. In 1998, Congress voted to stop cash payments to veterans suffering from tobacco-related illnesses. As part of the Transportation Equity Account, Congress decided these payments could be better used paying for highway projects than to support our veterans. This was a bitter blow to our veterans. To lessen the impact on veterans, Congress told the VA and the Department of Justice to sue the tobacco industry. We promised that we would support this litigation and that if any funds were recovered, we would devote them to paying for medical care for veterans.

Now, we were very clear when Congress voted to take away the cash payments to veterans for tobacco-related illness. We promised veterans we would help them recover from the cigarette manufacturers the costs of treating tobacco-related illnesses.

The administration did what we asked them to do in 1998. The VA and the Justice Department filed a suit to recover the medical expenses incurred by the Veterans Administration in treating tobacco-related illnesses. And under the legal provisions they are using, the Medical Care Recovery Act, all the money recovered will go back to the Veterans Administration, just as Congress urged.

This amendment that I am now offering, I think, meets the objections that were raised last night. The funds will not be transferred out of the VA medical account, even as we tried to limit it last night from that VA medical account for legal and administrative expenses. Instead, it will come from the operational funds from the Veterans Administration as well.

I know that the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee thought this was unnecessary, because he thought the Veterans Administration had the authority to do this, but we want to make it very clear that those funds will be available for this lawsuit; and I think we are addressing the main argument that I heard last night that our amendment was objectionable, because it took funding from medical care for veterans.

I hope that this amendment will be acceptable to the majority, and I would hope that they would agree with us and allow us to pass this amendment and to permit the lawsuits to be funded that I think will have enormous benefits for the veterans and for the taxpayers of this country. On that basis, I ask your support for the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we had some discussion on this yesterday, about 3½ hours' or 4 hours' worth; and we tried to make the point over and over that veterans' medical care funds were sacrosanct.

□ 1800

We were not going to those precious funds to be used for anything other than what they were intended.

So when the gentleman came back with an amendment that talked about using administrative funds, I have no objection to that amendment. We believe the amendment is superfluous. It really accomplishes nothing. The amendment really is not necessary. We made that point again and again, that it is the medical care funds that we were protecting in the bill.

Our language specifically denotes medical funds shall not be used. All other funds within the bill are open and available. There was no prohibition, no restrictive language on any of those other 17 areas of funding.

So the gentleman's amendment makes administrative funds available for the Justice Department lawsuit. We believe in effect they already are. The practical upshot of this is the Veterans Administration will have to come back to the Congress and ask for a reprogramming of these funds, and I would have no objection to that.

So, for those reasons, this side is prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to be argumentative, and I am very grateful that the chairman has accepted the very wise amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and I do want to add my support to it.

Mr. Chairman, let me also acknowledge that I wish to briefly comment on the previous amendment that was offered en bloc by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), and I believe the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), to offer my opposition to the expenditures of funds on the amendment that would take monies out of the human space flight and other space programs, noting that those programs have been particularly efficient.

I comment on that particular amendment because the debate has been in this bill on the cutting of funds across the board. I think that is what defeated the Waxman amendment yesterday, which was the thought we were taking money out of the veterans health care.

I simply want to say this bill overall is bad because it cuts everyone, and we have enough money to be able to fund these important programs under the VA-HUD bill.

So I am hoping that we will have a bill ultimately, though I applaud the work of the committee, that will fund the various programs as they should, veterans health care, human space flight, NASA science aeronautics and technology, EPA programs and other programs that my colleagues would desire to support.

I support the Waxman amendment, and I oppose the previous amendment that was discussed.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's support and the willingness of the chairman of the subcommittee to work out this issue so that we have this amendment before us today. I just want to note for the record that it is not my understanding that this will require a reprogramming of funds. We believe that this amendment authorizes the use of

those funds. That may have to be determined later. I do want to note we may have a disagreement on the consequences.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, there is some confusion about exactly how this would come back. If it was in the budget request, then it would be clearly not subject to reprogramming. I will be willing to work with the gentleman as we go down the road on this issue. But, as I said, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, tobacco use kills 430,000 people a year. That's more than the number who die from murder, suicide, AIDS, alcohol and all illegal drugs combined.

The number of people suffering from tobacco-related illnesses today is in the millions. A great many of these deaths are attributable to deliberate congressional action over the years of subsidizing tobacco companies financially through farming, marketing and export.

The Congress gave support and credibility to the public statements of tobacco companies that smoking tobacco wasn't harmful.

And perhaps the most culpable congressional act was to include cigarettes in the package of sea rations and authorized supplies that we provided our soldiers, sailors and airmen.

We encouraged our brave, strong, patriotic servicemen to smoke cigarettes. We instructed them to ''light 'em if you had 'em''—and of course because we supplied them, most of them had 'em.

And now those very same soldiers are now paying the price of that official policy. They're suffering from emphysema, cancer of the lungs, and the larynx, and the mouth and the throat.

Well, the decades of deliberate deceit by the tobacco companies has finally been exposed.

But they've already made their millions selling cigarettes to the military, they've made their billions selling to the American public and they're still making billions marketing an instrument of death and suffering to the rest of the world.

But what of our veterans who sacrificed their lives to serve their country. Those strong, brave soldiers are lying in homes and hospitals, suffering ignominious suffering and death. They're paying the real price of corporate deceit and congressional consent.

Why shouldn't those tobacco companies at least pay for some of the price of those trusting soldiers' health care?

This amendment says they should. We protect tobacco companies from the legal means of making them responsible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of the National Cemetery Administration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for use in cemeterial operations; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $106,889,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses shall not exceed $1,125,000: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $125,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $46,464,000: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $28,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is $4,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, $62,140,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That except for advance planning of projects (including market-based assessments of health care needs which may or may not lead to capital investments) funded through the advance planning fund and the design of projects funded through the design fund, none of these funds shall be used for any project which has not been considered and approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this appropriation for fiscal year 2001, for each approved project, shall be obligated: (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 2001; and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2002: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall promptly report in writing to the Committees on Appropriations any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above: *Provided further*, That no funds from any other account except the ''Parking revolving fund'', may be obligated for constructing, altering, extending, or improving a project which was approved in the budget process and funded in this account until 1 year after substantial completion and beneficial occupancy by the Department of Veterans Affairs of the project or any part thereof with respect to that part only.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, 8122, and 8162 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than $4,000,000, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous ''Construction, minor projects'' appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is less than $4,000,000: *Provided*, That funds in this account shall be available for: (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the department which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe; and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

For the parking revolving fund as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 8109, income from fees collected, to remain available until expended, which shall be available for all authorized expenses.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 8131–8137, $60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans cemeteries as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 2408, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2001 for ''Compensation and pensions'', ''Readjustment benefits'', and ''Veterans insurance and indemnities'' may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations.

SEC. 102. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2001 for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 103. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs (except the appropriations for ''Construction, major projects'', ''Construction, minor projects'', and the ''Parking revolving fund'') shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

SEC. 104. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons (except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, and persons receiving such treatment under 5 U.S.C. 7901–7904 or 42 U.S.C. 5141–5204), unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ''Medical care'' account at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2001 for ''Compensation and pensions'', ''Readjustment benefits'', and ''Veterans insurance and indemnities'' shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 106. Appropriations accounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2001 shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from title X of the Competitive Equality Banking Act, Public Law 100–86, except that if such

obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable from ''Compensation and pensions''.

SEC. 107. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2001, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1920), the Veterans' Special Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1923), and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1955), reimburse the ''General operating expenses'' account for the cost of administration of the insurance programs financed through those accounts: *Provided,* That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in an insurance program in fiscal year 2001, that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: *Provided further,* That if the cost of administration of an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall determine the cost of administration for fiscal year 2001, which is properly allocable to the provision of each insurance program and to the provision of any total disability income insurance included in such insurance program.

SEC. 108. (a) Notwithstanding sections 1710B(e)(2) and 1729B(b) of title 38 United States Code, and any other provision of law, any amount received or collected by the Department of Veterans Affairs during fiscal year 2001 under any of the following provisions of law shall be deposited in the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Fund, to be available in accordance with section 1829A(c) of title 38 United States Code:

(1) Section 1710B of title 38 United States Code.

(2) Section 1722A(b) of title 38 United States Code.

(3) Section 8165(a) of title 38 United States Code.

(4) Section 113 of the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act (Public Law 106–117; of title 38 United States Code.

(b) Provisions of law referred to in subsection (a) shall be treated as provisions of law referred to in subsection (b) of section 1729A of of title 38 United States Code, for purposes of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of that section during fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 109. In accordance with section 1557 of title 31, United States Code, the following obligated balance shall be exempt from subchapter IV of chapter 15 of such title and shall remain available for expenditure until September 30, 2003: funds obligated by the Department of Veterans Affairs for a contract with the Institute for Clinical Research to study the application of artificial neural networks to the diagnosis and treatment of prostate cancer through the Cooperative DoD/VA Medical Research program from funds made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 103–335) under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide''.

SEC. 110. As HR LINK$ will not be part of the Franchise Fund in fiscal year 2001, funds budgeted in customer accounts to purchase HR LINK$ services from the Franchise Fund shall be transferred to the General Administration portion of the ''General operating expenses'' appropriation in the following amounts: $78,000 from the ''Office of Inspector General'', $358,000 from the ''National cemetery administration'', $1,106,000 from ''Medical care'', $84,000 from ''Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses'', and $38,000 shall be reprogrammed within the ''General operating expenses'' appropriation from the Veterans Benefits Administration to General Administration for the same purpose.

SEC. 111. Not to exceed $1,600,000 from the ''Medical care'' appropriation shall be transferred to the ''General operating expenses'' appropriation to fund personnel services costs of employees providing legal services and administrative support for the Office of General Counsel.

SEC. 112. Section 9305 of Public Law 105–33, The Balanced Budget Act of 1997, is repealed.

SEC. 113. None of the funds in this Act may be used to procure information technology systems, engage in new initiatives, or implement a policy affecting total procurement costs over $2,000,000 in non-medical resources and $4,000,000 in medical resources without the approval of the Department of Veterans Affairs Capital Investment Board.

VACATING REQUEST FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. WALSH

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the request for a recorded vote on the amendments offered by myself be vacated, to the end that the voice vote thereon be taken de novo.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND (HCF)

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities and assistance to prevent the involuntary displacement of low-income families, the elderly and the disabled because of the loss of affordable housing stock, expiration of subsidy contracts (other than contracts for which amounts are provided under another heading in this Act) or expiration of use restrictions, or other changes in housing assistance arrangements, and for other purposes, $13,275,388,459 and amounts that are recaptured in this account and recaptured under the appropriation for ''Annual contributions for assisted housing'', to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the total amount provided under this heading, $9,075,388,459 and the aforementioned recaptures shall be available on October 1, 2000, and $4,200,000,000 shall be available on October 1, 2001, shall be for assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (''the Act'' herein) (42 U.S.C. 1437): *Provided further,* That of the total amount available for use in connection with expiring or terminating section 8 subsidy contracts, up to $37,000,000 shall be available for assistance under subtitle F of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act for use in connection with the renewal of contracts, which contracts may be renewed noncompetitively and for one-year terms, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such renewals: *Provided further,* That the foregoing amounts be for use in connection with expiring or terminating section 8 subsidy contracts, for amendments to section 8 subsidy contracts, for enhanced vouchers (including amendments and renewals) under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act (47 U.S.C. 1437f(t)), and contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 and, for terms of one year, section 473 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act: *Provided further,* That amounts available under the first proviso under this heading shall be available for section 8 rental assistance under the Act: (1) pursuant to section 24 of the Act or to other authority for the revitalization of severely distressed public housing, as set forth in the Appropriations Acts for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies for fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1997, and in the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996; (2) for the conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8; (3) for funds to carry out the family unification program; (4) for the relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency; (5) for tenant protection assistance, including replacement and relocation assistance; (6) for renewal of assistance under the shelter plus care program; and (7) for the renewal of section 8 contracts for units in a project that is subject to an approved plan of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990: *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to $25,000,000 shall be made available to nonelderly disabled families affected by the designation of a public housing development under section 7 of such Act, the establishment of preferences in accordance with section 651 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13611), or the restriction of occupancy to elderly families in accordance with section 658 of such Act, and to the extent the Secretary determines that such amount is not needed to fund applications for such affected families, to other nonelderly disabled families: *Provided further:* That up to $192,000,000 from amounts available under this heading shall be made available for administrative fees and other expenses to cover the cost of administering rental assistance programs under section 8 of the Act: *Provided further,* That the fee otherwise authorized under section 8(q) of such Act shall be determined in accordance with section 8(q), as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998: *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this heading up to $66,000,000 shall be available for very low income families living in properties constructed under the low-income housing tax credit program as authorized, as long as the vouchers are awarded within four months after the rule implementing this program is finalized: *Provided further,* That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to $60,000,000 shall be made available for incremental vouchers under section 8 of the Act on a fair share basis to those PHAs that have a 97 percent occupancy rate: *Provided further,* That any funds appropriated in the immediately preceding proviso that are not awarded by February 1, 2001, shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the ''Public housing capital fund'': *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall use up to $660,000 of the amount provided under this heading for monitoring public housing agencies that increase payment standards under the authority under section 8(o)(1)(E)(i) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(1)(E)(i) and for conducting detailed evaluations of the effects of using assistance as authorized under section 8(o)(1)(E): *Provided further,* That $11,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided further,*

That amounts provided under this heading shall be available for use for particular activities described in any proviso under this heading only to the extent that amounts provided under this heading remain available after amounts have been made available for the activities under all other preceding provisos under this heading in the full amounts provided in such provisos; except that for purposes of this proviso, the first, second, and third provisos under this heading shall be considered to be a single proviso: *Provided further,* That of the balances remaining in the HCF account, $275,388,459 shall be rescinded on or about September 30, 2001: *Provided further,* That any obligated balances of contract authority that have been terminated shall be canceled.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN:

Page 23, strike the provisos that begin on lines 6, 12, and 16.

Page 24, after line 19, insert the following:

For incremental vouchers under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, $593,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the amount provided by this paragraph, $66,000,000 shall be available for use in a housing production program in connection with the low-income housing tax credit program to assist very low-income and extremely low-income families.

Page 25, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

Page 25, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $127,000,000)''.

Page 27, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $30,000,000)''.

Page 29, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $43,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $395,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $215,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $80,000,000)''.

Page 37, after line 5, insert the following new item:

AMERICA'S PRIVATE INVESTMENT COMPANIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans under the America's Private Investment Companies Program, $37,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be for administrative expenses to carry out such a loan program, to be transferred to and merged with the appropriation under this title for ''Salaries and Expenses'': *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is guaranteed, not to exceed $1,000,000,000.

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $114,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $90,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $24,000,000)''.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill unfortunately represents a series of missed opportunities, and housing is one of the areas in which those missed opportunities are most severe. The amendment I am offering proposes to alleviate some of the most serious shortfalls by adding just over $1.8 billion to the HUD title of the bill.

In saying the bill falls short of what is needed, I mean no criticism of the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and others involved in putting this bill together. They did the very best they could with the resources available to them. Indeed, the chairman and his staff have included some useful and innovative provisions that will do real good, such as the language allowing increases in the payment standard for Section 8 housing vouchers in areas with tight rental markets and high rents.

The basic problem for this bill is simply the majority party's budget plan provides insufficient resources for overall domestic appropriations, mainly in order to focus on an agenda of tax cuts targeted to the high end of the income scale.

My amendment contains no offsets. There really are not places in this bill with excess funding that could be diverted to other purposes. I understand my amendment is subject to a point of order, and I will withdraw it at the appropriate time. My purpose in offering the amendment is simply to encourage a debate about the levels of funding that are necessary and appropriate for housing programs.

Housing is an area where national needs seem to be more acute, despite the booming economy. Yes, more people have jobs than before and incomes are rising, but in many areas rents are rising faster than incomes. People working at modest wages are often finding it harder and harder to keep a roof over their family's heads.

HUD's latest report on housing conditions tells us that there are 5.4 million very low-income households with worst case housing needs; that is, households with incomes below 50 percent of the local median who are paying more than half of their income for rent and receiving no housing assistance whatsoever. The fastest growing segment of that group is people working full time.

According to a recent survey of six cities by the Conference of Mayors, waiting times to get in public housing average 19 months in most cities. Waiting times for Section 8 vouchers averages 32 months. Officials in those cities estimate that their housing assistance programs serve just 27 percent of eligible households.

Considering that we are in a period of strong economic growth and that the Federal budget is in the best shape it has been for decades, you might think we would be taking steps to deal with these housing problems. But, unfortunately, the bill before us takes a step backward in funding for housing and community development.

Some of our colleagues may disagree and insist that the bill really improves several billions of dollars of spending increases for HUD. Those increases are largely illusionary, Mr. Chairman. They reflect the fact that the subcommittee found less unused budget authority to rescind this year than last, and that old, long-term Section 8 housing assistance contracts have been expiring and now require new appropriations just to continue the old levels of assistance. When you remove those accounting factors, you find that essentially all HUD programs in this bill are either flat or decreased a bit. Now, that makes no sense.

For example, the bill provides funds for about 100,000 additional housing assistance vouchers as proposed by the administration to try to make at least a small reduction in the number of families with worst case housing needs. That is what this amendment does, Mr. Chairman. It provides funds for about 100,000 additional housing assistance vouchers.

Vouchers alone, however, are not enough. There is also a need for programs to help stimulate production of low-income housing. Ultimately, we may need some new programs in that area. As an interim step, my amendment puts a bit more money into those housing production programs that are in place, the home block grant for local governments, the Section 202 and Section 811 programs that finance development of housing for low income elderly and disabled people, and the Native American Housing Block Grant, just for example.

We should also remember the key role played by public housing. My amendment adds a bit for public housing capital grants to help chip away at the $22 billion backlog in public housing modernization needs, and gives operating grants a 4 percent increase to help cover rising utility and payroll costs. It provides a $100 million increase for Community Development Block Grants, instead of the $295 million decrease in the bill. The amendment also funds the administration's APIC initiative, as recently agreed to by President Clinton and Speaker HASTERT.

□ 1815

Unfortunately, that agreement between the Speaker and President Clinton is not funded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has expired.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the increases in my amendment are fairly modest. Most programs would still be smaller than they were 6 years ago after adjustment for inflation. Indeed, several, such as housing for the elderly and the disabled, and homeless assistance, would remain below where they were 6 years ago in actual dollar amounts with no adjustment for inflation or for anything else. There are very real needs for modest expansion of housing and community development programs. We can and should do better than the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies had the resources to do in this bill. I very much hope we will be able to do better by the time this bill reaches the President's desk, and I know the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) shares that hope as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from West Virginia for a most excellent statement. I would like to talk about housing and put it in the context of our national economy and try to talk about it in human terms.

We have had an absolutely wonderful economic run for the past 7 or 8 years. We have had unparalleled prosperity in almost all regions of the country. But unfortunately, there have been some people who have been left behind by that prosperity. Our economy is a dynamic capitalist economy, and we do not want to do things that get in the way of the entrepreneurial class being able to make the investments and take the risks that create progress in the economy and create jobs and create an even stronger economic tomorrow.

However, there are those in this society who are either not as lucky or who are not as innovative, or as aggressive as others; there are lot of them who are not as healthy as some of the big winners in our society. So in any humane society, what we try to do is to take the rough edges off what would otherwise be a Darwin capitalism and try to make capitalism safe for human participation. The way we do that is not by stifling entrepreneurship; the way we do that is by trying to recognize that there are certain basics that humans need no matter how lucky they are. One of them is a decent education, another is protection from environmental abuse and corruption, a third is the right to decent health care when they need it, and fourth is the need for shelter.

Now, we have seen one thing in this society which creates a lot of problems. We have seen the gap between the very wealthy and most others in this society grow at an astronomical rate. We see at this point that the wealthiest 1 percent of people in our society own about 90 percent of society's assets, economic assets. The number 1 asset which most families strive for is to own a home so that they can begin to build equity and get a piece of the American dream. But very often, in some of our own neighborhoods, the very prosperity that is experienced by some of our most fortunate citizens operates to reduce the ability of some segments of our society to even gain decent shelter.

Example: in some neighborhoods, the ability of those who have done very well in our society, to be able to afford to pay for anything they want, means that they raise tremendously housing costs in certain neighborhoods, they drive whole groups of people out of neighborhoods, and they make the costs for those who stay much, much higher. It is the job of government to try to mitigate that. That is what this bill is inadequate in doing.

The gentleman from West Virginia has laid out in specific programmatic terms what some of the problems are in this bill. I would simply say that the result of this bill failing to fully meet its responsibilities in order to provide additional very large tax cuts for those at the top of the economic heap, the result is that we do not create the kind of opportunity that we should for all Americans to have at least the basics in life.

Pope John Paul said many years ago that there ought to be certain norms of decency in determining who has how much of economic goods in any society, and I think that is a good way to put it. We are not meeting those norms of decency when we fail in our obligation to assure decent housing for every American, and this bill most certainly falls short. I, for one, cannot support it until it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(On request of Mr. MOLLOHAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to cite a statistic that I actually did cite in my remarks to bolster the gentleman's argument, that in this robust economy, that the housing conditions in the HUD report recently completed tells us that there are 5.4 million very low income households with worst case scenarios, they are called worst case households, that is households with incomes below 50 percent of the local medium who are paying more than half of their incomes for housing needs and receiving no assistance whatsoever. A great shortfall in the Section 8 vouchers.

There is a great need out there, as the gentleman is describing, and this amendment, if we get the money, eventually, hopefully we can, the budget resolution that was passed by the majority falls far short of that that would be adequate to meet these basic housing needs.

So at the end of the day, we hope that that money is available. However, as of this point in time, the budget resolution supported by the majority which supports tax reductions for high-income individuals and no support for those who are the most neediest in our society for the most fundamental need, which is housing, that this Nation should be providing, rather than considering the tax cuts. The priorities of the budget resolution are simply upside down when they provide for tax cuts for wealthy Americans and do not provide resources for the most needy in our society.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I very much agree with the gentleman.

I would close by saying just one thing. We talk a lot in this Congress and in this society about generational inequities. One of the worst things we do to the younger generation is to make it harder for them to buy that first house. I know that when I was first married, my wife and I were able to afford a house only because she cashed in her teacher retirement fund. We had the $900 that it took to get a down payment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, there are not very many young couples today who can afford to buy a house for $900. I can see it in many of the young couples who I talk to back home during the weeks that I am back home, and I can see their frustration when they continually fall just short of being able to afford a first home or when rising interest rates put just out of reach that home that so many people desire.

It is very clear when we look at some of the sociological studies that one of the key ingredients to having a stable society and a society with a low crime rate and a high work ethic is housing ownership. People who own a stake in this economic are quick to try to protect that economy and the society that has made it possible. That is why I would urge the majority to review their decisions in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York continues to reserve his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I do insist on my point of order. I would like to explain briefly on the

merits of the point of order. First of all, the expenditures that are suggested are not offset, and that is, in the parlance around here, offset. The idea is that if we offer expenditure changes within the bill, we have to provide funds to back them up, to transfer funds from one account to another. This amendment does not comply, and it does not provide those funds.

There is also additional new authorization in the amendment. As the Chairman knows, this is the Committee on Appropriations. The authorizing committee, the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services should pass that legislation on to us and then we appropriate the funds. This has not been accomplished.

So for those reasons, I believe this amendment is out of order.

On the issue of Section 8 housing vouchers, I would just like to make a couple of points. We have provided $13.275 billion for Section 8 housing vouchers, $4 billion above last year. No matter how much money we provide, the administration wants more. No matter how much money our side is willing to spend on any item, the other side is always ready to spend more. But these expenditures need to be based on reality. Part of the reality here is that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been provided billions of dollars for housing vouchers for poor people, and by the way, the Section 8 program initially was sponsored by people on this side of the aisle. We think it is a good program. As we reduce the amount of public housing, the incremental vouchers take up the slack, people go out and they find an apartment, and the government helps to subsidize the cost of that apartment for people with low incomes. It works pretty well if it is administered properly, but right now, Mr. Chairman, it is not being administered properly. Mr. Chairman, 247,000 vouchers that we appropriated and provided for, that Congress provided for have gone begging; 247,000 American families that need those new commerce are not getting them. My good friend and colleague pointed out that HUD had a study that there are millions of Americans that need these vouchers, and yet, HUD is not complying with the law. They are not providing those individuals those vouchers.

That is what we appropriate these funds for. When those funds do not get spent, what has happened in the past is that the administration then comes back and says, ''Aha, we have money laying around that did not get spent, we will use that for other expenditures.'' So they use HUD as a bank to come back and find money and then redistribute it somewhere else, so it looks like they have helped poor people, but, in fact, they have not. The administration has taken that money and used it for defense or for transportation or some other area of expenditure. We do not think that is the right way to proceed.

So we funded the section 8 vouchers fully; and we have also said that those funds, if there are any funds laying around at the end that do not get spent, and as history would show, that is what will happen, we said, those funds must also be used for an additional 10,000 vouchers. We think that is what these funds were for.

So I would reserve my point of order against the amendment and await the ruling of the Chair.

□ 1830

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

Mr. Chairman, I am standing to support the Mollohan amendment, and having come from an area such as the one I represent, many of the arguments that I hear regarding housing I have to refute many times because of my experience in working with low-income people.

I think that our chairman and our ranking member have done a very credible job, Mr. Chairman, at the level of the subcommittee funding. But there are numerous funding problems in the bill which I have alluded to before.

The one that I have specific interest in at this point is the lack of funding to help the poorest of the poor people obtain decent housing. I want Members to look at this picture and put a face on it, as I have to almost every day in my district. That is, we are living in the era of the greatest economic prosperity that this Nation has ever had, but even this economic boom has created a housing crisis for many Americans.

Because of the population growth, many of the problems we have heard our very fair chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) talk about must be viewed from the point of view of putting a face on this problem.

Let us look at vouchers. In terms of these housing authorities having enough vouchers, I think that the chairman has a point there, but what the chairman has not realized is that many of the large urban areas like Miami and some of the other areas cannot get enough vouchers to meet the need because some other areas have the vouchers and are not using them. We cannot get them to the people in Liberty City as much as we should.

Whenever there is any kind of crisis there, when the sewers run over and when there is a crisis regarding housing, we cannot get the number of vouchers that we need. We cannot get them because they have utilized all that they had.

The other thing is that we must realize that there is a crisis in housing. We are not just dealing with pious platitudes here, we are dealing with real live people who do not have housing. There are over 5 million families who pay more than half of their income in housing.

We are told all the time, and we hear this all the time, that housing assistance is important to this affordability problem. We believe that. But these incremental vouchers are not what they are cooked up to be.

First of all, when we hand a poor person a voucher and tell them, look, go and find someplace to live, that is not as easy as it sounds here on this floor. It is very, very difficult. There are many people who I am hearing from every day in my district. Some people over on this aisle do not want any more middle- and low-income people coming to those areas. We have to fight that. The other thing is, rental housing is hard to find in some of these areas.

So I want Members to look at this picture I am talking about because it paints a new face on this problem of vouchers. Vouchers work, but the average waiting period for a Section 8 voucher is about 2 years. There is a backlog in the cities, the large urban areas I have spoken about.

In virtually every urban area in this country people making the minimum wage cannot even afford a medium-priced apartment rental. Housing vouchers make that possible and they do it by putting in private sector housing.

Yet, the bill fails to fund the President's request for 120,000 additional incremental housing vouchers. Despite the claims, it is debatable whether or not this bill would provide HUD with any new vouchers to help our families find safe, decent, and affordable housing. The bill as written claims to allow HUD to provide up to 20,000 additional vouchers, but we think this is just funny math, Mr. Speaker, or what we call creative accounting, because these additional vouchers are only funded in the bill through overly rosy and optimistic estimates of recaptures of unused Section 8 funds.

HUD will only have these vouchers available if the Department recaptures more funds than the amount HUD itself says can be recaptured. According to what I have learned, Mr. Speaker, HUD does not even expect these recaptured funds to be available.

We would never treat rich people this way. We can bet they get hard cash to meet their needs. Yet poor families are shunted aside with the promise that they may even get a voucher, and it may not pan out.

Refusing to provide these additional incremental housing vouchers means that families will have to continue to live in substandard housing, housing that is overrun by roaches and rats and vermin. We can do better in this country. We are a very prosperous country. I appeal to the committee to accept the Mollohan amendment. It is a credible amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Much has been said and made about the housing vouchers, and that our bill turns its back on those most in need. However, it is not

this bill but the Department of Housing and Urban Development itself which has, through its own dinosaur-like behavior, contributed to the very housing crisis that some have ascribed and attributed to Congress.

HUD has, by any admission through our public hearings, been seen to be incredibly slow in awarding Section 8 vouchers. This results in the recapture that the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) alluded to of funds because HUD does not spend them fast enough on the programs for which they were intended by Congress. The recapture would be equivalent to about 237,000 vouchers, because they do not spend down the money quickly enough.

With our tight budget allocation today, it makes no sense to fund a richer program that HUD has shown it simply cannot deliver. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated the spend-out rate at an extremely low 6 percent to begin with. Now the spend-out rate is projected by the CBO at an unbelievably low 1 percent.

This inefficiency is unacceptable; even more unacceptable given the fact that Secretary Cuomo has the use of his community builders to expedite the process and overcome bureaucratic hurdles within this huge bureaucracy.

HUD's policy should be, Mr. Chairman, to get the programs to the people as soon as possible. We have the same situation where fiscal year 1998 funds did not reach the street until October of 1999. Congress provided 50,000 vouchers in fiscal year 1999 and 60,000 vouchers in fiscal year 2000. We should not double the amount of vouchers, as some have suggested, when HUD does not award the ones already in the pipeline.

The bill before us includes language, thank goodness, to push HUD to do a better job, to move this huge bureaucratic dinosaur to do the job for the people who need public housing.

This bill also provides sufficient money to renew all expiring Section 8 contracts at a 100 percent rate, and to provide relocation assistance at the requested funding level. HUD should administer the current programs with a higher degree of efficiency before Congress expands it.

I oppose the amendment and support the bill, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the indulgence of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I want to speak strongly in support of the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriations bill as it comes before us exemplifies a very dangerous trend in America, and we have been manifesting it in various ways in this House.

We are at a time of great prosperity. The free market system as it works in this country with the cooperation of many branches of government, of the private sector, obviously, of labor unions, that private sector is generating wealth at a rate unheard of in human history.

That is a very good thing. A large percentage of our population is living in material terms better than we ever thought such a large number of people could live. But that very fact, as the gentleman from Wisconsin and others, the gentleman from Florida, have pointed out, exacerbates the problem for those among us, and they are in the millions, who through no fault of their own are not the beneficiaries of this prosperity.

Alan Greenspan has acknowledged that trade, globalization, helps some Americans and hurts others, not because of their inherent worth or lack of worth but because of where they were placed in the economy.

So we have a situation where, in many of the metropolitan areas in this country, it has become more and more expensive to live. That reflects the fact that a large number of people who want to live in those metropolitan areas have more and more money, but it also means that those who do not have money, and they number in the millions, the tens of millions, are disadvantaged.

In this bill, in other appropriations bills, in immigration legislation, in tax legislation, in public policy area after public policy area we help the wealthy, which is a good thing. That is part of our job, to help people who are productive and are making wealth do better, and we do that well; but we at the same time turn our backs on people at the low end.

People wondered, how come there was such a debate over China trade? Because there are so many economists and financial sector people, that was an easy one. Why is there resistance among America's historically generous people to globalization?

Here is why, because when we have a situation in which the rich get richer and the poor and working class gets poorer, that is a problem. It is not simply that the rich are getting richer and the poor are not getting richer at the same pace. We are talking about real drops in people's incomes if they are in basic manufacturing. We are talking about people living in cities for whom housing prices have gone out of sight, who have to move out of areas where they already live, who cannot find decent housing, who find housing only if they have to pay far too much money.

Mr. Chairman, it is not simply housing. We have had a big debate on Section 8s. I agree there are Section 8s that do not get used. I will tell the Members why in the area I represent, because we do not put enough money into the Section 8s. Housing rents have outpaced the fair market rents that we pay, so we make it worse when we cut the budget, when we begrudge relatively small amounts of the vast resources this country has for low-income people.

They say it is because it is not administered well. What about community development block grants? The community development block grant program is a Nixon program whereby the Federal government simply passes through money to cities and to States and they are allowed to spend it within a broad range of flexibility.

What have they done? They have cut it. This budget cuts community development block grants, a program on which HUD simply serves as a pass-through to local communities.

A few years ago Congress changed under the Republican rule the way public housing is governed. We were told they have really fixed it up. Why, then, is the public housing capital fund underfunded? Why then are the people who live in public housing, who live in an area now where they say they have improved the administration, are they given less money than they need significantly, less money than they got last year for the physical repair of public housing?

Part of what is going on is that we know, some of my friends on this side will privately acknowledge, this is not a real budget. They understand that this is too little. What they are saying is, let us get this budget through, this appropriations bill, and let it go over to the Senate, and let us get into negotiations with the President. Then the real budget will emerge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has expired.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. In other words, to the Members of this House, do not expect to make the real decisions. Pass through a budget, an appropriations bill, that we know is inadequate, that we know denies to the very needy people important programmatic resources, many of which are well spent.

We talk about the Section 8 problem being terrible, but the previous speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey, correctly pointed out that one of the things we have done is to spend money to preserve the existing Section 8 tenancies. Why are we preserving them? Overwhelmingly, we do that because the people who live in those units which were created by Federal funds are so fond of their housing that they put pressure on Members of Congress, so Members of Congress who voted against the program, who voted against funding the programs, vote to keep the programs going so people can continue to live there.

We have housing programs that are not perfect, but they do a very important job of trying to alleviate the severe economic distress of tens of millions of our citizens who are not participating in the general prosperity.

When we bring forward a bill that say we will do less of that this year in real terms than last year in the face of this great prosperity, we are not serving the basic values of the country. So I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will ask for a colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the distinguished chair of our subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman knows, I have an ongoing concern regarding the adequacy of HUD's programs for providing housing for the mentally ill. This year the committee is recommending level funding at $201 million for the Section 8–11 disabled housing program, and this is $9 million below the administration's request. These funds provide housing for both mentally and physically disabled people.

The administration's request estimated that 5,454 new housing units for the disabled would be available with this increase in funds. Would the chairman kindly tell me how many new units of housing for the disabled would be available under the committee bill?

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman for offering this colloquy and for her service on the subcommittee. She does a great job. I am sorry I missed my cue there, but I think I am back in form.

□ 1845

According to HUD, the bill provides sufficient funds for 3,321 new units, which, according to HUD's estimates, is a reduction of 200,133 units.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, as I know the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) is aware, appropriate housing and services for the disabled can vary widely. In the case of some mentally disabled individuals, their needs may simply be a home where they can feel safe without any special physical adaptations. But for those with severe physical disabilities, a home might require significant physical accommodations. The administration's justification for section 811 funds is unfortunately silent on how this continuum of care for the disabled is and will be met.

Will the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) agree to assist me in assessing how well HUD is progressing in achieving the goal of providing adequate and appropriate housing for all of America's disabled populations?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly, Mr. Chairman. As the gentlewoman from Ohio knows, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) has been a very active advocate for the housing needs of the disabled population, and I have worked very well with him in the past on this issue, and I am pleased to have the participation and support as well of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. My impression, Mr. Chairman, is that the disabled are currently underserved by section 811, and I am sure that the gentleman from New York would agree with me that we are not currently meeting the housing needs of the disabled. I further ask the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) to work with me as we go to conference to improve the overall level funding for section 811.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the concerns of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) are quite valid, and they deserve our attention. I will certainly do my best as this bill goes through the appropriations process.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) very much for his leadership on this issue and so many others.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor to certainly join my colleagues, and I do appreciate the work of this committee; and I think it has been stated earlier the frustration in which we are operating because, in contrast to what the appropriators have had to work with, we have an enormously booming economy.

So this amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is one that really should garner all of our support. Unfortunately, it is subject to a point of order; and, frankly, it should not be because we are in one of the most prosperous times that we could ever be in in both the last century and in this century.

I would venture to say, if we took some of the most prosperous cities in America, we would still find individuals who are unhoused, who are in housing that is unacceptable, who are homeless and are in need of the funds particularly utilized in programs of HUD.

HUD is one of the larger agencies, and it has one of the largest cuts in this appropriations process. Although my colleagues have supported the FHA loans, which certainly are meritorious, and the renewal of existing section 8A subsidies, my colleagues, however, on this appropriation on this subcommittee has provided less money for the housing programs than we have seen over the years.

I believe that it is time that we acknowledge the prosperity and to function with that. We do not have funding for empowerment zones. We do not have funding for new markets. We do not have funding for APIC. The section 8 that we do fund can afford to have more dollars. The good news is that section 8 vouchers can be utilized for buying housing.

What greater opportunity for those who are working and have less opportunities for them to take the dollars that were used previously for rental subsidies to be able to buy a home.

But if we continue to cut and undermine the housing subsidies that are given through the Federal Government, then we continue to emphasize that those who cannot meet the market cannot buy in the market because their income does not allow them to do so, a continuously increasing market, then we will not provide for them; they just do not get housing.

I believe inadequate housing is indicative of many things: dysfunctional families, children moving from place to place, children not having a home school, if you will, a school that they go to on a regular basis because they are living with relatives because their family members cannot afford decent housing.

I do not believe that, in this most prosperous time, that we commend ourselves well as a body that has a responsibility for funding programs that help the least of those if we do not provide the adequate funding.

The billion-dollar amendment that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) offers that spreads out through a variety of HUD programs answers the needs that we have and particularly the needs of those who are not housed.

A recent study on housing needs found that more than 5.3 million low-income families do not receive any Federal housing assistance at all. We must ensure that these families receive the help that they need, and mostly because they are low-income working families and they do not meet the status or the standards or there is not enough money to assist them.

We can only do that if funding meets that need. By funding HUD by less than 8 percent than the President requested, we cannot possibly accomplish this goal. But more importantly, even if we underfund what the President has asked for, we are underfunding this agency in great amounts, generally speaking, because there are large numbers of people who are still on waiting lists for public housing assistance and for section 8 certificates and for elderly housing.

So I would commend the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for realizing that, in prosperity, we must always do more; we must accept the question or answer the question, can we do more. Yes we can. We can do more with the housing that most of the people in America would support when they find that people cannot get the housing that they need.

I am disappointed that we have not gone the extra mile. I would think that those who are in need would likewise

challenge us to do more than we have done. Our elderly, our people who are unhoused, our people who do not have a sufficient amount of housing would ask us to object or eliminate the point of order and support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 4635, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations for FY 2001. Although this legislation retains our commitment to the American people in some areas like NASA, it falls far short of an appropriations measure that the American people expect from the 106th Congress. Accordingly, the President would veto the bill in its current form.

The measure increases spending for VA programs (6 percent more than the current level), NASA (1 percent more) and NSF (4 percent more), but it cuts EPA, FEMA and other vital programs. This bill is lacking in basic funding needs that are critical to the American people.

The President's FY 2001 Budget is based on a sound approach that maintains fiscal discipline, eliminates the national debt, extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, provides for an appropriately sized tax cut, establishes a new voluntary Medicare prescription drug benefit, and funds critical priorities for our future.

H.R. 4635 severely reduces our ability to address basic issues like poverty and the shortage of affordable housing and undermines investments in our communities. The elimination of funding for the Americorps program would deny over million young and impressionable Americans the opportunity to provide community services and become better citizens as participants in the Corporations' Americorps (62,000 participants) and Learn and Serve (1 million participants) programs. Nevertheless, we are living in unprecedented times of economic growth in America. Mr. Speaker, we cannot squander this historic opportunity to invest in America's future; the VA-HUD Appropriations measure risks doing just that.

I am very disappointed that the legislation increases spending for merely two HUD programs—FHA loans and renewal of existing section 8 rental subsidies—while providing less than even the current level for other HUD activities. Utilizing advance appropriations next year's budget and various gimmicks to give the impression that there isn't enough money to fund basic priorities is inconsistent with the needs of the American people. The reality is that we have a historic opportunity to continue paying down the debt while passing an appropriations measure that adequately meets the needs of those that have been left behind in the New Economy.

A recent study on housing needs found that more than 5.3 million low-income families do not receive any federal housing assistance at all. We must ensure that these families receive the help they need, and we can only do that if funding meets that need. By funding HUD by less than 8 percent than the President requested, we cannot possibly accomplish this goal.

Economic growth has done little to solve the housing problem in America. During the early part of the 1980s, the United States faced a slowing economy and worsening housing affordability. Even in the 1990s, the economy grew at a healthy pace; yet housing affordability for the poor continued to deteriorate. Today, housing needs are so acute that they are painfully visible in the neighborhoods of every major city in the United States, as the homeless have become a persistent part of our daily lives.

Although no requests for specific requests in congressional districts are permitted under the rule, we should recognize that the housing shortage in America continues unabated.

I have requested $35 million for the Supportive Housing Project for rental assistance to low-income families in Houston; $2 million for the Single Room Occupancy program which provides homeless persons in Houston with a private room to reside in, as well supportive services for health care, mental health; and job training; and $300 million for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program that provides states and localities with resources and incentives to devise long-term, comprehensive strategies for meeting the home needs of persons with AIDS and their families.

We cannot afford to forget those in our society who are not reaping the rewards of this economic boom. Housing is a critical component of keeping America's families first.

Compared to current levels, the bill decreases funding for public housing modernization (3 percent), revitalizing severely distressed public housing (2 percent), drug elimination grants (3 percent), the CDBG program (6 percent), ''brownfields'' redevelopment (20 percent), and the HOME program (1 percent).

Moreover, the measures provides no funding for urban and rural empowerment zones, welfare-to-work vouchers, the Moving to Work program or communities in schools. What are we saying here today as a collective body? Are we saying we don't care about those in poverty-stricken areas? Should we ignore the hopes and fulfillment of dreams that the empowerment zones have shown in certain areas? We can and we should do better, Mr. Speaker.

I am also disappointed that this measure would prohibit the Veterans Administration from transferring any medical care funding to the Justice Department for use in the government's lawsuit against tobacco companies. This is merely a partisan tactic to distract debate from how to spend the federal budget to ongoing litigation by the Department of Justice, which has nothing to do with the underlying measure. Such riders make little sense and frustrate the goal of funding critical programs for our future.

Despite the shortcomings of this bill, there are some commitments that have been secured and need to be preserved. Our ability to reach the stars is an important priority, which will ensure that America remains the preeminent country for space exploration. Last year, NASA's budget was needlessly cut and I support every effort to increase funding during the FY 2001 appropriation process. Although this measure is destined to be vetoed in its current form, I believe the $13.7 billion appropriation, $322 million (2%) less than requested by the administration, could have been even more generous.

The measure provides $2.1 billion for continued development of the international space station, and $3.2 billion for space shuttle operations. We need to devote additional personnel at NASA's Human Flight Centers to ensure that the high skill and staffing levels are in place to operate the Space Shuttle safely and to launch, as well as assemble the International Space Station.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud the Johnson Space Center and its many accomplishments, and I promise to remain a vocal supporter of NASA and its creative programs. NASA has had a brilliant 40 years, and I see no reason why it could not have another 40 successful years. It has made a tremendous impact on the business and residential communities of the 18th Congressional District of Texas, and the rest of the nation.

In closing, I hope my colleagues will vote against this legislation so that we can get back to work on a bill that invests in America's future, especially to strengthen our resolve to make affordable housing a reality across America.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I favor very much the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). I hope it passes. But, Mr. Chairman, the VA-HUD appropriations bill that we are considering is really seriously underfunded. It is underfunding so many housing programs which is so vital to so many people in our country and many in my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In this time of economic prosperity, it is important to remember where many people who are still struggling to get by every day, what is going to happen to those people and those who need the housing programs to put a roof over their heads.

Mr. Chairman, not everyone in this Nation is so lucky to own dot-com stocks. Not every family has seen the tremendous financial windfall that the Nation's booming economy has created.

This bill severely cuts housing programs by $2.5 billion less than President Clinton's requested amount. Nearly every program in HUD's budget is cut from the President's request.

I just cannot figure out why my Republican colleagues would not choose to fully fund affordable housing, which is so crucial to so many people in our country. Contrary to the belief of some of my colleagues, the HUD budget is not increased. In fact, this year's VA-HUD appropriations bill turns its back on the need for affordable housing. While the administration has requested 120,000 new section 8 vouchers, this bill does not include a single new voucher.

Community Development Block Grants, which are used to rebuild housing, improve infrastructure, and provide job training, among other things, are cut by almost $300 million.

Mr. Chairman, this bill cuts the HOME program, which helps local governments expand low-income housing, resulting in nearly 2,500 fewer households receiving critical assistance.

This bill provides no new funds for elderly housing, for homeless assistance

grants, for Native American block grants. Mr. Chairman, it cuts housing opportunities for people with AIDS to the extent of 5,100 fewer people with HIV/AIDS will not receive housing assistance.

Mr. Chairman, this bill also cuts $60 million in Hope 6 funds which are used to revitalize severely distressed public housing.

This bill has a devastating effect on my own congressional district as well. In Boston, overall funding from HUD would be cut by $16.1 million. In Boston, these cuts would mean we would not be able to provide English language to GED instruction, youth programming and after-school care to more than 1,300 children and adults.

Under this bill, Boston would be forced to turn away 3,000 potential first-time homeowners from the home buying classes. My city would also have to scale back its main street programs which develop neighborhood business districts.

Mr. Chairman, these are real programs. They help real people across this entire country as they strive to live with dignity. But today this Congress is going to cut those programs. Why? Because, Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues are so committed to providing tax relief for the wealthy Americans on the backs of those who literally need the programs to survive.

I hope the amendment is adopted, but I hope the bill is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am moved sitting here to think I am living in la la land somewhere. May I please ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), chairman of this subcommittee, where is he from?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am from the State of New York.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from a city in the State of New York?

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I was city council president in the city of Syracuse, and I served on the city council for 8 years.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that is what I thought. I ask the gentleman from New York, is there low housing stock in Syracuse?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have a public housing authority, one of the best run housing authorities in America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from New York also has a ghetto. We have ghettos all over this country. I am surprised that we would come down here and argue to the people that we want to cut out an opportunity for low-income people to have adequate housing.

One of the problems in this country is the inseparable triumvirate of inadequate jobs, inadequate housing, and inadequate educational opportunities. One can go to Syracuse, and I have been there, and I will show one where the ghetto is. One can go to Fort Lauderdale or in Miami, the district of the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), who spoke earlier, and I will show one a place where there is a necessity for added housing in this country.

At one point in the 1960's, I considered, as a lawyer, changing my entire practice to trying to help the low-income people of this country. At that time, the then HUD-FHA programs were 221D(3), 221D(4), 221H that did rehab of all properties. Along came Richard Nixon in 1968 and doggone if we did not cut out all of those opportunities. Real estate investment trusts attracted those persons who had high income to come into low-income areas to help build the housing stock.

Now, from the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), who I heard argue that the spend-down rate has been poor, one cannot spend where there is nowhere for a person to buy.

We do not have adequate housing in this country. Therefore, if one had all of what everybody is arguing, one still would not have low-income housing stock because it has been on the decrease.

Please come go with me in Washington, D.C., and let me show my colleagues boarded-over places, just like in Syracuse, I say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), just like in New York City, just like in Chicago and all over this country we find this.

Our charge is to help the least of those among us. What we have done is turn it on its head in this House of Representatives. We have helped the least all right. The least which control most of everything in this country are now gaining the most. None of us are to begrudge them, but that does not mean that the least of us should not be helped.

How dare we not accept the program like the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has offered and allow for us to be able to at least address minimally a problem that all of us know that is developing.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) spoke about how this creates dysfunctional families. It also helps to breed crime. It helps to breed all of those things about our society that all of us find repugnant. Yet, we come here and think that these people are supposed to be ignored.

This is the same Federal Government that allowed for banks to build all of these things all over this Nation and redline other communities and not give them an opportunity to have their communities developed.

In the area where I am from, from Fort Lauderdale, I have supported every Chamber project, I have supported every one of the tax situations that allowed for the development of the downtown area. All around me, everywhere around me, other than where I live, has developed in a mighty way.

I am proud to be a part of that community. But I will be doggone if I can stand here and say that I am proud so much that I ignore those people in the areas that all of that prosperity is looming around, booming all over them, and busting them right in the mouth by saying to them that we cannot do a minimal housing program that will be advantageous to all of society.

□ 1900

Shame on this House. Shame on every one of us that does not support the Mollohan amendment, and shame on all of us that cannot believe that it is necessary to put a fair roof over the heads of every American no matter where he or she lives; those that are disabled, those that are sick, those that are elderly, those that are children, those that need the kind of assistance that we can adequately provide in the kind of prosperous times that we have. How dare we not do that.

I find it absolutely abhorrent, and I call on every Member of this House of Representatives to support the Mollohan measure. Yes, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) will move a point of order, but I can order him to look in Syracuse, where the gentleman needs help in housing, and I certainly do in Ft. Lauderdale, and there are 433 other Members of this House with impoverished and rural areas that need adequate housing.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman. I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, I have a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, therefore violating clause 2 of rule XXI. It also provides no offsets for the expenditures that are proposed, as called for under section 302 of the Budget Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. No, Mr. Chairman. I recognize that the gentleman has a valid point of order. We appreciate the opportunity to debate the issue here, and again we recognize the validity of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI is conceded and sustained.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mollohan amendment and in opposition

to the VA–HUD appropriations bill, because I have some serious concerns about the negative impact this legislation will have on the quality of life for veterans and for those citizens who need public housing assistance.

This budget for VA–HUD proposes to cut $180 million for Section 202 housing programs, notwithstanding the fact that this is the funding which allows distressed housing authorities to demolish and replace decrepit housing which was mandated in the Omnibus Budget Act of 1996. The Congress has mandated that housing authorities in New Orleans, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other cities comply with new rules and new directives while, at the same time, cutting the money to make it happen. We cannot get blood out of a turnip, and we cannot make wood cabinets without lumber.

In Chicago, the Chicago Housing Authority has unveiled a bold plan for transformation. Components of this plan includes completely replacing the old out-dated, outmoded, socially irresponsible high-rise, densely populated semi-prisons with 25,000 new or newly rehabbed units of housing for families and the creation of new housing opportunities for senior citizens and people with disabilities.

Since half of the Chicago Housing Authority's existing stock falls under the Section 202 mandate, the CHA is counting on competing for Hope VI grants as the primary vehicle for change. The CHA will need to win Hope VI revitalization grants in fiscal year 2001 to begin rebuilding of its housing properties, with the one primary example being the infamous Robert Taylor Homes, which has produced 13 of the poorest 15 census tracks in the Nation, and is known as the center of poverty.

Under plans being drawn up with residents, the CHA is proposing to create new low-rise mixed income neighborhoods. These neighborhoods will be filled with quality housing, 50 percent of which is scheduled to be built by minority firms who will hire public housing residents. There will be new parks, new schools, new roads and infrastructure. These relics of past public policy failures will rise and give hope to thousands of people.

This fall, the CHA will take HUD's commitment to fund the CHA over the next 10 years and do something quite extraordinary. The CHA will sell bonds to the private market. And let me reiterate this last point. A public entity is taking Federal commitments from HUD for funding and taking them to the private market and asking them to underwrite the revitalization of the Nation's poorest neighborhoods. This type of public-private partnership to fund revitalization has never been done before.

A social nightmare has the possibility of being eliminated as we get rid of some of the worst housing in the Nation and create thriving new neighborhoods. And how is Congress proposing to respond to this bold Chicago plan for renovation? This House is proposing to cut $180 million needed to fund the first phase of this resurgence. We are stating to the private sector that this House does not have enough confidence in HUD or its funded agencies to pull off reform. We are saying that this Congress does not honor its commitments. We ask for the private sector to do its part, but we will not do ours. In short, we have dictated reform and retracted financial support. We want the rain without the thunder and the lightning. We will have summarily doomed reform before it has begun.

And what are the consequences? Instead of creating 25,000 units of quality housing, Congress will mandate the Chicago Housing Authority to demolish 19,000 units and keep 19,000 substandard ones. Instead of creating new construction jobs and business opportunities for small- and medium-sized minority ventures, Congress will close the door of opportunity. Instead of new schools, parks, roads, and needed housing opportunities for people of all incomes, Congress will have refueled segregation and pockets of poverty. And instead of demonstrating that government can be an active productive partner with private industry in the recreation of new opportunities for business and future customers, Congress will keep demanding compliance and reinvestment without demonstrating the will to put its money where its mandates are.

So I say to this Congress that without additional Hope VI funding, there is no hope. A promising future will be nothing more than broken promises. Those towers of misery will continue as barricades to advancement, locking future generations into poverty and preventing this country from wiping a terrible stain from its past.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the Mollohan amendment and urge that we vote down the cuts and raise hope.

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

I appreciate the hard work that my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), has done with the low funding allocations that he was given, however this spending bill makes cuts in Housing and Urban Development's efforts to address affordable housing, community development and economic development issues. I am pleased to take this opportunity to speak in support of the Mollohan amendment to increase the funding for the HUD housing programs by $1.8 billion.

This amendment addresses the drastic underfunding in this bill of several important HUD programs in the country and in my district. Under the President's budget, the Rochester, New York area would have received an increase of $4 million over last year. But, instead, under this bill being considered this evening, my district will have its programs cut by $400,000. These cuts mean fewer people will be able to purchase a home, fewer people with HIV/AIDS will receive housing assistance, less money is available to enforce fair housing laws, less money to fight against the widespread predatory lending practices, less money that can be used to deliver services to the homeless, and less money for elderly housing.

An elderly woman in Rochester contacted me frustrated about the critical shortage of affordable housing. The waiting list for this housing and the low maximum income limits on new and existing homes were a very great barrier to her, and she correctly pointed out that it will only get worse as seniors live longer.

She and her husband are ''too rich'' for low-income housing by $500 and too poor for assisted care senior housing. They also cannot find handicapped accessible housing, which is necessary for her husband, who has had a stroke. They are being forced to sell the home they live in and they do not know where they are going to move. She remarks, ''Our golden years have been very tarnished.''

Unfortunately, she is not an isolated case. With a record of $5.4 million unassisted low-income households in this country having worst-case housing needs, and spending over 50 percent of their income on rent, the bill's low funding is inadequate. I urge my colleagues to do better in conference.

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

Mr. Chairman, I stand here in amazement over what we are about to do. We stand in this Nation on high moral ground as we criticize other nations across the world about human rights' violations and all other kinds of violations when we are about to do the worst violation we can do of one; the pride of one who is less fortunate than us to not have a decent roof over their heads.

How can we, in this time of fiscal prosperity, deny those who do not have a roof over their heads? How can we not increase funding for Section 8 when we have hundreds of millions of people who are waiting for decent homes in this day and age of fiscal prosperity? What is wrong with us? What is wrong? We talk about, and many of the individuals particularly on the majority party always speak of, fostering family values. How can we foster family values if we do not value the family? These families need a decent place to live and we must increase the HUD-VA budget.

When we had times of budget deficits, we were enacting in this Congress a sort of reverse Robin Hood, because everything that we did was take away from the poor so that we can balance a budget. Well, we have a balanced budget. We have a situation where we no longer are trying to figure out where dollars are coming from. In fact, we have surplus budgets, yet we will not restore budgets to where they once were.

What is wrong with us when we do not care about the elderly, the disabled? How can we stand here, the greatest Nation in the world, and talk about how great we are. What kind of example do we set for other countries when we do not take care of the least of our own? It is ultimately our responsibility to make sure that we take care of the least among us.

This Congress, in the manner that it is behaving, if we do not support the Mollohan amendment, will be convincing me more and more each and every day that Robin Hood was right.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Mollohan amendment because this bill does not meet our great need for affordable housing. I represent Chicago, where the waiting list for public housing is 35,000 families long. Thirty-five thousand people is as big as some cities. That is like having the entire city of Atlantic City waiting in line to get a decent place to live.

It is even worse than that in Chicago. In Chicago, right next to that line is another line of 24,000 people waiting for Section 8 vouchers. In fact, that line is so long they had to close it. The need for affordable housing is so great in Chicago that not only can a person not get a rental voucher, they cannot even get in line to get a rental voucher. That is what we are facing in Chicago. And it is the same in communities across this country.

This bar graph shows the latest available national figures; 5.4 million households facing what is called worst case housing needs. That means that they either pay 50 percent or more of their income for rent or they live in substandard housing; 5.4 million men, women, and children, more than any other time in our history. But this bill does nothing, absolutely nothing, to help even one additional family, and does nothing to reduce the lines, and actually cuts money to improve housing.

□ 1915

The press asked for additional funds for public housing. That is money to do the repairs and upkeep that every home requires, including our public housing. And that is money for the HOPE 6 program, which would rebuild public housing that is uninhabitable like the kind we suffer in Chicago. And that is money for the Drug Elimination Grant program to fight the drugs and gangs and guns that are chewing up our children.

But this bill does not make any of that a priority. It actually cuts money for public housing from last year's funding levels. And these cuts are on top of the cuts that we had last year and the year before and every year since 1994, totaling over $1 billion in cuts for public housing.

In Chicago we have a line as long as Atlantic City waiting for public housing, and this bill does nothing to help them. And it does not help our cities and neighborhoods, either.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors, Republicans and Democrats, wrote us a letter detailing what they need to revitalize their cities and bring home jobs and homeowners back into their community. The mayors want $2 billion for HOME, the major Federal homeownership program that gives mortgage counseling to would-be home buyers and helps build cities and repair homes. This bill, however, does not make homeownership a priority. This bill actually cuts the HOME program. And it does not do enough for the homeless. This is a housing budget.

If we help anybody, we should at least help the people who have no house at all. Instead, we keep homeless funding at the same inadequate amount that we gave them last year. It is not that there are any less homeless people. In fact, there are more homeless people.

The Urban Institute recently updated their study on homelessness. The new study showed that over 840,000 people live on the street any given night. We should be ashamed. Twenty-five percent of those people are children. That is more people than live in Detroit or Milwaukee or San Francisco. Imagine on any given night that everybody in San Francisco, even the children, have to line up in a homeless shelter. This bill leaves them out in the cold.

There are lines of people waiting for affordable and decent housing in Chicago, in Washington, in San Francisco, in Boston, in rural America, in the South, in the North, everywhere. And this bill does not enough, almost nothing, and certainly nothing additional to help them.

With a booming economy and budget surpluses, we can help the families, the seniors, the communities, and the homeless. The President asked for that money to provide more help. The majority leadership could have found the money. I am voting against this bill until they do. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437), $2,800,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which up to $50,000,000 shall be for carrying out activities under section 9(h) of such Act, for lease adjustments to section 23 projects and $43,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937: *Provided further*, That of the total amount, up to $75,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs resulting from emergencies and natural disasters in fiscal year 2001.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g), $3,138,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. KELLY

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY:

Page 25, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 45, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Mrs. KELLY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for the amendment to be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment that the CBO has certified is budget and outlay neutral. This amendment increases funding for the Public Housing Operating Fund by $1 million. To offset the cost of the amendment, it reduces funding for the HUD Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses by the same amount.

As a member of the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development, I have worked in an oversight role for HUD for a number of years. In that time, I have witnessed a great deal of change at HUD. I can unequivocally state that HUD does an excellent job at public relations.

Listen, if HUD dedicated the same energy toward ensuring a decent, safe, and sanitary home and suitable living environment for every American, I believe we would have the smallest of tasks before us today. Unfortunately, that is not the case, and we have a long way to go to recognize those laudable goals.

It is unfortunate, but today's HUD is plagued with problems that simply cannot be blamed on passive administrations. Countless reports of the GAO and the HUD Office of the Inspector General cite deep-rooted government waste, fraud, abuse, mismanagement, and a general lack of oversight.

For instance, the General Accounting Office recently reported that in 1998 HUD made nearly $1 billion in section 8 overpayments because the agency cannot validate the income eligibility of housing assistance applicants. This wasted money could have provided housing for some 150,000 more families.

Another example is the HUD Office of the Inspector General, which has reported for years that HUD operations suffer from systematic management weaknesses. HUD's response has been the HUD 2020 Management Reform

Plan, but the IG reports that the agency remains far from addressing the systematic management weaknesses.

These problems demand action. Yet, instead of acting on recommendations of independent investigations, HUD has thrown good money after bad, writing their own reports and hiring consultants to write glowing reports about what a great job HUD is doing. Unfortunately, these reports do not magically fix HUD's deep-rooted problems.

I have received from the HUD Inspector General's office a list of these reports by outside consultants on which HUD has spent well over a million dollars. Mr. Chairman, I include the following list for the RECORD:

Contract No.	Task Order No.	Contractor Name	Date of Award	Amount of Contract	Purpose
OPC–21273	5	Price Waterhouse Coopers	Unknown	Indefinite Quantity	Responding to audits and findings (the GTR is from Housing)
OPC–21217	4	Price Waterhouse Coopers	9/30/99	$1,000,000	FILA Audit Response
OPC–18542	14	Price Waterhouse Coopers	10/30/98	126,984	Evaluate the accomplishments of 7 critical projects of HUD 2020
OPC–21387	Basic	Squire, Sanders & Dempsey	3/31/99	200,000	Legal Services to assist in defense of claims asserted
Purchase Order		Day, Berry & Howard	5/26/98	48,000	Investigation of EEO complaint
Purchase Order		Williams & Connolly	5/26/98	49,875	Investigation of EEO complaint
OPC–18531	4	Ernst & Young	9/21/99	146,962	Independent analysis of CB effectiveness
OPC–18532	8	Booz-Allen	9/26/97	37,576	2020 Technical Assistance
OPC–18532	9	Booz-Allen	12/18/97	412,724	2020 Assessment, includes subcontracts with Champey and Osborne
OPC–18533	4	Andersen Consulting	7/15/99	155,713	HUD Customer Survey

Above is a listing of HUD initiated contracts that were intended to dispute OIG audit or investigative matters. A comprehensive listing would be difficult to compile. The procurement data system (1) has hundreds of vendors, (2) does not identify subcontractors, (3) is not linked to the HUDCAPS disbursement system, and (4) the tasks descriptions provide minimal detail. Also, the amount column is the obligation amount, actual payments would need to be verified with the payment system (HUDCAPS). We suspect that costs were greater for some contract items, but we are uncertain as to if and when these payments were made.

The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) has conducted several reviews of HUD activities at the specific direction of Congress. NAPA's contract activity with HUD has been a little over $1 million. NAPA's reviews of procurement and staff resources are two recent examples where HUD used favorable portions of these reports to dispute issues developed during OIG audits.

Mr. Chairman, these reports were compiled by Price Waterhouse, Coopers, Booz Allen, Anderson Consulting, Ernst & Young, and others. While outside evaluations are helpful, my concern is that HUD directed their focus away from their problem areas or limited the scope of the consultants' report to such a point that they could not properly evaluate the program.

For instance, Ernst & Young was paid nearly $150,000 last September to evaluate the effectiveness of the Community Builders program. Unfortunately, they were limited to a select 40 community builders, each chosen by HUD of the more than 800 in place.

I ask, how can we see any value in such an investigation? We cannot allow such problems at HUD to continue. We have to send a strong message that the HUD mission is safe, clean, strong, and affordable housing and not a good public relations effort.

My amendment is reasonable. We move $1 million from the Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account to the Public Housing Operating Fund, where I am confident it will be spent on providing a suitable living environment for people dependent on public housing. It was my hope that the Public Housing and Operating Fund could have been funded at a higher level.

With the budgetary constraints placed on my good friend from New York, the chairman of the VA–HUD subcommittee, the levels in this bill are admirable. I look forward to continuing our work to raise to fund further.

Passage of this amendment certainly is a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in favor of an amendment to send a clear message to HUD on the proper use of HUD funds.

The waste, fraud, abuse, poor oversight, and mismanagement indicative of HUD must be properly addressed and denied no longer.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the Kelly amendment. This amendment would help ensure that funds will be spent on helping individuals purchase housing and not on the wasteful self-promotional activities of HUD. It would direct funds to a program which promotes self-worth and strong neighborhoods by replacing the worst public housing, turning around troubled neighborhoods, and implementing rent policies that reward and encourage work. This program requires greater responsibility on the part of the tenant as a condition for assistance.

Many HUD programs have continually been criticized for their waste, fraud, and abuse. The Federal Housing Administration is a perfect example of one such program. HUD has used taxpayers funds to finance all kinds of studies and reports, including one self-congratulating report that had a price tag of $400,000. The waste, fraud, and abuse within HUD has cost taxpayers and potential home buyers millions and maybe even billions of dollars.

I appreciate this opportunity to highlight the waste within HUD, some of which was recently revealed in reports by the HUD Inspector General and the General Accounting Office.

One of the most horrific examples of waste, fraud, and abuse within these reports has been discovered in the management of the FHA. HUD's inventory of unsold homes last year was the highest that it has been in 10 years, which is amazing in such a tight housing market.

Due to the increased number of these unsold properties, HUD hired contractors at the cost of $927 million to maintain and restore the properties. HUD's lack of oversight led to rampant fraud.

One of these contractors was a company called InTown, who had seven of these 16 contracts. Due to InTown's inability to maintain existing HUD property or refurbish the run-down properties, the Government had to terminate their contract, but not before paying them. Then InTown filed for bankruptcy and the subcontractor hired by InTown put liens against these HUD properties. This resulted in a loss to the Federal Government of $7 million.

HUD's lack of efficiency, management, and oversight continues to deny homeownership assistance to the most needy individuals. HUD is denying the opportunity for more people to participate in their programs by allowing their taxpayer dollars to be wasted in this manner.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for her amendment and for her continued diligence on stopping this waste, fraud, and abuse that goes on in so many of our government agencies and programs. HUD is a perfect example of an institution in need of fiscal reform.

I urge support of the Kelly amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment. The Kelly amendment stops HUD from spending money on self-promotion and puts money where it will be spent on families who need public assistance housing. It is simply wrong for HUD to spend one penny on self-promotion while people in need remain on waiting lists.

In her semiannual report to the Congress for the period ending March 31, HUD Inspector General Susan Gaffney found ''massive fraud schemes.'' Gaffney also reported ''a very significant breakdown'' in program controls designed to prevent such fraud. Gaffney also said, ''Our work in the areas identified serious control weaknesses that expose the Department to fraud, waste, and abuse.''

We do not have to look very far to see evidence of the Department's inefficiency and poor oversight. Just look at HUD's payment of excessive section 8

rental subsidies to the tune of $935 million in 1998 and $8.5 million for storefront operations that never benefited the public. Or we may look to HUD's staffing shell game. For years HUD had complained about having inadequate funds for a required staff of 9,300 full-time employees and has threatened a reduction in force.

However, even though Congress provided funds for 9,300 FTEs in current year, HUD only had 9,040 full-time on staff. We must believe that this inflated personnel requirement represents an attempt by HUD to secure a larger than necessary appropriation.

Examples like this leave us no reason to question Inspector General Gaffney's claim that HUD will remain on GAO's high-risk list for the foreseeable future.

The Kelly amendment is another step in the Republican majority's goal of eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse. This amendment strikes $1 million from the Operating and Expense budget and puts it into the Public Housing Operating Fund, where every penny will be spent on housing.

This amendment will not cut any staff, as my colleagues on the other side may claim. This amendment will merely reduce the expense fund, which HUD uses as a slush fund to operate its current Secretary's political PR machine.

Under the current Secretary, we have witnessed the absolute politicization of HUD. We saw HUD sweep in and seize control of public housing programs from the City of New York. We have watched the current Secretary bend and contort HUD's mission to now include industry lawsuits and gun control programs.

In my home State of Nebraska, soon after a member of our congressional delegation endorsed the wrong presidential candidate, programs that HUD had funded for years mysteriously had their funding cut off. For me, it is all too clear, what is intended to be a public housing agency has, sadly, become a public relations agency for the current administration. The Secretary should not use taxpayer funds to promote his own ambitions.

This amendment stops HUD from spending money on public relations and puts the money back into public housing. HUD should not spend money on what amounts to political advertising while we still have families in need on waiting lists.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening in support of the Kelly amendment. But I want to be clear on this. I rise in support of the amendment not because of any insensitivity to affordable housing, as the other side seems to suggest, but, instead, because I care passionately about affordable housing.

I come from a State where breaking the bonds of poverty has been one of our highest priorities.

□ 1930

I believe that the dollars we spend on affordable housing are about the most important dollars we as an institution spend. Now, I want to believe that the leadership of HUD shares that philosophy, the importance of these precious dollars. But, Mr. Chairman, to be honest at times that is awfully hard to believe. We have heard reference to the Office of Inspector General's report. That report is damning. It shows that there is a lack of accountability at HUD. HUD could not produce reliable financial records for 1999. Yet these dollars are precious. HUD's newly installed financial system, something called HUDCAPS, could not even meet basic financial system requirements. Yet they say these dollars are precious. The Inspector General's report listed example after example of fraud, waste, and abuse.

As my colleagues have mentioned over and over again this evening, HUD spends an awful lot of money on self-promotion while people, while families stand in line waiting for help with affordable housing. The Community Builders Program quite frankly has been little more than a public relations effort. The Inspector General's report says that it is full of, quote, inappropriate hiring. That is putting it mildly. The Inspector General, not me, not the House Republican Conference, not the RNC, says that this program does very little if anything, very little if anything, to address the core mission of affordable housing. This directs valuable dollars away from where we need it most. We need to get back on track.

The Kelly amendment is simple. It is common sense. It helps HUD to refocus on its core mission of providing affordable housing. It does not cut staff. It does not cut core programs. It cuts self-promotion. It sends the money back to where it belongs. A number of my colleagues have and will tonight speak about the lack of funding for affordable housing, and I share some of their values and some of their concerns. This amendment is a simple, common sense way to meet the needs that my colleagues have enunciated. If we want to put more money in affordable housing programs, this amendment is the way to do it.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in strong support of the Kelly amendment. I would anticipate after all the rhetoric we heard on the preceding amendment that this would receive strong bipartisan support given the concern that the minority has expressed for doing more in the key operating accounts of this bill. This is a case where the Representative merely wants to take $1 million from nonessential expenses, from report writing, from promotion within the Housing Department and put it into an account that will help people receive affordable housing, $1 million, from nonessential administrative overhead into a program that will enable more people to get the housing that they deserve.

We have heard about waiting lists for some of these important programs, and I think that there is a tremendous amount of merit in this common sense amendment. But it is a very modest amendment, let us face it. We can do even more. We should be doing even more. I have been fortunate to be the chairman of the task force on the Committee on the Budget that has looked at other ways to find the resources to put into these key accounts that help people with a certificate and a voucher program, for example. One of the problems that we uncovered within HUD was an inability to truly verify the income of those that receive housing benefits.

Now, that is important because if HUD is underestimating the income of beneficiaries, it is overpaying subsidies. And if it is overpaying the subsidy to someone who is in public housing, then there is someone else that is not in the housing that cannot benefit because someone is taking their place, perhaps inappropriately, because they have misreported their income.

Well, it stands to reason that we should be able to verify the income of those that are relying on the Federal Government for such a significant and important subsidy. Unfortunately, HUD cannot. How big is this problem? Is it $1 million? No. Is it $10 million? No. Is this a $100 million problem in HUD? No. Is this a $500 million problem? It is even bigger than that. HUD and the GAO estimates there are $935 million in subsidy overpayments every year. This is not a historical problem. This is a yearly problem. Last year they estimated it at over $800 million. This year $900 million. What does that mean? That means over 100,000 families on the waiting lists cannot get access to existing affordable housing.

Now, the members of the administration that testified said, ''Well, we don't know for sure that it's $935 million.'' I am the first to admit it is very difficult to estimate the exact amount of the overpayments. But even if we are off by a factor of two, that is still nearly $500 million that taxpayers are sending to Washington that we are appropriating to HUD that everyone in this body and across the country thinks is going to affordable housing and it is not. We need to do better. This is a very modest step in the right direction, taking $1 million from administrative overhead and helping people get the housing that they need. I very much hope that this will be supported on a bipartisan basis because it is not just a good amendment, it is common sense.

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

Mr. Chairman, I cannot imagine this amendment being supported on a bipartisan basis. The fixes that we need to HUD were contained in the Mollohan amendment, to increase funding for incremental Section 8 vouchers, for public housing capital fund, for the public housing operating assistance, for Native American housing block grants,

for Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, for community development block grants, all programs that were cut significantly in this bill, as was the very account that the gentlewoman proposes to cut another $1 million out of, the S&E account.

Obviously it takes money, it takes people to administer these programs. The request from the President for the FTEs, that is, the number of people to work at HUD to help people with housing problems, to administer all of these programs that are short-sheeted in this bill, the President's request was for 9,300 FTEs. This bill funds 9,100, already a significant cut. The President requested $1.095 billion for the S&E account, the account that the gentlewoman takes $1 million out of. This bill appropriated $90 million less than the President's request already, or an 8 percent cut the S&E account took from the President's request in this bill.

We can ill afford to take more money out of the S&E account. If we have administrative challenges at HUD, the way to address them is not by further cutting the account from what this bill already cuts but to appropriate not only the programmatic requests at the requested level but also the S&E account, the people who administer, who are out there delivering the services to people. We cannot continue to cut the programmatic side and the S&E side and deliver adequately the housing needs of the most needy in our society. We cannot continue to do that.

This is really, let us face it, a symbolic cut, a symbolic amendment, just taking a jab at HUD by taking another jab at the civil servants who work hard every day in every way to deliver these needed services to people who are the most needy in our society. No, I cannot imagine this amendment being supported on a bipartisan basis because I think we understand the motives behind it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not know quite where to begin. I do rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York. I want to emphasize it is long overdue. The gentleman from West Virginia has very eloquently stated the difficulty in cutting the salaries and expenses account. But for the benefit of the Members in the Chamber, I would just like to go through a few of the issues that we are struggling with in the overall picture rather than in a very narrow focus.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology of the Committee on Government Reform, I have come to understand that the auditor over at HUD cannot even issue an unqualified opinion regarding the financial affairs at HUD. Yet the argument is being made on the other side to increase the resources available to HUD.

I would urge all Members as a first step to familiarizing themselves with the affairs there that they read the Inspector General's report for 1999. In that, the Inspector General cannot even close their books on HUD. Are Members also aware of the fact that HUD cannot establish the condition of the units under its control? Literally they cannot. I would commend to all Members that they read the recent article in The Washington Post by Judith Havemann regarding HUD's efforts to see what kind of shape the 4.6 million units it controls are in. HUD has hired contractors to inspect its portfolio and report back on the conditions that exist therein. Perhaps we should applaud this effort.

After all, each day that this inspection continues provides us with information about the condition of another 120 to 150 living units. Let us see. 4.6 million, 120 to 150 a day. That means in the year 2084, the complete report will be available. I can hardly wait to see it. We should applaud this effort.

Are Members aware of the new program under the auspices of Secretary Cuomo called Community Builders? Before I share this with my colleagues, I want to read something from the 105th Congress regarding what is allowed under Public Law 105–277 and what is not:

No parts of any funds appropriated in this or any other act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, nor for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress except in presentation to the Congress itself.

Now, that is put in there so that the agencies do not go to Congress and lobby for their own interests. However, I want to share with the Members here what the reality is. On September 9, 1999, the public affairs officer for HUD sent out the following instructions to the field public affairs staff. Again this relates to the community builders area of HUD's operations.

It says:

Attached is an op-ed penned by the Secretary, that would be Secretary Cuomo, regarding the proposed cuts to the HUD budget. Here is what I need you all to do ASAP. Again this is a memorandum sent to the 800-odd community builders.

Number one, localize the opinion editorial, in other words, suggesting to them that they send to their local media an opinion or an editorial piece to be published in the paper. Do whatever will get your specific media interest. Here is the local information in case you deleted the earlier copy. Find out who to send it to. Call your local daily newspapers. Fax the localized op-ed to the editorial editor. After all, the House is voting on the budget today or tomorrow. We expect the Senate to take up our appropriations bill very soon. Please send me an e-mail of all of your local op-eds and your plan of attack for getting the piece placed in as many newspapers as possible in your area.

Now, on the one hand in the 105th Congress we have a law that says you are not to do this and in virtually that same year we have the employees of HUD actually doing that under the auspices of Community Builders.

Let me share with Members the financial details of the Community Builders Department. This program has 440 temporary slots and 372 permanent slots. One might ask, what does a community builder do? That would be very appropriate. Because the Inspector General found that HUD could not document what the community builders were even doing.

□ 1945

Further, in one sample by the Inspector General, of 59 Community Builder individuals interviewed, 39 reported that they spent over 50 percent of their time on public relations activities.

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

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

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, just think, they spent 50 percent of their time on public relations activities. Just think, we have a whole new cadre of people out in our community doing public relations work on behalf of HUD, in this case, 812 people whose task it is to highlight the accomplishments of HUD. According to the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies who exercises oversight, these individuals are paid an average of $91,000 per year, $91,000 per year on average. Just think, 812 of them, what a great job. That is $73 million a year for public relations, not for housing; for public relations.

I could go on. Believe me, I could go on; but we do not have enough time today. The amendment of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) is long overdue. There is not a clearer or a more compelling case that highlights the failures of HUD as respects their financial conditions or their public relations efforts.

Just think, almost $73 million that Secretary Cuomo decided to spend on public relations instead of housing, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is telling me we do not have a million dollars to cut out of S&E.

I hope that Secretary Cuomo can soon report to us that his public relations are in order so he can then concentrate on the task that HUD was created for. What a great thing, HUD focusing on housing.

Support the symbolic effort presented by the amendment from the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY). Vote yes on the Kelly amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 525, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For grants to public housing agencies and Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities for use in eliminating crime in public housing projects authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11901–11908, for grants for federally assisted low-income housing authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11909, and for drug information clearinghouse services authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11921–11925, $300,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $5,000,000 shall be solely for technical assistance, technical assistance grants, and program assessment for or on behalf of public housing agencies, resident organizations, and Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities (including up to $150,000 for the cost of necessary travel for participants in such training) for oversight training and improved management of this program, and $10,000,000 shall be used in connection with efforts to combat violent crime in public and assisted housing under the Operation Safe Home Program administered by the Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided*, That of the amount under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be provided to the Office of Inspector General for Operation Safe Home.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

For grants to public housing agencies for demolition, site revitalization, replacement housing, and tenant-based assistance grants to projects as authorized by section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, $565,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which the Secretary may use up to $10,000,000 for technical assistance and contract expertise, to be provided directly or indirectly by grants, contracts or cooperative agreements, including training and cost of necessary travel for participants in such training, by or to officials and employees of the department and of public housing agencies and to residents: *Provided*, That none of such funds shall be used directly or indirectly by granting competitive advantage in awards to settle litigation or pay judgments, unless expressly permitted herein.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the Chairman of the VA/HUD subcommittee regarding the current level of funding for veterans medical care and H.R. 4635. I am very thankful for the good work of the Members on the House Committee on Appropriations for bringing to the floor a bill with a $1.35 billion increase in spending for veterans medical care.

An increase of this size would not have been possible without the hard work of the subcommittee chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH). Unfortunately, according to James Farsetta, the Director for Veterans Integrated Service Network 3, which includes lower New York and northern New Jersey, we will again face funding shortfalls in our region, despite the overall increase in funding.

This is due to the VERA program, inflationary costs, and the exploding epidemic of hepatitis C. Despite the help of the Chairman, the VA's diligence in responding to this program has been sorely lacking.

Mr. Chairman, last October, our VISN director requested $102 million in reserve funding, and while the VA announced in January that they would provide $66 million of the amount, that money did not reach the VISN until 3 weeks ago. Additionally, VISN 3 has requested $22 million to test and treat veterans infected with hepatitis C.

The VA budget request states, and I quote: ''Hepatitis C virus is a serious national problem that has reached epidemic proportions.'' To date VISN 3 has the highest number of veterans infected with hepatitis C nationwide, and in a one-day, random screening for hepatitis C in March 1999 found the hepatitis C infection rate in VISN 3 was nearly double the national average.

To date, the VA has not provided any additional funding for hepatitis C and has not provided any reason as to why VISN 3 is being denied this funding. It costs $15,000 a year for 1 year of treatment for a veteran who has tested positive for hepatitis C virus.

Mr. Chairman, this situation has gone on long enough. I am asking for your assurance to ensure that the VA ends their delay tactics and provides critical supplemental funding to VISN 3 that is so desperately needed. I understand that it is possible that VISN 3 will need reserve funding again next year.

I hope that the gentleman will continue to work with me and with other concerned Members to make sure that the VA is responsive to the needs of VISN 3 and does so in a timely manner.

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

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman (Mrs. KELLY) for bringing these important concerns to my attention, and I would like to assure her and other Members that I am well aware of the problems faced by VISN 3, particularly in regards to funding levels. I will continue to work with the gentlewoman and our colleagues, the Senate and the Administration to ensure that VISN 3 is not just disproportionately disadvantaged under the funding levels contained in this bill and ensure that the VA ends their delays on the hepatitis C funding issue.

I also want to assure the gentlewoman that I, too, find the delays and unresponsiveness of the VA intolerable. I will continue to make my displeasure clear with the VA officials to ensure that the proper reserve funding is sent both this year and next.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and her hard work.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his continued efforts on behalf of our veterans, and I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman to assure proper medical care for our veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (Public Law 104–330), $620,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,000,000 shall be contracted through the Secretary as technical assistance and capacity building to be used by the National American Indian Housing Council in support of the implementation of NAHASDA, and $6,000,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to $300,000 for related travel and $2,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $6,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, 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 the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $54,600,000: *Provided further*, That for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to $200,000 from amounts in the first proviso, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses'', to be used only for the administrative costs of these guarantees.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 3739), $6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $71,956,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to $150,000 from amounts in the first paragraph, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses'', to be used only for the administrative costs of these guarantees.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901), $232,000,000, to remain

available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary may use up to 1 percent of the funds under this heading for training, oversight, and technical assistance activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. NADLER:

In the item relating to ''DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $18,000,000)''.

In the item relating to ''INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $18,000,000)''.

In the item relating to ''INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES'', after the second dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $18,000,000)''.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to increase the appropriation for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, or HOPWA, program by $18 million. This was $10 million less than the President requested and far less than is truly needed to adequately fund this program, but represents the amount necessary to ensure that those already in the program do not receive a cut in service.

I am delighted by the bipartisan nature of this amendment, and I would like to specifically thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for joining me in offering this amendment and demonstrating the bipartisan support that this program enjoys.

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

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is tremendously important for thousands of people. It funds the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS. We are requesting an increase. Consider these facts: HIV prevalence within the homeless population alone is estimated to be 10 times higher than the infection rates in the general population. Primary care providers and people living with HIV/AIDS repeatedly cite the lack of affordable housing as the single most detrimental barrier to accessing real health care.

When the number of individuals living with AIDS increases, the number of eligible housing sites also needs to increase. HOPWA-funded beds in residential facilities are 80 to 90 percent less expensive than an acute-care hospital bed. The HOPWA program reduces the use of emergency care services by $47,000 per person per year.

Last year, this vital Federal program provided over $27 million for California alone. Across our Nation this year, there are four new eligible metropolitan statistical areas that will be added to the program. Those are the new areas, Albany, New York; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Columbia, South Carolina; and Oklahoma City.

Other States will also qualify for HOPWA funds. In this appropriation bill, the HOPWA level is level funded at last year's level. Without the adoption of our amendment, every HOPWA recipient will experience a funding cut. That is why this modest increase of $18 million dollars is so desperately needed. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for the bipartisan Shays-Nadler-Horn-Crowley-Cummings-Foley amendment. That amendment provides needed services and justice, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, the housing provided by HOPWA allows people to improve the quality of their lives and access to life extending care. With the longer life span comes the need for more assistance both in medical care and in housing. No person should have to choose between extending their life or keeping a roof over their head, and the fact is without adequate housing and nutrition, it is extremely difficult for individuals to benefit from the new treatments.

Let us give the HOPWA program the necessary money it needs to provide those services. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the Nadler-Shays-Crowley-Horn-Cummings-Foley amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I rise in support of this amendment, as well, and on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), who are also cosponsors of this amendment. I know the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) as well has expressed support of this. We are prepared to vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone to support this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I will not take all of the time provided. I appreciate the brevity of the statements of the speakers who are advocating for this. We have no objection to this amendment on this side. The committee recommended funding for HOPWA's budget at last year's level; however, like many other accounts in this bill, I had hoped to increase funding for this account but could not, because such a decision would have adversely impacted other accounts.

On those grounds, I am prepared to accept the amendment. These funds would normally go to National Science Foundation, those funds are not wasted there either, but this is a priority program; and the additional funds are necessary.

I would register for the record, a concern, however, that the formula that HOPWA uses is outdated by many estimates and other programs, including the Ryan White program, which have updated their formula for dispersal of funds; and we would urge HOPWA to consider seriously looking at that.

Other than that reservation, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Nadler amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Nadler amendment to increase by $18 million the appropriations for the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) program.

As we all know, AIDS is the number one public health problem in this nation and in many places throughout the world. And in my District back in Chicago, AIDS has reached epidemic proportions. In fact, there are at least a thousand reported cases of AIDS in my district and since 1980, more than 10,000 people have died of AIDS in Chicago.

Although the mortality rate among individuals living with AIDS is declining as a result of better medical treatments, combination therapies, and earlier diagnosis, the housing opportunities for those living with the disease have not improved accordingly. It is important that this Congress respond with compassion and support.

This bill in its current form does not meet this objective, for there are still far too many victims of AIDS who are living, but have no place to live.

Fortunately, this amendment seeks to correct this gap and help to meet this need, $18 million is no panacea, but will help many persons living with AIDS to have a place in which to live.

Therefore, I urge passage of the Nadler, Shays, Crowley, and Horn amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I likewise, rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Nadler/Shays/Crowley/Horn amendment to increase HOPWA funding by $18 million to $250 million.

HOPWA allows communities to design local-based, cost-effective housing programs for people living with AIDS.

It supports patients with rent and mortgage assistance and provides information on low-income housing opportunities.

While basic housing is a necessity for everyone, it is even more critical for people living with AIDS. Many AIDS patients rely on complex medical regimens and have special dietary needs. Lack of a stable housing situation can greatly complicate their treatment regiment.

We must not forget that while medical science has made important advances in treating AIDS, a cure remains elusive. In the meantime we must do what we can to help people living with this disease.

Mr. Chairman, I implore my friends on the other side of the aisle who often speak about ''Compassionate Conservatism'' to support this amendment.

This vote presents an opportunity for my colleagues to match their rhetoric with a small federal funding request.

The people who benefit from the HOPWA program are some of our nations most needy. They are living in a very difficult circumstance.

Mr. Chairman, I eagerly look forward to the day when medical breakthroughs render the HOPWA program unnecessary. However, today in the present I call on my colleagues to people living with AIDS this modest increase in support.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support to an increase in funding for Housing for People with AIDS—HOPWA.

HOPWA is the only federal program that provides community based HIV-specific housing. It is vital to the lives of persons who are living with HIV/AIDS because it allows people to benefit from their treatments and helps to keep them from being exposed to other life-threatening diseases, poor nutrition and lack of medical care.

Up to 60 percent of people living with HIV/AIDS will need housing assistance at some point in the course of their illness. According to the National AIDS Housing Coalition, one-third to one-half of all people living with HIV/AIDS are either homeless or in imminent danger of losing their homes.

In my district, Alameda County, the Ryan White Planning Council Needs Assessment Surveys in 1998 and 1999, ranked housing as the highest area for ''unmet need'' and ''served but unsatisfied'' of eight service categories. This study also indicates that anti-retroviral therapies are helping people living with HIV/AIDS live longer healthier lives, thus our responsiveness to their housing needs is more urgent than ever.

In the Bay Area community I represent, housing costs are reaching astronomical heights and are becoming increasingly impossible for even moderate wage earners to meet. The working poor and the disabled, including persons with HIV/AIDS, are in great jeopardy.

Since 1992, HOPWA funding has provided essential development awards for projects ranging from a rehabilitated five bedroom house in north Berkeley to a newly constructed 21 unit complex in East Oakland. HOPWA has also provided the resources and support for 20 emergency housing beds, 40 transitional housing shared units, and 174 permanent units throughout my district. Yet, these programs have only addressed a small portion of the housing needs for persons and families affected by HIV/AIDS.

The rental market vacancy rate in my district is less than 1% and market rents throughout Alameda County far exceed Fair Market Rents (FMRs). With the limited rental assistance available from the HOPWA program, people living with HIV/AIDS are unable to find and rent affordable housing. Additionally, HIV/AIDS Housing Programs operate at capacity and routinely maintain lengthy waiting lists.

While, HOPWA has provided the much needed gateway for people with HIV/AIDS to access housing, treatment and care services, we need to do better. Many persons living with HIV/AIDS are forced to make difficult decisions between life sustaining medications and other necessities, such as housing. These decisions become even more dire when the cost of housing is taken into consideration. For many people with HIV/AIDS, HOPWA has been life saving.

In August 1999, the County Board of Supervisors declared a State of Emergency with respect to AIDS in the African-American Community of Alameda County. The Congressional Black Caucus' Minority Health Initiative, partnered with HOPWA to push forward a community wide response to the State of Emergency including closing the housing gap for people with HIV/AIDS.

In my district we are finally seeing positive results from our efforts. For example, the Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) has been able to successfully partner with county agencies like the Office of AIDS & Communicable Diseases, and Cal-PEP, a community-based AIDS service organization, to provide access to short-term transitional housing for people living with HIV/AIDS, who have recently been released from incarceration. Often times, the incarcerated population is over looked or under served regarding AIDS services. HOPWA has helped to close that gap by providing housing and treatment services, but also to render prevention education services on post-exposure and secondary exposure risks for HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, like all of us, people living with HIV/AIDS dream of living in suitable and quality homes. We must ensure that all people have a place they can call home. We have to do everything we can to close the housing gap.

I urge you and my colleagues to support this amendment because HOPWA will help close the housing gap, but also will help to reach our goal of eradicating HIV/AIDS. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with colleagues from both sides of the aisle, Mr. NADLER and Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HORN, and Mr. FOLEY to offer an amendment to increase funding for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS by $18 million dollars. I know many of my colleagues will ask why this one program, out or many others that were cut or also ''level'' funded deserves an increase, and I hope we can effectively explain why. You have supported us in the past—by ensuring that HOPWA maintained its funding last year.

And this past winter, you overwhelmingly voted for our amendment to increase the authorization amount for the HOPWA program. We need your support again now.

We have made great strides in the treatment of AIDS. New medications have increased life expectancy by years, even after the onset of full-blown AIDS. Currently, there are about one million American living with HIV and AIDS. More than 200,000 of these currently need housing assistance. Additionally, 60% of people with HIV/AIDS and their families will need housing assistance at some point during their illness.

The HOPWA program provides rental assistance, mortgage assistance, utility payment assistance, information on low-income housing opportunities and technical support and assistance with planning and operating community residences. These important services assist individuals and families financially—not forcing them to choose between housing and medicine. Currently, HOPWA benefits 52,000 people in 415,000 housing units. HOPWA is the only federal housing program addressing the housing crisis facing people living with AIDS.

The housing provided by HOPWA allows people to improve the quality of their lives and access life-extending care.

With a longer life span comes the need for more assistance, both in medical care and housing. Life-saving drugs are costly, forcing many people to decide between essential medicines and other necessities—such as food and housing. No person should have to choose between extending their life or keeping a roof over their head. And the fact is, without adequate housing and nutrition; it is extremely difficult for individuals to benefit from the new treatments.

Longer life spans mean less space in HOPWA programs. Additionally, since 1995, the number of Metropolitan areas and states qualifying for HOPWA formula grants has increased significantly.

In fact, 4 new regions are to be added this next year. The result of these two factors means that level-funding HOPWA at $260 million will mean cutting the program. The current funds will need to stretch further. Let me give you an example from my home state. In Fiscal Year 2000, New York State received 3.25 million in HOPWA funding. In Fiscal Year 2001, with level funding, New York State will only receive $3.1 million. This will result in a loss of services. In fact, HUD informs me that 5,170 fewer people with HIV/AIDS will be receiving assistance. Let's make this real—this means the over 5,000 people and their families will be living on the streets. Housing is essential to help individuals with treatments for this disease.

This year's appropriations limits make it very difficult to find an offset for any increase. My colleagues and I do not want to take money away from any program. But when confronted with the reality that over 5000 individuals and their families in New York State will be living on the street, we need to make a way. My colleagues and I have proposed an $18 million offset from the National Science Foundation's Polar and Antarctic Research Program. I want to make it clear that I am not opposed to science research and understand the value it can have on our lives and the future of the human race. However, the Polar and Antarctic research program is coordinated by NSF but has 12 other federal agencies also contributing funds over $150 million.

We ought to be farsighted in looking at problems in our global atmosphere and scientific research, but we must not be so short-sighted that we harm the citizens of this country in our efforts. I am not saying that NSF's programs are not worthwhile, but we need to have compassion for those people who struggle to live each day with AIDS. They need our assistance and we cannot leave them out in the cold.

Let's show compassion. Vote for the Nadler-Shays-Crowley-Horn-Cummings-Foley.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, which would reduce funding for polar research at the National Science Foundation by $18 million and increase funding at Housing and Urban Development by a like amount.

I would suggest to the gentleman from New York that if he seeks to increase funding for housing people with AIDS, he could find the resources within HUD's nearly $30 billion appropriation. This agency is far better able to accommodate the amendment's purpose through efficiencies than by cutting NSF, an agency having a budget that is a small fraction of HUD's appropriation.

Cutting the appropriation for the Nation's premier science agency, as the gentleman from New York proposes, is ill-advised. The Congress has affirmed the importance of an active U.S. presence in Antarctica. Stable funding for polar programs is necessary because of the long lead time required for these operations. If this amendment passes, funding probably will have to be shifted from basic research programs to support polar operations already in the pipeline.

As the White House recently pointed out in its June 15, 2000 press release, any cuts to the NSF budget would put the ''new economy'' at risk. The basic research NSF funds in the biological and other sciences is a vitally important part of the overall Federal research portfolio, adding to our store of knowledge in valuable, and often unpredictable ways.

Mr. Chairman, we can all sympathize with the plight for those who have contracted AIDS, but I do not think that it is in their best interests to cut funding for our premier basic research agency that may one day help provide the underlying research needed to find a cure for this and other debilitating diseases.

The House should reject Mr. NADLER's amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The gentleman from New York proposes to reduce funding for the National Science Foundation by $18 million in order to increase funding at the Department of Housing and Urban Development by the same amount. This is a remarkably short-sighted idea.

This appropriations bill adds $4 billion to HUD's already $25.8 billion budget for FY2000—that's an increase that represents more than NSF's total budget. To this increase, the gentleman wishes to add $18 million raided from NSF's significantly smaller appropriation.

This House has continually recognized the important role NSF and basic research have played in our Nation's economic and technological development. Research funded by NSF, including research at the poles, has led to the development of new pharmaceuticals and new diagnostic and therapeutic tools that have preserved and protected the health of people worldwide. Our understanding of viruses, of pathogens, of carcinogens, has been aided immeasurably by the type of basic research NSF enables. This is a fact not lost on the current Administration, which pointed out in a press release last week that cuts to NSF will put at risk ''longer, healthier lives for all Americans.''

While I commend my colleague for the intent of his amendment, I must take issue with its effect. Moving this funding from a well-run agency like NSF to one with a history of mismanagement like HUD sends the wrong message to all federal agencies. It's worth noting a GAO report issued last summer taking HUD to task for its management deficiencies. The report noted significant weaknesses in internal control, unreliable information and financial management systems, organizational deficiencies, and staff without proper skills. GAO concluded that ''HUD's programs are a high-risk area'' based on ''the status of [these] four serious, long-standing Department-wide management deficiencies that, taken together, have placed the integrity and accountability of HUD's programs at high risk since 1994.''

In that light perhaps the gentleman should look within HUD's $30 billion appropriation to find the offsets his amendment requires, rather than force cuts in the Nation's premier science agency. I urge the House to reject this amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to work with my colleagues to bring forth such an important amendment to increase funding for Housing Opportunities for People with Aids (HOPWA).

For individuals with AIDS and other HIV-related illnesses, adequate and safe housing can be the difference between a person's opportunity to live life with self-respect and dignity and being relegated to a life of poor, unhealthy and safe conditions often leading to homelessness and possibly death.

At any given time, ⅓ to one-half of those living with HIV-related illnesses are either homeless or in imminent danger of losing housing. And 60% of these persons will face a housing crisis at some time during their illness due to discrimination and increased medical expenses. Moreover, as their health declines, persons with HIV-related illnesses may lack the ability to work or at least to earn up to their full potential, leaving them vulnerable to either not being able to find appropriate housing or losing their housing.

Sadly, this problem disproportionately impacts low-income communities where homelessness is often a paycheck away. And the CDC has estimated, in past studies, that HIV infection rates are 24% among the homeless, and in some urban areas as high as 50%.

HOPWA is the only, federal housing program designed to address his crisis. 90% of HOPWA funds are distributed by HUD to cities and states that are hardest hit with the AIDS pandemic. These jurisdictions then determine how best to utilize the funding to meet locally-determined housing needs and services for persons living with HIV-related illnesses, such as short-term housing, rental assistance, home care services, and community residences.

In 1998, HUD estimated that for each additional $1 million in HOPWA funding, an additional 269 individuals and families living with HIV and AIDS would have access to vital housing and housing-related services. Moreover, HOPWA funding has been demonstrated to reduce emergency health care expenses by $47,000 per person.

Consequently, increased HOPWA funding is critical. As the number of AIDS cases continues to rise, the ability for localities to address increased housing needs must keep pace. Without significant increases, we will continue to fight a losing battle that no other federal program can combat. While Section 8 housing waiting lists swell, other programs prove more politically popular than those addressing AIDS, and persons with HIV/AIDS are discriminated against, housing opportunities created specifically for these individuals are crucial.

As such, I urge my colleagues to support the Nadler-Shays-Crowley-Horn-Cummings-Foley HOPWA amendment to increase FY 2001 funding by $18 million to level of $250 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORBES:

Page 29, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $16,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $78,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $69,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $9,000,000)''.

Page 52, after line 6, insert the following new sections:

REDUCED DOWNPAYMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR LOANS FOR TEACHERS AND UNIFORMED MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES.

SEC. 207. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(b) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(11) REDUCED DOWNPAYMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHERS AND UNIFORMED MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), in the case of a mortgage described in subparagraph (B)—

''(i) the mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount that does not exceed the sum of 99 percent of the appraised value of the property and the total amount of initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees (as the Secretary shall approve) paid in connection with the mortgage;

''(ii) no other provision of this subsection limiting the principal obligation of the mortgage based upon a percentage of the appraised value of the property subject to the mortgage shall apply; and

''(iii) the matter in paragraph (9) that precedes the first proviso shall not apply and the mortgage shall be executed by a mortgagor who shall have paid on account of the property at least 1 percent of the cost of acquisition (as determined by the Secretary) in cash or its equivalent.

''(B) MORTGAGES COVERED.—A mortgage described in this subparagraph is a mortgage—

''(i) under which the mortgagor is an individual who—

''(I) is employed on a full-time basis as: (aa) a teacher or administrator in a public or private school that provides elementary or secondary education, as determined under State law, except that elementary education shall include pre-Kindergarten education, and except that secondary education shall not include any education beyond grade 12; or (bb) a public safety officer (as such term is defined in section 1204 of the Omnibus

Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b), except that such term shall not include any officer serving a public agency of the Federal Government); and

''(II) has not, during the 12-month period ending upon the insurance of the mortgage, had any present ownership interest in a principal residence located in the jurisdiction described in clause (ii); and

''(ii) made for a property that is located within the jurisdiction of—

''(I) in the case of a mortgage of a mortgagor described in clause (i)(I)(aa), the local educational agency (as such term is defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801)) for the school in which the mortgagor is employed (or, in the case of a mortgagor employed in a private school, the local educational agency having jurisdiction for the area in which the private school is located); or

''(II) in the case of a mortgage of a mortgagor described in clause (i)(I)(bb), the jurisdiction served by the public law enforcement agency, firefighting agency, or rescue or ambulance agency that employs the mortgagor.''.

(b) DEFERRAL AND REDUCTION OF UP-FRONT PREMIUM.—Section 203(c) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (3) and notwithstanding''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) DEFERRAL AND REDUCTION OF UP-FRONT PREMIUM.—In the case of any mortgage described in subsection (b)(11)(B):

''(A) Paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection (relating to collection of up-front premium payments) shall not apply.

''(B) If, at any time during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the insurance of the mortgage, the mortgagor ceases to be employed as described in subsection (b)(11)(B)(i)(I) or pays the principal obligation of the mortgage in full, the Secretary shall at such time collect a single premium payment in an amount equal to the amount of the single premium payment that, but for this paragraph, would have been required under paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection with respect to the mortgage, as reduced by 20 percent of such amount for each successive 12-month period completed during such 5-year period before such cessation or prepayment occurs.''.

HYBRID ARMS

SEC. 208. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 251 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''IN GENERAL.—'' after ''(a)'';

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) DISCLOSURE.—In the case of any loan application for a mortgage to be insured under any provision of this section, the Secretary shall require that the prospective mortgagee for the mortgage shall, at the time of loan application, make available to the prospective mortgagor a written explanation of the features of an adjustable rate mortgage consistent with the disclosure requirements applicable to variable rate mortgages secured by a principal dwelling under the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).'';

(3) in subsection (c), by inserting ''LIMITATION ON INSURANCE AUTHORITY.—'' after ''(c)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) HYBRID ARMS.—The Secretary may insure under this subsection a mortgage that—

''(1) has an effective rate of interest that shall be—

''(A) fixed for a period of not less than the first 3 years of the mortgage term;

''(B) initially adjusted by the mortgagee upon the expiration of such period and annually thereafter; and

''(C) in the case of the initial interest rate adjustment, shall be subject to the limitation under clause (2) of the last sentence of subsection (a) (relating to prohibiting annual increases of more than 1 percent) only if the interest rate remains fixed for 5 or fewer years; and

''(2) otherwise meets the requirements for insurance under subsection (a) that are not inconsistent with the requirements under paragraph (1) of this subsection.''.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may implement section 251(d) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–16(d)), as added by subsection (a) of this section, in advance of rulemaking.

Mr. FORBES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening offering an amendment to deal with the housing crisis in the United States. The costs of housing is rising far faster than the average working family can afford. I propose an amendment, first of all, that would make it easier for police, fire fighters and our public school teachers to get an FHA loan. It would create a new FHA adjustable-rate mortgage for all people to use; and the revenues that would be generated would help to fund additional housing for people who are disabled, the elderly, people with AIDS, and the homeless.

This is a critically important issue, not just to the people that I represent, in suburban Long Island New York, but across the country, where we have seen the price of housing skyrocket.

Like other areas around the country, they are plagued with high property taxes and very expensive, ever-increasing real estate prices. Despite the booming economy, no place is it more evident that the haves are doing better and the have-nots are doing worse than in the housing market.

Despite the booming economy, the rents and real estate prices are simply rising far faster than wages. The costs of housing is clearly becoming more elusive and further out of reach for the middle class.

According to a study by the National Low-income Housing Coalition, housing costs on Long Island, for example, are the fourth highest in the country. Just to be able to afford a two-bedroom apartment on Long Island, a family needs to have an average household income of $45,000; and buying a home is an even greater challenge, even for middle-income families in Long Island, and I believe most of the Nation. Suburban America particularly is mired in perhaps the worst affordable-housing crisis ever.

Median home sales in Suffolk County, New York, run about $200,000; median home sales prices have shot up from $134,000 to $160,000 in my county alone over the last 5 years.

□ 2000

I would reference a firefighter living in Suffolk County, New York, Dennis Currey, who is with the North Patchogue Fire Department, and his fiance, Michelle, who have been looking for a house for months. They want a modest three bedroom home so that they can have room for Michelle's son and the child that they one day hope to have, but the only houses they were able to find were selling at best at $170,000.

The down payment requirements were staggering to them, and it would have meant every bit of their savings would have been taken up on the down payment alone, with little money left over to fix up this house that was sorely in need of repair. So what are they forced to do? They have to postpone their dream. This fire fighter who dedicates himself to protecting our community cannot afford to buy housing in that same community.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this is an issue that in previous times has gotten overwhelming support from this House. We have been honored, frankly, to see that almost 400 Members of this House have approved legislation that would allow public servants like our school teachers, our fire fighters, and our police officers to get into affordable housing with a minimum of 1 percent down. The fees generated, which would amount to about $114 million, would help pay for the extra housing needs that have been addressed at various times during this debate.

The elderly, the disabled, the people with AIDS, and the homeless would benefit from these increased fees. We would allow those who certainly work for the betterment of our community, who educate our children, who provide for the safe and secure communities we enjoy, we would allow these folks to get into affordable housing.

I think this is a good initiative, and I would ask that we have an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to vote on this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SANFORD. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this amendment is the same amendment that we dealt with in committee

which attempts to add housing for the elderly, add housing for the disabled, add housing for homeless assistance grants and add housing opportunities for people with AIDS.

The gentleman from New York in this amendment is attempting to pay for this amendment by taking three actions which the House has already endorsed and which would in fact raise money for the Treasury, which could then be used to finance these amendments.

Now, we have had objections raised on this floor for 2 weeks that we did not, in the amendments we were offering to these bills, provide proper offsets to those amendments. We suggested that those offsets ought to come from the majority party's over generous tax package, over generous certainly in what it provides for the very wealthiest of Americans.

This House has given away already, just on the minimum wage bill alone, this House has voted to provide $90 billion in tax relief to people who make $300,000 a year or more. If this House can do that, it ought to be willing to get around a bookkeeping transaction in order to provide assistance to some of the folks who need it the most. Certainly these folks mentioned by the gentleman from New York do.

Mr. Chairman, it is suggested that this offset is out of order only because it is not authorized. I would say that that is the narrowest of technicalities, Mr. Chairman, because this House has already approved the legislation that contains the same transactions, and, if my memory is correct, or I should say more accurately if my notes are correct, it was approved with 8 dissenting votes and 417 in favor.

It seems to me Dick Bolling when he was here, who is probably the greatest legislator I ever served with, Dick Bolling, always attacked the idea that legislators were more focused on what he called ''legislative dung hills'' than they were policy issues. By that he meant that Members often spent more time defending committee jurisdiction than they did defending the interests of their constituents. It seems to me that allowing this minor technicality to stand in the way is doing just what Dick Bolling derided so eloquently in the years that he served in this House.

There is no public purpose to be served by admitting that this authorization is not going to become law, and, if that authorization becomes law, the offsets which the gentleman is talking about would be in perfect order.

I would simply ask, can we not bend even a little to help the people who are most in need of shelter in this country? If the answer is no, that is indeed regrettable. But this amendment is something that we should do.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman from Wisconsin's lack of interest in jurisdictional fights, but for those who are inclined to disagree with us, I should note that the committee of legislative jurisdiction on this particular set of offsets passed it unanimously, so there is certainly no quarrel there, and the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct, this is a technicality.

I do recognize the right of people fairly to insist on technicalities, if they are, in fact, people who have been consistently technical. But the notion of legislating in an appropriations bill, my word, what will they think of next? We have seen appropriations bills in this Congress that had more legislation than appropriation. Indeed, as you people drop the appropriation, you increase the legislation. It is kind of a zero sum game.

Being accused by my Republican colleagues of legislating in an appropriations bill is like being accused by Wilt Chamberlain of being too tall. I mean, it just boggles the mind that a party which regularly legislates whenever it wants to in an appropriations bill would do this, and that is why the gentleman from Wisconsin's parliamentary argument had such force.

We have a bill which has been supported by the authorizing committee unanimously, which was overwhelmingly supported on this floor, in fact, it was amended somewhat on the floor. There were some concerns raised by the gentleman from Florida, who has been a very diligent watchdog in the interests of lower income people. So the form in which it survived, it was not some accident or some oversight, it received a lot of work, a lot of compromise. In fact, we worked this one out. And now to be told, well, we are going to knock it out because it has not yet completed the authorization process is very hard to live with.

But I will make this proposition, because obviously a single Member has the ability to pursue this, it could have been protected by the Committee on Rules, but the Committee on Rules apparently had a rare fit of opposition to legislating in an appropriations bill, so they did not do this one. But by the time this bill goes to House-Senate conference, we will, I believe, have finished the authorization process.

So I guess I would say to the gentleman from New York who has offered an excellent amendment, and let us be clear, the gentleman seeks to add funds to programs of uncontested popularity and moral worth, for helping the homeless, for housing for the elderly. These are programs which are overwhelmingly supported by local governments, by constituents, by the people who benefit from them.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would simply make the point that I think that the charge that the gentleman is laying is an incorrect one, because we are really not talking about the Republican Conference as a whole. What we are talking about was that I was one of the eight that happened to vote against this when it came to the floor. In the same way that you so skillfully have used every arrow in essence in the legislative quiver, this is simply a way of blocking legislation that I disagree with.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I accept that. I thank the gentleman, and I would say, yes, the gentleman has been consistent in this regard, so my charge of inconsistency does not lie against him. It is true, the gentleman is the one individual Member who raised that, and I appreciate that.

All the more reason though to say when we get into the conference committee and when this comes back to the floor, unless the gentleman's numbers multiply more than I expect, and unless 8 becomes twice 80, 3 times 80, then this will be law. So we can ask, I hope, if the only reason we are not going to accept this now is the admirable consistency of the gentleman from South Carolina, he has been admirable in his consistency and I appreciate that, but if that is the only problem we have to adopting it now, I would hope when this bill finally comes before us as a real bill, and not the Halloween fake skeleton that it is now is, this amendment of the gentleman from New York will be in it, and the gentleman from New York's proposals will be accepted.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out also that the pay-fors which the gentleman is trying to use in this amendment in fact help additional families, because the hybrid ARMs provision that the gentleman seeks to use tonight would help about 55,000 more families purchase houses in fiscal year 2001, and reducing FHA down payments for teachers and uniformed municipal employees would again increase the volume of FHA single-family lending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has expired.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly think in a period where Mr. Greenspan and company have begun an upward ratcheting of interest rates, that we would be especially anxious to do these things.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for making the point. For those who may not be fully familiar with our jargon, let me make the point that ''hybrid ARMs'' referred to a particular form of mortgage, and it is not a hotel for people of uncertain genealogy.

With the renewed hope that in conference, once the point of order does not lie, the very sensible prioritization of the gentleman from New York will survive, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SANFORD. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not planned on speaking, but listening to the last speaker, I think it was a good dialogue, but the ranking minority member, my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) continually talks about tax breaks for the rich.

The left, in any fashion, cannot even stand or comprehend giving people their money back. It is not your money. To do that cuts power in this place, the ability to rain money down to different interest groups. It is just wrong.

The tax break for the rich, when we said the marriage penalty, people that get married, I do not think there should be a penalty for that. We do things backwards in this country with the IRS. I do not think we ought to tax work. I do not think we ought to tax savings. I think we ought to reward those. I think we ought to tax consumption. A different system.

The death tax, you know, I do not mind someone owning the Ponderosa. This country is so great, because you can work hard and you can do anything. Look at the people that have achieved, primarily those that have an advantage of education, but even the immigrants that come to this country. What a great country it is. I do not mind someone having the Ponderosa. As a matter of fact, I am excited about it, because that is part of the American dream. But my colleagues on the other side would have Little Joe and Hoss have to sell the Ponderosa because they cannot afford to pay the taxes on it.

The $500 deduction per child, that is not for the rich, that is for families. We pay too much taxes, and families are struggling to support their children. The Social Security tax, my colleagues on the other side, they just could not help themselves in 1993. They increased the tax on Social Security, and we did away with that. But yet that is a tax for the rich and our senior citizens.

□ 2015

After rhetoric and rhetoric and rhetoric, they said, in 1993, we want to give tax relief to the middle class, tax relief to the middle class, but yet the Democrats gave us one of the highest tax increases in the history of this country; and again, they could not help themselves, they had to tax the middle class as well. That was extra revenue for their spending here. They increased the tax on Social Security. Every dime out of the Social Security Trust Fund, they put up here and they used that with the tax increase to increase spending, and then they cut defense $127 billion. We think that is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleagues on the other side, the rhetoric of tax breaks for the rich, they may get some of their people to believe it, but it is not so. They know it and I know it. They fought against the lock box for Social Security because it is a political issue, and we fought for a balanced budget. Alan Greenspan said it would cause lower interest rates, and in 1993, the Democrats' budget had deficits of $200 billion and beyond, forever; and they still increased spending and increased taxes and took Social Security money to even increase that and then drove us further in debt.

Mr. Chairman, we have a vision. With the balanced budget, locking up Social Security and paying down the debt, we pay nearly $1 billion a day on the national debt. Can we imagine, $1 billion a day. Can we imagine what we can do in this body without having a tax burden on the American people and our children and our grandchildren? I mean, that is a vision worth going after.

My colleagues fought against welfare reform, the left did, because they want to just keep dumping more money; and on every single bill, my Democratic colleagues would say, well, we could fund this if it was not for the tax break for the rich. They just cannot bring themselves to give people their money back. They have to spend it. Of course, there is one area in which the left will cut and that, of course, is defense in many cases. We tried to protect Medicare and they used it as a political pawn in the last election, but the President overrode them and signed the Medicare bill. The same thing with Social Security and tax relief.

This exercise up here of the left for the November elections is almost laughable. One of the most difficult things that we have to do, when we sit up here and we try and get more dollars to the classroom in education and the left says oh, you are cutting education; well, we actually increased education. A good example is the Democrats, the maximum they ever contributed to special education was 6 percent. In 5 years, we got that, including Medicaid, up to 18 percent. We increased the budget $500 million this year for special education, which none of the Democrats, or very few of them voted for, supported it; but yet they say, the Republicans are cutting education. That is rhetoric, the same as tax breaks for the rich.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SANFORD. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a lot of that rhetoric that ought to be corrected, and I think we have an opportunity to do so.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

We have heard a very interesting rewrite of history, and I would like to give the facts rather than fiction.

Before Ronald Reagan came to office, we never had a deficit larger than $70 billion. Then he ran through this Congress a proposal which doubled military spending at the same time that it provided very large tax cuts. The result, we wound up with deficits approaching $300 billion, and we have been trying to dig out from those deficits for the last 18 years. Those deficits have added almost $4 trillion to the Nation's indebtedness.

President Clinton proposed that we change course, and he passed his budget in 1993 with not a single Republican vote in either House, and that budget put us on the road to deficit reduction. It was predicted at the time by the majority leader of the House and by the Speaker of the House that it would lead to record unemployment and a doubling of deficits. Instead, it did just the opposite, and anyone except fiction readers and writers recognize that.

When George Bush walked out of the White House, his prediction for the deficits for that year was $323 billion. A little different picture today. We now have surpluses in very large amounts, despite the fact that the Republican-controlled Congress in each of the last 2 years actually appropriated more money than President Clinton asked for, and so now we have surpluses, and the question is, what should we do with them.

The Republican Party's answer has been that we should provide a minimum wage bill of $11 billion worth of benefits to minimum wage workers, tied to a tax cut of $90 billion for people that make over $300,000 a year. They have proposed eliminating the inheritance tax. They claim that they are defending farmers and small business. Only one out of every 6,000 beneficiaries in that bill is a farmer or small businessman. So in contrast to our inheritance package, which would have exempted inheritances of up to $4 million per family, they said no, take off the whole lid. So they gave Bill Gates a $6 billion break; they gave the 400 richest people in this country $200 billion in tax cuts over 10 years.

Now they begrudge us our effort to provide this tiny little bit of housing for the poorest people in this country, paid for by an amendment that will raise money by providing additional housing for yet other people.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the record is clear. It seems to me our obligation is clear. We ought to pass this amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, very quickly, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is critically important. I

mean, the gentleman from California just a moment ago referenced the rich and the poor. Well, let us look at these public servants. Let us look at these public school teachers who cannot afford to buy a home in the community where they teach. Let us look at the firefighters who are protecting our communities who cannot afford to buy a home where they are protecting our communities and our property and our lives. Look at the police officers who keep us safe and secure in our communities, and yet they cannot afford to buy a home in that same community.

I think this is a critically important need. As the gentleman from Wisconsin referenced, we come to the floor with the opportunity to do good for these public sector employees and, at the same time, raising the necessary revenue from fees that are a part of the FHA program that would further allow the disabled, people with AIDS, the elderly, to get into homes. I applaud my friend from New York, the chair of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee who, frankly, were working against great odds and very limited allocations.

But we have given them a way to solve this particular problem. They can allow school teachers, police officers and firefighters to get into housing; and at the same time, they can fill the need that so many in this Congress who have provided bipartisan support for the need to provide additional housing for the elderly, for people with AIDS, and the disabled.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SANFORD. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, nice spin from the left. I would tell my colleague that in every case when the Speaker was Newt Gingrich, he voted every single time with the then majority until the gentleman went to the Democrat side.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will not. The Contract with America the gentleman supported; the gentleman supported impeachment.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will not yield.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is going to characterize my record, I should be allowed to respond.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, those are the gentleman's actual votes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is using a broad generalization.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) controls the time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in every case, in most of the cases, the gentleman voted with the majority; but now it has changed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the spin on Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan only had the Senate for one term, and if we take a look at who controls the spending in this place, it is the Congress, not the President.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield for corrections? It is the gentleman from New Jersey's time. Will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am yielding to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to yield in a minute.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Is it not the person who controls the time who has the right to yield?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in the case of Ronald Reagan, it is the Congress that controlled spending, not the President.

The President talks about the economy and how good it is. He has not passed a single budget since we took over the majority, except in 1993 when the Democrats controlled the House, the White House, and the Senate. The only mistake that I think that Ronald Reagan made was that he did not veto enough bills, but at that time the Democrats had such a large majority, it would have been difficult to override a veto.

Mr. Chairman, it is the Congress that spends, not the President. The President worked with the Congress, a Democrat majority, to reduce taxes, just like President Kennedy did, because both President Kennedy and Ronald Reagan knew that if we reduce taxes, we are going to increase revenue into the Treasury, and that is a fact. You can try to dispute it, but it is a fact.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield for disputing?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield, only to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues will continually bash Ronald Reagan; they will continually say tax breaks for the rich, but it just is not so. They can spend, they can try and rewrite history, but it just will not work. The fact is that the left cannot stand tax relief, even if it is for the middle class. They increased the middle-class tax in 1993, they increased the tax on Social Security, they increased the gas tax, they cut the military, they even gave us a retroactive tax, if my colleagues remember that. Not many people remember that one.

We have tried to go back, and we have reduced the Social Security tax; we have given working families and their children a $500 deduction. Capital gains paid for itself; ask Alan Greenspan. It gives us lower interest rates, putting Social Security into a lock box; it helps us pay down the debt, the national debt, which will take away from our children the burden that is on our backs. Yet my colleagues on the other side, in every single one of these bills, you watch, line item by line item, they want to spend more money, spend more money for this; and we could spend this if it was not for the tax break for the rich.

I can see my colleagues do not like that, but it is the truth. Over and over and over again, they cannot stand tax relief. That is why they fought us on the balanced budget; that is why they fought us on welfare reform, because it takes their ability to spend away. When they spend and spend and spend more than we have coming in, that builds up the debt, and over a long period of time, it has taken its toll.

Mr. Chairman, our vision is different. We pay down the national debt, keep the balanced budget going, and then we will be able to really help the people of this country by having a smaller, more efficient government, and again, which the left cannot stand.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SANFORD. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I was disappointed that the gentleman from New Jersey, when we thought we were having some back and forth, would not give us time.

☐ 2030

I did want to point out to the gentleman from California that Ronald Reagan had a Republican Senate for 6 of his 8 years. That is a fact that even I believe the gentleman from California would probably have a hard time disputing. At no point was there ever in the House a majority approaching an override, so the notion that Ronald Reagan was facing this overwhelmingly Democratic Congress is one more figment of the imagination of the gentleman from California.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Forbes amendment. Unlike the bill before us and many of the amendments we have considered, this amendment takes us in the right direction. I know that the chairman and the ranking member indeed were working with constraints, but nonetheless, this bill takes us in the wrong direction.

I listened to the debate in the Mollohan amendment. The Mollohan amendment was timely and urgent. I regret a point of order was raised against it, and I regret my colleagues raise a point of order against this amendment.

It is for that reason that I intend to oppose the bill. The bill does not go far enough, deep enough. It is not about spending but it is about the priorities of the American people. It is not deep enough in addressing the serious and growing housing problem confronting this Nation.

For some, Mr. Chairman, this is the best of times. The United States is enjoying the longest sustained period of economic growth in the history of the Nation. Despite these rosy economic pictures, many are being left out. For those, these are the worst of times.

For at least 20 years now, there has been a troubling trend, a trend that affects the very quality of life for most Americans. It is an alarming and disturbing trend because fewer Americans can afford healthy meals, fewer can afford health care, fewer can afford education, fewer can afford decent housing and other means to a better life.

Housing is basic. Housing affects every person alive on the Earth, regardless of gender, race, class, religion, nationality, educational attainment, or marital status. The lack of adequate housing is a problem, but the lack of affordable housing is even a greater problem. A growing number of poor households have been left to compete for a shrinking supply of affordable housing.

Some may find this surprising in light of the economy. However, there are many, many, almost 1.5 million, who are said to be homeless in America today.

A recent article in the Washington Post described the high-tech homeless. In its profile several individuals were cited who were employed, in fact were earning good salaries, and they found themselves homeless because of the high cost of housing where they live. It is shocking. An executive in Silicon Valley who was earning $125,000 annually, when he lost his job suddenly, he was evicted from his apartment within one month. Another woman who earns $36,000 could not find affordable rental housing for her and her family.

It seems that while 250,000 new jobs have been created in Silicon Valley for the past 10 years, only a little better than 40,000 new housing units have been constructed, leaving a fierce demand and limited supply.

Recently there have been records in mortgage interest rates, leaving many people to believe that housing in the United States is more affordable than ever. That is not true. Despite the low mortgage rate, fewer people are able to afford to purchase homes. That is principally because income growth for the poor and the working poor has been weak.

This group of Americans are called cost-burdened, according to HUD. That means they are spending more than 30 percent of their income for housing. The poor and the working poor find themselves on a treadmill going nowhere. While all the attention has been placed on low interest rates and affordable mortgages, the spiralling costs of rental housing has been completely ignored.

There are actions we can seek to begin to take, and we should do it indeed by accepting these amendments. I want to put on record that the Congressional Black Caucus has made a pledge, and it is working in partnership with the private sector, to help and indeed to promote 1 million new homeowners in the next 5 years.

Our pledge was recently also reinforced by the Secretary of HUD, Secretary Cuomo, who said he wanted to build 750,000 new homeowners.

I know a point of order indeed will be considered. I think we must oppose this bill. It is wrong for America. It is moving in the wrong direction.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SANFORD. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) which will help firefighters, public school teachers, and police obtain better housing, affordable housing.

Every year the majority party underfunds affordable housing. Every year the President and Secretary Cuomo are forced to negotiate for every last family. Unfortunately, it looks like we are headed down the same road again. The VA-HUD bill is cut $6.5 billion below the President's request, and the President would be right to veto this bill.

Mr. Chairman, earlier my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), pointed out the record of this administration in balancing the budget deficits that haunted our country throughout the 1980s, deficits created during the Reagan years which he pointed out reached $4 billion. But this administration understands that the way to balance the budget is not to prevent low- and moderate-income people from having access to homes.

One critical area that the bill is very bad in is public housing. The bill cuts public housing funds $120 million compared to last year's level. Nationally, the average waiting list for Section 8 housing is more than 2 years. While the administration proposed 120,000 new Section 8 housing vouchers, this bill merely holds out the possibility that 20,000 may be funded if some overly optimistic Section 8 recapture levels are achieved.

This bill is especially hard on New York City and New York State. In New York City, the housing authority reports that there are over 131,000 families waiting for public housing. There are over 216,000 waiting for Section 8. These two lists combined is over 303,000 people who are waiting for low-income affordable housing in New York City alone, and this bill does them a great disservice.

The turnover rate in housing in New York is minuscule, 3.8 percent for public housing and less than 5 percent for Section 8. The only way to help needy people and needy people across the country find homes is to provide new vouchers and fair funding for public housing, and I would say the passage of this amendment.

We also have a huge problem in New York with expiring Section 8 contracts. In my district this is affecting thousands of people. In recent years I have been successful in working with HUD to preserve some of this housing through the mark to market programs. Thanks to HUD funding, thousands of people living in Renwick Gardens and 209 East 36th Street complexes in my district retained their Section 8 housing.

Today my biggest concern is the Marine Terrace complex in Queens, where again Section 8 contracts have run out for thousands of families and thousands of families may lose their homes.

Mr. Chairman, we keep hearing about compassionate conservativism in the press, but there is no compassion in this bill. Programs under VA-HUD benefit some of our Nation's most needy citizens, and this bill does them wrong. This bill provides no new increased funds for elderly housing, for homeless assistance grants, for housing opportunity for people with AIDS, or for Native American block grants.

The record of this Congress on housing matters is exceptionally poor for New York State, New York City, and I would say the entire country over the past 6 years. In fact, this bill funds homeless prevention programs at a level 21 percent lower in real terms than 6 years ago, when the Democrats were in the majority. Elderly housing is funded 53 percent lower than 6 years ago, public housing is 27 percent less than 6 years ago, and home ownership counseling is funded 70 percent less than 6 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, the people who benefit from these programs do not have high-paying lobbyists representing them with these secret 527 groups pushing their special interests. They are simply needy Americans who need housing assistance.

So I call on my colleagues to support my colleague's bill, which is doing something to help affordable housing across the country, but overall, this bill hurts housing. It is a bad record. It has been a bad record for housing for the past 6 years. I urge my colleagues to support my colleague's amendment, but the overlying bill is just plain bad policy, especially in a time when we have surpluses.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of serving as ranking member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies under the service of our very distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for a year, and this is my second year.

It has been a distinct pleasure to serve with the chairman and serve under the chairman as he has processed these bills, and as I said in my opening remarks, he has been extremely fair and responsive to the minority as we have worked through them.

One of the areas of the bill that I have been very impressed about his support for is the area of the bill that we now are debating, which we are debating, the HUD section. He has been a real advocate on the committee, and exercised his leadership role to the advantage of public housing and all the programs that this amendment really speaks to.

I have to conclude from that that the chairman overall, and not speaking specifically about any particular provision, supports this idea of funding these programs that we were not able to fund at the President's request.

The other gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES), I am extremely impressed with the amendment he has come up with here. He has not only expressed his concern for our level of funding, an inadequate level of funding for housing for the elderly, for housing for the disabled, for homeless assistance grants.

He has not only expressed his concern with it and come up with dollar increases for it, but he has done what many amendments, including my amendment, did not do tonight: He has come up with the funding for it. It is an excellent source of funding. I think the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) is to be commended for his ingenuity here. He has taken a piece of legislation that we have passed on the House floor, H.R. 1776, the American Home Ownership and Economic Opportunity Act, and taken provisions out of that to fund this bill, to find $114 million in the first year.

What is significant about that? What is significant about it is that the House has already expressed its attitude about the provisions of this legislation. We passed this act in the House on April 6 of this year by a vote of 417 to 8, so the House has already expressed its will on the authorizing provisions that the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) is offering to fund the increases in these worthy housing programs that I support and I have to imagine the majority supports.

I want to commend the gentleman for that and speak in particular favor of it, because all that has to happen for us to have the increase in housing for the elderly up to the President's request of $779 million, all that has to happen to increase funding for Section 8–11 housing for the disabled up to the President's request to $210 million, and to increase homeless assistance grants, which is desperately needed, by $20 million, would be for the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) to release his point of order on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest if that were to occur and we had no other objection raised we would be affirming, if you will, a vote that has already occurred in the House, as I say, on April 6. With an overwhelming majority 417 to 8, the Members of this body approved the funding mechanisms that the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) is suggesting to fund this, if the gentleman from South Carolina would release his point of order.

If he did that, we would be funding these accounts, authorizing the provisions in the appropriation bill, doing what the House wanted to do with the American Home Ownership and Economic Development Act, do what the National Association of Realtors is asking us to do, to authorize these provisions, and at the same time increasing funding to the President's request in some cases, and in some cases, like the homeless, providing $20 million more to programs that are extremely worthy.

I would ask the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) if he would release his point of order and we could move forward and, perhaps on a real bipartisan basis, approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) to fund these projects.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SANFORD. Unfortunately, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves his point of order.

□ 2045

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

Mr. Chairman, just to respond to my colleague, I would simply say that my colleague from New York and, frankly, a lot of other colleagues both on the Democratic and Republican side of the aisle have been very consistent in their advocacy, whether it is for helping fire fighters or policemen or teachers; and I admire that. I really do.

My contention and the reason I raise this point of order tonight is simply tied to a belief, again, I was outvoted on this, but a belief that our Founding Fathers set up a rule of law based on equality under the law.

Any time that I see a fire fighter and a policeman and a teacher, all of whom do great benefit to our society, I also have to ask, well, does a welder do great benefit to our society, or does a private school teacher do great benefit to our society, or does a nurse working for a private hospital do great benefit to our society. I believe that they, too, help out. They are not in the public sector, but they do make a contribution to the society.

So my objection is solely based on the idea of equality under the law, and that is the reason I would insist on my point of order.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I raise the question about the legitimacy of the point of order. I want to make it very clear the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), given his intellectual honesty, has every right to raise a point of order. I would just say this, any Member who, unlike other Members, sticks by his term limits pledge is entitled to raise this point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order. Reluctantly, I raise it, not against the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES), but against the underlying amendment in that it directly amends existing law in several respects in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI specifically.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment directly amends existing law. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation. The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

For the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, $20,000,000 to remain available until expended, which amount shall be awarded by June 1, 2001, to Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, State community and/or economic development agencies, local rural nonprofits and community development corporations to support innovative housing and economic development activities in rural areas: *Provided*, That all grants shall be awarded on a competitive basis as specified in section 102 of the HUD Reform Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MRS. MEEK OF FLORIDA

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 36 offered by Mrs. MEEK of Florida:

Page 30, after line 14, insert the following new items:

URBAN EMPOWERMENT ZONES

For grants in connection with a second round of the empowerment zones program in urban areas, designated by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in fiscal year 1999 pursuant to the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, $150,000,000 to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for ''Urban Empowerment Zones'', including $10,000,000

for each empowerment zone for use in conjunction with economic development activities consistent with the strategic plan of each empowerment zone, to remain available until expended.

RURAL EMPOWERMENT ZONES

For grants for the rural empowerment zone and enterprise communities programs, as designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, $15,000,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture for grants for designated empowerment zones in rural areas and for grants for designated rural enterprise communities, to remain available until expended.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) reserves a point of order.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is an amendment that would include $150 million to Round II Urban Empowerment Zones and $415 million to Rural Empowerment Zones, the full amount proposed in the President's budget for fiscal year 2001. It would serve as a down payment on the funds which were promised and have been due to Round II funds.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment does not include an offset. We hear a lot on this floor about offsets. I think we hear too much of that. We are hearing it because it is an intellectual cop-out that we use when we do not want to fund something.

But I am pleading with this body to understand the importance of the Empowerment Zone. It is a major economic development initiative designed to revitalize deteriorating urban and rural communities. Its purpose is to create jobs and business opportunities in the most economically distressed areas of the inner city and rural heartland.

The growth of the economy has bypassed these communities. Take my home county of Miami-Dade. We were given a designated Empowerment Zone, and the unemployment rate is 15 percent, and the poverty rate is 48 percent. Clearly, trickle-down economics is not working for these communities.

The Empowerment Zone discussion in this Congress is a well-kept secret. No one talks about it. No one wants to discuss it. Yet, there are Empowerment Zones in Round II that have been designated for many communities of people who are on this floor, who have promised and told their constituents that they would get Empowerment Zones: Southwest Georgia; Riverside, California; Boston, Massachusetts; Cincinnati, Ohio; St. Louis, Missouri; Knoxville, Tennessee; New Haven, Connecticut; Columbus, Ohio, are just a few of them. The one in Miami is in my district. The growth of the economy has bypassed these districts.

These distressed communities will benefit enormously by a strong and committed Federal investment that leverages private sector dollars. This is not government money alone. They leveraged private sector dollars. In fact, the comparatively modest Federal investment of $1.5 billion over 8 years for the 15 urban Round II Empowerment Zones alone will generate an additional $17 billion in local investment, 35 percent of which will be contributed by the private sector, Mr. Chairman.

These are important zones. I want my colleagues to know that Empowerment Zone designation is not an easy process. Distressed communities had to work long and hard before being designated as Empowerment Zones. It is a very competitive process. The prospect of having an Empowerment Zone brings together all segments of the community, public and private.

Every year that we do not fully fund Round II Empowerment Zones, the harder it becomes to get these coalitions together. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, bringing the private sector to the table, working with public entities, and planning for an Empowerment Zone; yet when it is time to have them funded, it is a very solid issue.

I know firsthand about the process. I cochair, along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the Empowerment Zone Committee for Miami. We spent many months and countless hours working with the local government, businesses, community development corporations, and community leaders preparing the Empowerment Zone application. When we were finally chosen, there was no funding. That was a cruel joke for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and myself for Round II Empowerment Zones.

A key element of the program for Round I participants was Federal funding, the Federal Government came through with that, made available through the Title XX Social Service Block Grant Program. Mandatory Social Service Block Grant funds provide a consistent and reliable source.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. MEEK of Florida was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, getting the funding for the Round II Empowerment Zones has been impossible. Last year, the VA-HUD appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000 included $3.6 million for each Round II Empowerment Zone instead of the expected $10 million for the first year.

Recently, in the agreement announced by the White House and the Speaker, funding was again promised as a part of the deal, not to mention a third round of Empowerment Zones.

I am just asking this committee and this House to keep faith with the promise they have made to the American people for Empowerment Zones, and working very hard toward trying, through this process, to do what is right, to fund these zones.

Mr. Chairman, we must finish the work which we have begun and fund these Empowerment Zones. I ask the Members to vote positive for my amendment because it is a people's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) that many of us on this side of the aisle, reaching way back in history to Jack Kemp, when Jack Kemp talked about Enterprise Zones and reducing the burden, what we found in the inner cities is that a lot of the businesses left, crime erupted because the businesses left because of crime; and then it became a vicious cycle of welfare and drugs and the rest of the things. People had no place to work.

In Los Angeles, during the riots, the Enterprise Zone worked very good because many of those small businesses, already depressed, produced no revenue. It put people out of work. They were then drawing welfare or unemployment. Instead, then Governor Pete Wilson set up Enterprise Zones to reduce the taxes on those particular areas so that they would have a chance to start. Guess what, those small businesses came back with reduced tax rates. They hired people. So instead of drawing welfare or unemployment, it put working people to work.

The Enterprise Zone, or I am not sure of the Empowerment Zone, but I would imagine it is very simple, and it worked very, very well. I do not know, but I would think that that would be under the Committee on Ways and Means. I am not sure if it is under the jurisdiction of this committee or not since it deals with taxes, but maybe the gentlewoman from Florida is talking about something different. But the concept of going in and helping people to help themselves is a good one.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. The Empowerment Zone concept is a well-kept secret. In terms of what committee of reference it should preside, it is hard to say in that, since we have been relegated, been given an Empowerment Zone, I do not think any committee has dealt with it, particularly with the Round II shortchanges we have had.

I thank the gentleman for really letting the Congress understand what Empowerment Zones do, because if they are funded, they can bring the community together. It is one of the strongest economic development initiatives, and I wish we could fund it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Reluctantly, Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words to speak briefly in support of the amendment to increase the funding committed for Empowerment Zones.

But I also want to say the value of the gentlewoman's amendment is far understood. I ask the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) to enter into a colloquy with me.

My understanding is there was an appropriation both for urban and rural. Since I come from rural America, I can tell the gentlewoman that we need to have the tax incentives to stimulate the economic development.

I was in New York over the weekend like the gentlewoman from Florida was and saw the impact of an Empowerment Zone which had become an economic engine using high-tech and Bell Atlantic to generate jobs. To have that kind of partnership between the public and the private sector, the city, the State, and the Federal Government working together, I think it was an excellent example, some of the best practices how we can have economic development.

Now, coming from rural America, I want to see that, whatever increase comes, it would also have an opportunity for those of us who live in rural America because we have been shortchanged by this economy, shortchanged by sometimes the appropriation; and we do not want to be left out of the formula.

I support the concept and support the gentlewoman's amendment, but I want to make sure that I heard that rural America had the same opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Yes, Mr Chairman. I think the gentlewoman from South Carolina is right. There is just as much opportunity in rural areas as in urban areas. They have the same needs for economic development. The gentlewoman has been a strong proponent of rural housing since she has been here. What any better way than to have an appointment as an Empowerment Zone.

I also want the gentlewoman to know that the Round II Empowerment Zones have many rural communities involved in them. Many of them were enterprise communities, but there were some who had Empowerment Zones as well.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, did it include Empowerment Zone and enterprise community, both rural and urban areas?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, that is correct, both of them.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, Round II would have meant that they would have continued those that were in existence?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. At the funding level they were promised, Mr Chairman.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, we had one in our district, and I will tell the gentlewoman they are suffering. We had water and sewage provided, but we have not had the second provision for the enterprise community. We did not get an Empowerment Zone.

But even the enterprise community allowed us to bring water and sewer and to entice economic development. Now that they are almost ready, we do not have that additional resource to make sure we have the kind of infrastructure that would attract the businesses to those communities. We do not have the money for the staff capacity. As the gentlewoman well knows, the collaboration to make this hatch requires a lot of people working together, and you need to have staff in order to do that, and that is what we are suffering from.

□ 2100

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I thank her for her contribution, because she has really applied the cause for enterprise zones in rural communities.

I am just hoping as we go along that the chairman, in all of his work with the committee and in conference and with the ranking member, will work forward to getting monies into empowerment zones and the enterprise communities. They are both very worthy causes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, if I entertain the chairman in a colloquy, and I know the chairman is committed, because I know he is one of the most committed persons to economic development and housing. I know it pains him that he cannot provide all these resources, but does the gentleman still persist that he must have a point of order?

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would just respond to the gentlewoman that the reason for this is because it is clearly the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and we cannot usurp that jurisdiction. It would be a problem.

I have listened to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) speak and listened to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) speak. I am a supporter of empowerment zones and enterprise zones. I am a former city council president. I am a city person. I know the need and I know they are needed in rural areas too. But we just cannot encompass that in this bill. It would also put us over our allocation in violation of the Budget Act. So, reluctantly, I have to insist on the point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of budget totals for fiscal year 2001 on June 20, 2000. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee suballocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the Act.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. No, I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair is authoritatively guided by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to section 312 of the Budget Act, that an amendment providing any net increase in new discretionary budget authority would cause a breach of the pertinent allocation of such authority. The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) would, on its face, increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill. As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act. The point of order is, therefore, sustained. The amendment is not in order.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say first of all that I am reminded tonight of the fact that really the right to decent and affordable housing should really be a basic human right and this bill goes in the opposite direction.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I am acutely aware of the enormous housing needs of our Nation, and especially in the State of California. Housing costs in northern California, which I represent, are particularly alarming. Housing costs are reaching astronomical heights and are becoming increasingly impossible for moderate wage earners to meet. The working poor, the disabled, and our senior citizens are in greater jeopardy than ever.

Today, I talked to a constituent who is a senior citizen in my district, and who is in desperate need of housing. She has been told that there are from 3 to 5 years in terms of a waiting list. Now, that can be a lifetime for an elderly individual. If anyone needs confirmation of this crisis, I direct their attention to the State of the Cities report released by HUD this past Monday in Seattle.

This report outlines the paradox between economic growth that is increasing employment and homeownership and the dramatic increases in rents and housing prices. The report also notes that over the 1997 to 1999 period, house prices rose more than twice the rate of inflation and rent increases exceeded inflation for all 3 years. Furthermore, among the top 10 markets that HUD identifies as the hottest high-tech markets, house prices rose more than 18 percent in the last 2 years, and in 1999 rose by 27 percent. That is outrageous.

In this best of all economic times, deservedly celebrated as unusual in its longevity, why are we now talking about cutting out the bare necessities

for those who absolutely cannot survive without help? Why are we cutting the bare bones of housing and the economic opportunities to really reach some level of self-sufficiency?

We kick people off welfare and tell them to be independent and we keep a few scaffolds to hold them up until the foundations and the pillars can be reinforced. With the cuts in this bill, we are kicking out these few scaffolds and supports that remain. So what do we suppose will be the outcome?

Congress must do more than maintain the status quo with the underfunded Section 8 program. Congress should do better than ignore the moving to work program and dismissing welfare to work vouchers. We can also do better than underfunding elderly and disabled assistance programs by $78 million.

Mr. Chairman, the American Dream is one of living in suitable and quality homes. It rightfully gives us a serious stake in this society. Having safe, clean affordable housing really allows us to have a solid place from which we can accumulate some wealth, for those who can afford to buy a home, to care for our families, to send our kids to decent schools and to invest in dreams for the future. This bill really does turn those dreams into nightmares.

This Congress is elected to serve everyone in this Nation, as well as to be particularly attentive to our own constituents. This bill is neither attentive nor cognizant of the fact that millions are homeless or live in substandard housing. It also ignores the fact that millions are living from paycheck to paycheck or are neglecting other basic needs, such as nutrition or health needs, because of the high cost of housing. This bill really does not serve everyone. And I cannot in good conscience, and I hope many of us here tonight, will not vote for this and neglect our constituents and other Americans. Housing really should be a basic human right.

So let us go back to the drawing board and put forth a budget that values the housing requirements of the poor, of our senior citizens, of the disabled, of the homeless, of our working men and women, who deserve a decent and affordable place to live. That is the right thing to do.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4635, the VA-HUD Independent Agencies appropriations bill. I stand opposed to this bill because the American people cannot stand here today and demand to be heard. I stand opposed to the bill's funding levels because, in the midst of economic prosperity for many, others have been left out of the process. We must provide hope with support for children, families and communities suffering all across this Nation.

I cannot support this bill that turns its back on the affordable housing crisis in America. I cannot support a bill that overlooks 5.3 million households, or 12.5 million Americans, with serious housing needs. Moreover, with the average waiting period for Section 8 vouchers or public housing units being over 2 years, we cannot afford to wait. We must provide relief to this ever growing problem. We must provide increased funding not only for affordable housing and public housing but for elderly housing as well.

CDBG, the Community Development Block Grants, were developed for those with low to moderate incomes. Since 1974, CDBG has been the backbone of communities. It has provided a flexible source of grant funds for local governments to devote particular development projects and priorities.

I am tired of hearing about Wall Street's prosperity. Let us see a little prosperity running down East 105th Street in Cleveland, which is in my district. This bill cuts progress that would come to communities via Community Development Block Grant funds.

Within CDBG, this bill cuts $44 million from Section 108 loan authority, cuts every community development program, and also cuts $275 million from last year's CDBG funding level.

Let us talk about homeownership and affordable housing. Housing and expanding homeownership is of great concern to the 11th Congressional District. We must find solutions to provide affordable housing for all. H.R. 4635 does not get us there.

This bill cuts the President's housing request by more than $2 billion. This reduction denies the request for 120,000 new rental assistance vouchers, has a $78 million cut in elderly and disabled housing, and a $28 million cut in providing housing assistance for people with HIV/AIDS. Shame on this Congress if we do not provide the necessary aid for those who need it most.

In addition to neglecting housing, economic development is forgotten as well, for this bill provides zero funding for empowerment zones, zero funding for APIC loan guarantees, cuts in the New Markets Initiative, and a 20 percent cut in funding for Brownfields redevelopment.

This appropriations bill is a reverse Robin Hood. Yes, it robs neighborhoods all over this Nation. It robs communities that use CDBG funds for child care, Meals on Wheels, and other community programs.

If we want to expand homeownership opportunities, let us do it the right way. Include funding for HOME funding, which funds low-downpayment homeownership programs and affordable housing construction. This bill cuts HOME funding by $65 million. Let us fund housing counseling, which helps in the fight against the growing problem of predatory lending. This is counseling which is needed across this country as the predators continue to prey on low-income persons who really need counseling advice.

What is the reality here? The reality is that this appropriation bill does an injustice to Americans all over this Nation who need help. We cannot continue on this road of denial and neglect. We cannot in clear conscience support H.R. 4635 and then move to the upcoming celebration of independence on July 4, for there are people who are still not free: Homeless persons, those without decent housing and living conditions, and those living in deteriorating communities.

We must never forget the words inscribed at the Statute of Liberty: ''Bring me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.'' Let us breathe free by being a just Congress, a just House of Representatives, a House of the people, by the people and for the people.

Support housing, support community development, support the elderly. Oppose H.R. 4635.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, $4,505,000,000: *Provided*, That of the amount provided, $4,214,050,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (the ''Act'' herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301), to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That $67,000,000 shall be for flexible grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, $3,000,000 shall be available as a grant to the Housing Assistance Council, $3,000,000 shall be available as a grant to the National American Indian Housing Council, and $39,500,000 shall be for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Act: *Provided further*, That $15,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided further*, That $20,000,000 shall be for grants pursuant to the Self Help Housing Opportunity Program: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated herein (other than a grant made available in this paragraph to the Housing Assistance Council or the National American Indian Housing Council, or a grant using funds under section 107(b)(3) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended) shall be expended for ''Planning and Management Development'' and ''Administration'' as defined in regulations promulgated by the department.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MRS. MEEK OF FLORIDA

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 37 offered by Mrs. Meek of Florida:

Page 30, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $395,000,000)''.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is really heart wrenching and heartbreaking when a point of order is usually coming from the floor regarding some of the things that people back home do not even understand.

Someone who does not have housing, someone who is living in a run-down dilapidated community knows nothing about the nomenclature of this Congress. That nomenclature includes offsets, it includes point of order, it includes authorize. All of those types of terminology is based on a stalling technique to hold back growth in the cities. Now, our cities are rundown, they are dilapidated, and we need to do something about it. That is what Community Development Block Grant money is supposed to do.

Now, I have fought very hard on this floor for CDBG funds. They are being dissipated with everything but what they were designed to do. Many times that is by design. But, anyway, I want to increase the funding in the bill for Community Development Block Grant programs, and I want to increase it by $395 million to raise the funding level in the bill to $4.9 billion. That is the President's request.

□ 2115

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand my amendment raises community development funding only to the level of $4.9 billion. So we can see that my amendment is a very reasonable compromise that I am certain the subcommittee chairman and my colleagues can enthusiastically support.

I also understand that there is no offset for this particular amendment. But I want to raise the consciousness of this Congress as well as to have them realize that something has to be done to improve Community Development Block Grant funds.

I have a letter here, Mr. Chairman, from the Conference of Mayors, in which I am sure, just reading this, there are more than 200 signatures on this letter; and they are calling for a community development funding level of $5 billion.

We keep saying we want to return the money back to the people. What is any better way to return this money we keep hearing about back to the people? The $5 billion that we are asking for will help these crumbling cities, and it will keep us going in our cities and in our rural communities, as well.

It is important to note that the bill's total for CDBG, $4.505 billion, is $95 million less than the $4.6 billion provided 6 years ago. Six years ago there was more money provided for CDBG than there is now. Think about it. Someone is mathematically challenged here. With 6 years of inflation, the cut in CDBG purchasing power since fiscal year 1995 is actually about 15 percent, which is a huge cut in a program that works so well and does so much good.

All of my colleagues realize and understand the CDBG program. It is one of the most popular government programs. We keep saying we want to adequately fund proven programs. CDBG is a proven program. It provides communities with flexible funding to develop and build housing and economic development projects that primarily benefit low and moderate income people.

Probably most of my colleagues have CDBG projects in their district that have either been completed or are under way. CDBG funding has been provided locally. We are going back again to sending the money back home. It is not administered from here but back home. Very often they are able to leverage it.

This is the right time, Mr. Chairman, to increase Community Development Block Grant appropriations to take advantage of this real strong economy. What better time can we have that we can leverage it than now?

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, presents a tremendous opportunity to help this Nation's poor. It is one of the first tools that cities can turn to. When we drive through Washington, Virginia, wherever we go in this country, we will see these low, run-down communities.

Why can we not build our communities? We have more money being sent to foreign nations than we have trying to build our distressed communities. There is something wrong with that, Mr. Chairman. It is wrong-headed. There is something wrong in poking ourselves in the nomenclature of denial. That is what we are doing. We are denying these people who can help their communities, who can leverage this. There are so many people in this country who want to invest, Mr. Chairman, in some of these communities.

So I am asking my colleagues to support this amendment. It does not involve an offset. The VA bill is terribly underfunded as it is.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The time of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. MEEK of Florida was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not include an offset. This VA–HUD bill is already terribly underfunded as it is. The chairman and the ranking member have worked very hard to try to get us better funding than we have, but we are still in that position. We are tied down by the constraints, our own constraints. We put an albatross around our own necks.

When we go back to our communities, our people will not know anything about offsets. They do not know anything about that. But they do know when their communities are crumbling under their feet.

So I am hoping that no one will make that point of order, that this House will adopt my amendment today and adequately fund the CDBG program, the lives of those who have been left behind by the booming national economy.

I spent some time on Wall Street the other day, Mr. Chairman. I was shocked. I am a senior citizen. I have never been on Wall Street where I was at the Stock Exchange. And it was marvelous to see where the money is turned over. But do my colleagues know what? It is not getting back to those communities, to those poor people whose government can help these people.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I continue to reserve my point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, this debate can go on and on and on and it probably will sort of ad nauseam. I support the gentlewoman from the great State of Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

For the life of me, it is difficult to understand where some of my colleagues are coming from when they talk about cutting efforts and reducing resources toward an issue that seeks to expand homeownership.

The one sort of valuable asset that most people ever own in their lives, we all hope to invest in stocks that will generate huge yields and make a lot of money for us, but the truth be told, the one major asset, the most valuable asset that most Americans will control or own in their lives is a home.

We are close to 5½ million people. In this Congress, we often use the term ''low income'' to describe some of the folks that will benefit from this initiative. But whether they are low income or middle income or even high income, they are still Americans. There are 5.4 million who have worse-case housing scenarios.

Empowerment Zones and Community Development Block Grants really empower cities and local players working with the market and those in the private sector to come up with solutions to help expand homeownership and expand economic opportunity of all Americans.

I was on that trip with my colleague from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) to New York and did not have the opportunity to visit the New York Stock Exchange as some of my other colleagues did, but have had opportunity in the past.

I hear so many of my colleagues often talk about how government is around people's necks and it is squishing innovation and creativity and wealth in America. Let us deal with a few facts for one moment.

The Dow has grown three times over the last 8 years. Some people suggest that this President has not been a good one, but I think he deserves just a small bit of credit for not standing in the way of those entrepreneurs and business people from growing this economy.

Wealthy Americans have seen their wealth. Some of them have doubled, tripled. Some have even quadrupled. I love that. I support that. That is what

distinguishes our Nation from so many other countries around the globe, why so many people seek to come to this great Nation.

We in government in a lot of ways have a responsibility to ensure that we bring the market to those communities and those neighborhoods that ordinarily might not benefit and might not, I should say, see the benefits of a strong economy.

When we bring the market to communities that ordinarily do not see it, and I applaud the President's new market initiative and even some on that side that have come up with innovative ideas, my colleague from Oklahoma and other members in that caucus on the other side, finding ways to bring more people into this new economy, it would seem to me that Empowerment Zones and Community Development Block Grants would be something that those on the other side would be eager, would jump to support.

In many ways, it is the public and the private partnering, working together to empower people who ordinarily might not be empowered. We have an opportunity, unlike any generation of Congresspeople, searching for solutions at a time when we are not running a deficit. We still have an enormous debt that we have to service and ensure that we pay down, and there are plans on the table in which to do that, but we now have a chance to help empower new groups of people and not worry as much as perhaps a generation before.

My dad served in this Congress for 22 years. He never had this chance, never had this opportunity. What do my friends on the other side choose to do with this chance and this opportunity? In my estimation and in many of my colleagues' on this side, and I would agree with the young gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) the nomenclature, the terminology we use here is confusing not only to those at home but even sometimes to those of us in this Congress, we choose, in my estimation, to squander this moment.

Instead of taking the opportunity to invest in folks who want an opportunity, who want a chance, we have chosen not to. Shame on us as a Congress. We will have only ourselves to blame if we look back a few years from now and realize that this window is closed and we took no opportunity to expand HOPE, to expand opportunity to hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of Americans crying out for this chance.

From a parochial standpoint, I have thousands of people on the section 8 waiting list, Mr. Chairman; meaning they want to own their own home, they want to realize the American dream. All they are wanting is a hand up. We have an opportunity to do that this evening and in the coming days in this Congress. But based on what has been put before this Congress, H.R. 4635, it seems once again we are going to fail not only those in Florida, not only those in Texas, not only these in New York and Tennessee and even my dear friend from New York, but we are going to fail the 5½ million people scattered across this country who are doing nothing more than asking what every stockbroker in the stock exchange asks for, and I support that, what every high-tech executive in Silicon Valley and Silicon Alley and Austin and Boston and Northern Virginia are asking for, just a chance and just an opportunity.

We have a chance in this Congress to do that this evening and in the coming days. I would hope my colleagues on the other side would take a second look at what they propose and make the effort to fix it. This is one way to fix it, to support the amendment of the gentlewoman from the great State of Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has presented us with an excellent opportunity. I wish I could waive the procedural wand. And I do respect the chairman retaining and reserving his point of order.

I stood on this floor before, and I have acknowledged the hard work of the chairman and the ranking member. I did that as I supported the effort of the ranking member to add $1 billion to this legislation, this appropriations bill. And now I come to acknowledge the good work of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) on two elements that she has offered to explain to the American people and to our colleagues.

I said that I wished I had a magic wand, because I think the message that we are trying to portray and to explain is that this is a return on America's tax dollars. We have come to the floor of this House and eloquently debated the importance of giving an estate tax relief; and, frankly, I believe that over the long haul we can collectively, in a bipartisan way, do something for those individuals who deserve some estate tax relief.

The bill we passed the other day, of course, was just to fatten the pockets of about 1 percent of America's people.

But when we begin to talk about an Empowerment Zone and Community Development Block Grants, we are talking to the working men and women of America; and we are saying to them, we are not grabbing hold of their tax dollars, holding them close to our chest, never to return them back to the highways and byways of the local community.

What the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) is arguing for is to give back to the people of America who live in rural areas and urban areas who are sometimes keeling over from decay, give them back the tools that they can work themselves.

Our President and the leadership gathered together to understand the concept and promote the concept of empowerment and they named it Empowerment Zones. I understand that my colleague from Florida has an Empowerment Zone. The good citizens of Houston and other parts of Texas are seeking to secure an Empowerment Zone.

It is not a handout, Mr. Chairman. It is putting the mind and the intellect and the engine of ingenuity together in our local communities coming up with a plan that will take Federal dollars and invest them wisely. That is an Empowerment Zone.

So I support the $150 million that we should be putting into this legislation to be able to support the many applicants around this Nation, rural and urban alike, who have sought the opportunity to invest in their own neighborhoods. It is a tragedy that we would deny them that. It is a tragedy that we do not explain to the people of America what the Empowerment Zone means and what these Community Development Block Grants means.

Let me tell my colleagues what they mean in Houston, Texas. They mean a new police station. They mean a new library. They mean a new inner city park where there were no parks. They mean a new health clinic. Because the City of Houston can take these block grants and embrace them and utilize them for the needs of the community. They need help in historic zones and help in the areas that they are claiming to be a historic zone.

They can also be used to help people suffering from AIDS in a variety of support services. They can be a multiservice center where my elderly come every day in a safe and secure and air-conditioned location. And I tell my colleagues that if they live in Houston, Texas, in August, if they live there in July, if they live there in September, they need air-conditioning. This is what Empowerment Zone monies mean, and this is what CDBG monies mean.

As I said on this floor before, in the most prosperous of times, when we have the most prosperous time in our history, the question will be asked of us, what have we done for those who are voiceless, who cannot speak for themselves. I would imagine that the working men and women and that the children that are part of these working families look to our local governments and to our county governments to provide these kind of resources for them.

I joined a group of youngsters at a library the other day. I could not have been more excited about their excitement about being in a library funded by CDBG monies.

□ 2130

I want to applaud the gentlewoman from Florida for adding the $150 million for an empowerment zone. There is

a whole long line, Mr. Chairman, of applications for the empowerment zone, and for CDBG moneys because there is more than a long line. As was quoted by a staff member, I think the good staff member of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), there is not a rural county or hamlet or village or city in America that has not received community development block grant dollars. What a tragedy to be able to tell them in this most prosperous of times that we will deny them the right kind of proper investment of their tax dollars and that is returning it back to them to do what is best for their community.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of full funding for the 15 Round II Urban Empowerment Zones. My community of El Paso is one of those 15 designated empowerment zones. El Paso was designated based on its low per capita income, high unemployment rate, and maintaining the poorest ZIP code in the Nation. Within this context, El Paso worked hard to achieve a Round II Empowerment Zone designation. My community has sought to utilize the full benefits of the designation to quickly raise the standard of living and quality of life for all El Pasoans since receiving this designation in 1999.

Unfortunately, my community has continued to suffer because Congress has failed over the past 2 years to provide the full $10 million in annual appropriations for each of the urban empowerment zones in Round II. This year's bill continues that dismal track. The goal of the Empowerment Zone initiative is to leverage private sector resources with Federal funds to create economic and job development in areas which have lagged behind the national economy.

The first round of empowerment zones showed that with adequate funding and tax incentives, distressed communities like ours could create valuable new jobs, adequately train workers, develop affordable housing and child care, and generate business opportunities to raise the overall quality of life. Each of the first round empowerment zones received $100 million in Federal grant funding over the 10-year span of the Empowerment Zone designation along with various other tax incentives to attract and spur economic growth. This combination of resources and tax incentives was critical to addressing the needs of those historically underserved communities such as El Paso.

In contrast, the Round II empowerment zones have received only a small portion of the grant funds that they were promised and that they had anticipated. They have received annual funding below $4 million for the past 2 years, more than $14 million less than they expected. This underfunding has stymied long-term plans for development and growth. It has further undermined the tremendous leveraging capability of using public funds to draw private investment through a multiplier effect.

As our Nation enjoys one of the strongest economies in generations, it is incumbent that we provide opportunities for our distressed communities. The empowerment zone residents deserve to reach their full potential, but this can only take place if they receive full funding. Both President Clinton and Speaker HASTERT committed to $200 million in funds for the Round II empowerment zones and enterprise communities in fiscal year 2001. This bill has failed to include those dollars for empowerment zones and enterprise communities. The citizens of my community and other empowerment zones are awaiting the opportunity to share in our strong economy. With the full funding as promised for Round II, we can truly improve the quality of life of empowerment zone residents and no longer delay their opportunity to share in the American dream.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of Budget Totals for fiscal year 2001 on June 20, 2000. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee suballocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under subsection 302(f) of the Act.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is authoritatively guided by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to section 312 of the Budget Act, that an amendment providing any net increase in new discretionary budget authority would cause a breach of the pertinent allocation of such authority.

The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida would, on its face, increase the level of new discretionary budget authority. As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The point of order is therefore sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of the amount made available under this heading, $23,450,000 shall be made available for capacity building, of which $20,000,000 shall be made available for ''Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing'', for LISC and the Enterprise Foundation for activities as authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–120), as in effect immediately before June 12, 1997, with not less than $4,000,000 of the funding to be used in rural areas, including tribal areas, and of which $3,450,000 shall be for capacity building activities administered by Habitat for Humanity International.

Of the amount made available under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may use up to $55,000,000 for supportive services for public housing residents, as authorized by section 34 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and for grants for service coordinators and congregate services for the elderly and disabled residents of public and assisted housing: *Provided*, That amounts made available for congregate services and service coordinators for the elderly and disabled under this heading and in prior fiscal years may be used by grantees to reimburse themselves for costs incurred in connection with providing service coordinators previously advanced by grantees out of other funds due to delays in the granting by or receipt of funds from the Secretary, and the funds so made available to grantees for congregate services or service coordinators under this heading or in prior years shall be considered as expended by the grantees upon such reimbursement. The Secretary shall not condition the availability of funding made available under this heading or in prior years for congregate services or service coordinators upon any grantee's obligation or expenditure of any prior funding.

Of the amount made available under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be available for neighborhood initiatives that are utilized to improve the conditions of distressed and blighted areas and neighborhoods, to stimulate investment, economic diversification, and community revitalization in areas with population outmigration or a stagnating or declining economic base, or to determine whether housing benefits can be integrated more effectively with welfare reform initiatives: *Provided*, that any unobligated balances of amounts set aside for neighborhood initiatives in fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 may be utilized for any of the foregoing purposes.

Of the amount made available under this heading, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $45,000,000 shall be available for YouthBuild program activities authorized by subtitle D of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, and such activities shall be an eligible activity with respect to any funds made available under this heading: *Provided*, That local YouthBuild programs that demonstrate an ability to leverage private and nonprofit funding shall be given a priority for YouthBuild funding: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this paragraph, $3,750,000 shall be set aside and made available for a grant to YouthBuild USA for capacity building for community development and affordable housing activities as specified in section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993, as amended.

Of the amount made available under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be available for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI), to finance a variety of economic development efforts.

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $28,000,000, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $1,217,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in section 108(k) of the Housing and

Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That in addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, $1,000,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

For Economic Development Grants, as authorized by section 108(q) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, for Brownfields redevelopment projects, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make these grants available on a competitive basis as specified in section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, $1,585,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That up to $15,000,000 of these funds shall be available for Housing Counseling under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968: *Provided further,* That $17,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenace of information technology systems.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency shelter grants program (as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, as amended); the supportive housing program (as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act); the section 8 moderate rehabilitation single room occupancy program (as authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; and the shelter plus care program (as authorized under subtitle F of title IV of such Act), $1,020,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not less than 30 percent of these funds shall be used for permanent housing, and all funding for services must be matched by 25 percent in funding by each grantee: *Provided further,* That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment progams for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further,* That up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated under this heading is transferred to the Working Capital Fund to be used for technical assistance and management information systems.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOUSING FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For assistance for the purchase, construction, acquisition, or development of additional public and subsidized housing units for low income families not otherwise provided for, $911,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That $710,000,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance, and amendments to contracts for project rental assistance, for the elderly under such section 202(c)(2), and for supportive services associated with the housing, of which amount $50,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects and of which amount $50,000,000 shall be for grants under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q–2) for conversion of eligible projects under such section to assisted living or related use: *Provided further,* That of the amount under this heading, $201,000,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, for project rental assistance, for amendments to contracts for project rental assistance, and supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811 of such Act: *Provided further,* That $1,000,000, to be divided evenly between the appropriations for the section 202 and section 811 programs, shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall designate at least 25 percent but no more than 50 percent of the amounts earmarked under this paragraph for section 811 of such Act for tenant-based assistance, as authorized under that section, including such authority as may be waived under the next proviso, which assistance is 5 years in duration: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may waive any provision of such section 202 and such section 811 (including the provisions governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance and tenant-based assistance) that the Secretary determines is not necessary to achieve the objectives of these programs, or that otherwise impedes the ability to develop, operate, or administer projects assisted under these programs, and may make provision for alternative conditions or terms where appropriate.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

From the Rental Housing Assistance Fund, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 2000, and any collections made during fiscal year 2001, shall be transferred to the Flexible Subsidy Fund, as authorized by section 236(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

FHA—MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 2001, commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of $160,000,000,000.

During fiscal year 2001, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed $100,000,000: *Provided,* That the foregoing amount shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan program, $330,888,000, of which not to exceed $324,866,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''; and not to exceed $4,022,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Office of Inspector General''. In addition, for administrative contract expenses, $160,000,000, of which $96,500,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided,* That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed $65,500,000,000 on or before April 1, 2001 an additional $1,400 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each $1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below $1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed $16,000,000.

FHA—GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–3 and 1735c), including the cost of loan guarantee modifications (as that term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended), $101,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, of up to $21,000,000,000: *Provided further,* That any amounts made available in any prior appropriations Act for the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) of guaranteed loans that are obligations of the funds established under section 238 or 519 of the National Housing Act that have not been obligated or that are deobligated shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the making of such guarantees and shall remain available until expended, notwithstanding the expiration of any period of availability otherwise applicable to such amounts.

Gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed $50,000,000; of which not to exceed $30,000,000 shall be for bridge financing in connection with the sale of multifamily real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act; and of which not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single-family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, $211,455,000, of which $193,134,000, shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''; and of which $18,321,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Office of Inspector General''. In addition, for administrative contract expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, $144,000,000, of which $33,500,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided,* That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed $8,426,000,000 on or before April 1, 2001, an additional $19,800,000 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each $1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments over $8,426,000,000 (including a pro rata amount for any increment below $1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed $14,400,000.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C.

1721(g)), shall not exceed $200,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed mortgage-backed securities program, $9,383,000 to be derived from the GNMA guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account, of which not to exceed $9,383,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z–1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, $40,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, of which $10,000,000 shall be for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) Initiative.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, $44,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, of which $22,000,000 shall be to carry out activities pursuant to such section 561: *Provided*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by sections 1011 and 1053 of the Residential Lead-Based Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, $80,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which $1,000,000 shall be for CLEARCorps and $10,000,000 shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related environmental diseases and hazards.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $7,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $1,004,380,000, of which $518,000,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, $9,383,000 shall be provided from funds of the Government National Mortgage Association, $1,000,000 shall be provided from the ''Community development block grants program'' account, $150,000 shall be provided by transfer from the ''Title VI Indian federal guarantees program'' account, and $200,000 shall be provided by transfer from the ''Indian housing loan guarantee fund program'' account: *Provided*, That the Secretary is prohibited from using any funds under this heading or any other heading in this Act for employing more than 77 schedule C and 20 noncareer Senior Executive Service employees: *Provided further*, That the community builder program shall be terminated in its entirety by October 1, 2000.

Mr. WALSH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 46, line 2, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALSH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH:

Page 45, line 25, strike ''*Provided*'' and all that follows through page 46, line 2, and insert the following:

Provided further, That the community builder fellow program shall be terminated in its entirety by September 1, 2000: *Provided further*, That, hereafter, no individual may be employed in a position of the Department of Housing and Urban Development that is designated as ''community builder'' unless such individual is appointed to such position subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service: *Provided further*, That any individual employed in such a position shall be considered to be an employee for purposes of the subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Hatch Act).

Mr. WALSH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical and clarifying amendment regarding the termination of the Community Builder Fellow program. This amendment simply clarifies language that was included in the bill and in the fiscal year 2000 appropriation that terminates the Community Builder Fellow program. In addition to clarifying language, language is added requiring that any former community builder fellows at HUD be subject to the provisions of the Office of Personnel Management and the Hatch Act. I believe the other side has reviewed this amendment with us, and I believe they are in agreement and that they are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's amendment. I appreciate the hard work that he has put into considering our concerns for the language as it was drafted in the bill. I appreciate the fact that we have reached a satisfactory compromise on this issue. I again compliment the gentleman on his good work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $83,000,000, of which $22,343,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration and $10,000,000 shall be provided from the amount earmarked for Operation Safe Home in the appropriation for ''Drug elimination grants for low-income housing'': *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within the Office of Inspector General.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Federal Housing Enterprise Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, including not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, $22,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed such amount shall be available from the General Fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund: *Provided further*, That the General Fund amount shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $0.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. HINCHEY:

Page 46, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $4,770,000)''.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that would add $4.77 million to the budget of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.

OFHEO, as it is known, is an independent regulatory agency within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It was created by Congress in 1992 to oversee the safety and soundness of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the two largest government sponsored enterprises.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are private companies that were chartered by Congress to encourage homeownership by creating a secondary market for mortgage debt. They have been very successful in this endeavor. They own or guarantee nearly half of all home mortgages and almost 80 percent of middle-class mortgages. While they are not Federal agencies, the two housing GSEs enjoy some advantages that other private financial institutions do not. Nevertheless, as a result they are able to issue debt at rates that rival the Treasury because the market presumes that their securities are backed by the U.S. Government.

Although the law specifically states that this is not the case, Fannie and Freddie are, in reality, too big to fail.

They are exposed to more than $2 trillion in credit risk from the mortgages they guarantee. They are also subject to $850 million of interest rate risk from the whole loans and mortgage-backed securities they hold in their portfolios.

Both GSEs are adequately capitalized, well managed and are in excellent financial condition. Times are good and homeownership rates are at all-time record levels as a result. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac should be commended for their role in this success. But we should not forget that we are entering a period of interest rate volatility.

The Federal Reserve has raised the prime rate five times during the past few months and it seems poised to do so again. As a result, the GSEs which are exposed to considerable interest rate risk could be vulnerable to a slowdown in the economy. I do not mean to suggest that they are in any trouble or that they would not be able to weather a downturn, but there have been times in the past when both Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have suffered financial difficulties.

□ 2145

Indeed, this is why Congress created this regulatory body in the first place, to ensure the safe and sound operation of the GSEs in troubled times. OFHEO will soon round out its regulatory program when it implements a risk-based capital standard that has been 6 years in the making.

After completing a thorough analysis of its needs in light of the $2 trillion housing finance market it oversees, OFHEO requested $26.77 million from Congress this year. While this is a substantial increase over last year's budget, the extra funds will be used for some very necessary purposes.

They include hiring additional examiners to ensure compliance with the new capital rules; train staff to understand the complicated financial transactions and risk management techniques used by the GSEs, to upgrade technology, including the purchase of faster computers and sophisticated risk management software, and also to implement a series of organizational reforms recommended by OFHEO's outside auditors.

The Congressional Budget Office has scored this amendment as budget neutral. The funds for OFHEO's budget come from semiannual assessments on the GSEs, subject to Congressional approval. No offset is necessary to approve this increase.

Fannie Mae and Freddy Mac are not opposing this amendment. They believe that OFHEO should have the resources it needs to do its job. They know that the investment in safety and soundness pays dividends in market confidence. Investors need to know that the GSEs are adequately capitalized and soundly managed.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to cast a vote for safety and soundness and support this amendment

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr.HINCHEY).

Mr. Chairman, OFHEO requested an increase this year and the Committee on Appropriations gave them one. OFHEO's budget has increased from $19.5 million to $22 million, a 15 percent increase over last year's funding level. That is as great an increase as any budget within this bill.

The increase is consistent with past increases and based on OFHEO's budget justifications is fair and adequate; but OFHEO wants a 50 percent, 5–0, 50 percent increase in their budget, and they claim the increase is necessary to finalize the risk-based capital standard and to adequately monitor the safety and soundness of the GSEs. But if past performance is any indicator of future action, I suspect OFHEO will not be able to do as they assert.

My doubts are well founded, as OFHEO has never met their promises as they relate to risk-based capital standard despite a statutory requirement to do so by April of 1994. I remind you, we are in the year 2000; that is 6 years ago. So they did not keep that commitment.

Despite the GSE Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, OFHEO was 5 years late issuing the preliminary rule, 5 years late. We are asked to give them a 50 percent increase in their budget?

Their tardiness cannot be blamed on the Committee on Appropriations. Every year since 1994, OFHEO promised this committee that they would get the rule out. Every year, the committee increased funding to the requested level, and every year for 5 years OFHEO has failed to keep their promise.

This is just one of the reasons I am not persuaded that OFHEO requires a 50 percent increase in their budget request. We are aware that OFHEO has recommended that they be removed from the appropriations process. They feel their mission is compromised because they must justify their expenditures to this committee; however, until the law is changed, refueling OFHEO's budget is our concern.

Let me describe the review this committee conducts on this account. First, the fact that discretionary funds are not needed to pay for the account is none of our concern. We dig much deeper and are far more comprehensive because we take the responsibility seriously. We look at how many staff are currently on board, whether staff will increase, what the staff duties are, the costs of travel and equipment.

This review is then coupled with the performance of the agency, which has been abysmal, to see if the staff hours are having the intended results, because OFHEO's request was so out of line with past requests. Rather than dismissing it entirely, we requested OFHEO to provide us with additional documentation to justify the increases.

Mr. Chairman, I asked that OFHEO make comparisons between their responsibility to regulate the safety and soundness of the GSEs and the responsibilities of other similarly situated regulators. Mr. Chairman, they never responded to the subcommittee's request. Instead, OFHEO resorted to press releases accusing my subcommittee and me of being ''subject to the maneuverings of the entities'' that OFHEO regulates. Not only is this accusation insulting, but it borders on slander.

I certainly have not been approached by Fannie Mae or Freddy Mac about OFHEO's budget, and I am fairly certain that no one on the subcommittee was approached. In fact, those entities make it a habit of never discussing OFHEO's budget with me, with other Members or with our staff.

In my opinion, this highly inappropriate accusation was not merely foolish, but it was petulant and naive. Furthermore, this statement and the agency's inability to act in a timely way on risk-based capital rule has forced me to reconsider whether this agency has the credibility and the independence it takes to be an effective regulator.

Certainly, we have no intention of rewarding this type of behavior and refusal to comply with the subcommittee requests by getting OFHEO an increase in funds.

I urge everyone in this body to vote a resounding no on this amendment. OFHEO does not deserve the attention.

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

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hinchey amendment that would restore the $4.7 million in the budget for Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, otherwise known as OFHEO. And I want to say to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Walsh), while I understand his frustration with how this matter has been debated, I think that this cut in OFHEO could not come at a worst time.

Let me say, as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), mentioned, that OFHEO is the only Federal financial regulatory agency which is subject to the appropriations process, and there is no doubt that that ought to be changed; and I would hope that the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, which I am a member of, would take that up along with the Committee on Appropriations and treat OFHEO like the Comptroller of the Currency and the FDIC and the Office of Thrift Supervision. But obviously that is not going to happen before this bill is enacted.

The problem with not providing OFHEO with the proper resources compounds an existing problem that the Committee on Banking and Financial Services is already looking at. As the gentleman from New York might

know, the Subcommittee on Capital Market, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services is in the process of considering legislation as to whether or not the GSEs, Freddy Mac, Fannie Mae, as well as the Federal Home Loan Bank, which are not under OFHEO, are sufficiently capitalized. And we have been going through a number of hearings on this, and the linchpin in all of this is going to come down to the final regulations issued by OFHEO as it relates to the capital oversight of the GSEs.

Mr. Chairman, this reduction in the amount of resources that they need to carry out their job, quite frankly, could not happen at a worse time.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to clarify, this is not a reduction. This is an increase of 15 percent in their budget.

Mr. BENTSEN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but I would also add that their activities have increased as they are in the final stages. As the chairman knows, they are in the final stages of preparing the regulation that will set capital standard for Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae.

They are in the process of reviewing the comments on the initial regulations that were published in the Federal Register, so their workload clearly has gone up. And I think the chairman would concur that the responsibility as laid out in the 1992 act is quite important.

To go back to my original point, we are in the midst of a debate in the authorizing committee as to whether or not the GSEs are properly capitalized, whether or not their structure ought to be changed. And we are relying greatly on what OFHEO is going to come up with, so I think it would be a mistake at this time not to provide them with the proper resources.

I would hope that the gentleman would accept the Hinchey amendment. Let me say I know the gentleman quite well; we have traveled together. I have nothing but the greatest respect for him. I think that if OFHEO, and I have no reason to question what he said, if OFHEO did what he said, they were wrong to do that.

I would hope that the chairman would not allow some bad judgment on the part of the agency in trying to get in the way of the resources that they need to carry out their duty that we on the authorizing committee have asked them to do and the Congress has asked them to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I consider the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) a good friend and someone I admire in this body, and I want to assure the gentleman that there is absolutely nothing personal. We are talking about performance.

This is an agency that has failed its mission for 6 consecutive years, and for us to give them a 15 percent increase I think is pretty generous, but not a 50 percent increase.

Mr. BENTSEN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just hope that the gentleman would see to accepting the Hinchey amendment. We need this information if we are going to carry out our oversight functions with respect to the GSEs. The House is in a great deal of debate about this, and it would be, I think, counterproductive to undercut the one regulatory agency over the GSEs at this point in time, and so I would hope the House would adopt this amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise to speak in favor of my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), for his thoughtful amendment. He is a former member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and he has worked with OFHEO for over 7 years here in this body.

I want to offer my support for providing the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, OFHEO, with the full resources it needs to comprehensively regulate Fannie Mae and Freddy Mac and to regulate their safety and soundness. As my colleagues are aware, OFHEO funding comes from assessments on Fannie Mae and Freddy Mac, not from the taxpayers. However, approval for OFHEO assessments is tied to the appropriations bills.

The GSEs play a critical role in our Nation's housing finance system, increasing the availability of home mortgage funds and increasing homeownership.

In recent months, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises has led a series of hearings and oversight on the housing GSEs.

During the course of our hearings, the subcommittee has come to two conclusions that I think are overwhelmingly supported by both sides of the aisle. First, with an almost 70 percent homeownership rate, our Nation's housing finance system is the most successful in the world. Secondly, the housing GSE regulators should have the resources that they need to do the job to oversee safety and soundness.

The Hinchey amendment makes an increase of $4.8 million to $26.8 in the amount of funding that OFHEO can assess the GSEs. Regulations of GSEs require highly technical analysis and this increase will give the agency the ability to hire and retain the high-level staff required to do its job.

I know that no matter how my colleagues feel about GSEs, we all want to ensure that the enterprises are adequately supervised. So I really urge the support of the Hinchey amendment and appeal to my good colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from the great City and State of New York (Mr. WALSH), to accept this amendment.

Again, it does not in any way come out of resources of the taxpayers. It is an assessment on the GSEs to pay for their own oversight for safety and soundness.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to increase funds for the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight. OFHEO has an important job, we admit, doing regulatory oversight to ensure the safety and soundness of the two largest government-sponsored enterprises: Fannie Mae and Freddy Mac. Just because the funds for OFHEO come from assessments on Fannie and Freddie does not mean that the Committee on Appropriations will roll over and give them anything they want.

The subcommittee requested an adequate justification to support the whopping 50 percent increase in funds they requested and the 40 percent increase in personnel as requested by the President. OFHEO never responded to our requests for their budgets' justification.

□ 2200

Yet the committee ended up providing the still generous 15 percent in increased funds contained in this bill. Fifteen percent is a respectable amount, given that so many of our accounts had to be level funded due to the tight budget allocation. Further, there is only so much of an increase an agency can absorb effectively in one year. The Committee on Appropriations reported dollar figure is based on merit and not on any of the outside forces that some have alluded to.

I urge rejection of the amendment and support of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee over the jurisdiction of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, or OFHEO, I rise to speak in favor of the Hinchey amendment. This amendment would increase the amount of funding provided in the bill from $22 million to approximately $26.8 million, the full amount requested by OFHEO for the year 2001.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, may I point out this has nothing to do with budget restrictions. All of this money will be paid by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and they are in favor of the expenditure. OFHEO is the safety and soundness regulator of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. As such, Congress has charged the agency to reduce the risk of failure of the two companies in order to ensure that they are able to continue their important mission in our

Nation's extremely successful housing and mortgage finance sectors. Although this organization receives its fundings from the companies it regulates and receives no taxpayer dollars, unlike other financial regulators, it is subject to the annual appropriations process.

It is crucial that OFHEO have sufficient capacity to fulfill its safety and soundness oversight responsibilities. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac continue to grow and their operations increasingly are complex. According to this regulatory agency, the two enterprises are currently exposed to more than $2 trillion in credit risk on mortgages. That figure has doubled since 1993. Moreover, this agency is in the process of finalizing its risk-based capital standings. When promulgated later this year, OFHEO will need the resources to enforce them properly.

We need to have a strong independent regulator for the housing government sponsored enterprises. We must also ensure that the regulators have the resources they need to get the job done. As someone who participated in the Congressional debate to resolve the savings & loan crisis, I am acutely aware of the need to protect taxpayers from risk. It is in the public's interest that we maintain a strong regulatory regime over Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. This money will help this agency to achieve this objective.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great respect for the chairman of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member. I know that although, for whatever reason, they have only limited the increase to 15 percent, that when they analyze the $2 trillion potential risk to the United States taxpayers, when they realize that it costs the budget allocation nothing because it is budget neutral, and because Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are in support of their own regulator having more financial reserves to handle the safety and soundness of these two organizations, it would be unreasonable for this Congress not to grant them this requested fund.

So I urge my colleagues on the committee, both the chairman and the ranking member, to realize that to deny a request for approximately $4 million more by the regulators to regulate themselves, to save the exposure of the American taxpayers to $2 trillion of potential risk, and to provide for safety and soundness, would really be an unreasonable decision.

I urge my colleagues, both the chairman and the ranking member, to agree with the Hinchey amendment, that it is reasonable, it is proper, it does not cost the taxpayers a cent, and that it provides for safety and soundness for the American people and for this government. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Hinchey amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I agree with much of what they are saying. I too am a member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. I too am very concerned about the taxpayer exposure that the GSEs provide. I am concerned about the over extension of capital risk. But I believe we are getting the cart in front of the horse on this amendment.

What OFHEO has had is a plus-up of about 15 percent over the last 4 years. OFHEO has met its budget requests over the last 4 years. The issue that we are dealing with in discussing our GSEs, the issue we are dealing with in evaluating contingency taxpayer risk, and the issue that we are dealing with on the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises is changing the structure of the regulator. So if we are to try to pump a 50 percent increase into this current regulator, into OFHEO, it is putting the cart in front of the horse.

What we need to do is pass good authorizing legislation that provides for a strong regulator to catch up with the fact that the GSEs are growing extremely strongly. I believe the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) are really hitting the nail on the head. They are correct in saying that we have to have a strong regulator over the GSEs. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we ought to do so after we have proper authorizing legislation. We ought to do so after we have authorized through the Committee on Banking and Financial Services a proper regulator to do its true job of ensuring taxpayer safety and soundness with respect to these GSEs.

So to give a 50 percent increase to this overseer, to OFHEO, before enacting proper oversight legislation, authorizing legislation, would be a mistake. That is why I think a 15 percent increase is more than enough. Let us pass good authorizing legislation. I urge Members to reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 525, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) will be postponed.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, reverse Robin Hood; robbing from the poor and working people to give tax breaks to the rich. Mr. Chairman, once again the Republican leadership is attempting to cut housing programs that assist our Nation's poorest at the time our country is going through the greatest economic expansion in our national history. It seems to me that we should be doing everything we can to help our citizens move from homelessness to home ownership, and public housing is critical in that transition.

The funding cuts proposed for our Nation's most needy community is simply a disgrace. Among the critical programs that will suffer budget cuts are public housing, drug elimination grants, and CDBG programs. In addition, Brownfields redevelopment, an area of particular concern to me since there is a Superfund site in my area, is being cut by 20 percent of the current level.

Additional cuts made to the Community Development Block Grant Program are an embarrassment. This program is extremely important, one that assists communities to create economic opportunity for residents of poor neighborhoods. It is one of the most flexible of all Federal grant programs and allows States to work with partnerships, with local housing authorities, to develop community and economic development projects. These block grants can be used to rehab housing, provide job training, finance community projects and assist local entrepreneurs to start a new business or shelter the homeless or abused spouses.

Every time I hold a town hall meeting in my district, the issue of housing always comes up. Public housing, elderly housing, those participants cannot be ignored.

I feel it is my responsibility as an elected official to stand up for my constituents and defend their needs. I believe it is the job of Congress to represent those who have little resources, and particularly no voice, not those who can afford the best attorneys and find loopholes in the Tax Code to circumvent their taxes.

This budget is drawn up to benefit the wealthy. Just last week the majority party passed a bill giving estate tax breaks to the wealthiest families with large assets. While the majority party is giving tax cuts to wealthy Americans, even in good economic times the poor continue to suffer, mainly because of unjust funding priorities, such as the one proposed in this bill.

While the President's budget, and I want to commend him, would increase vital infrastructure investments in families and communities, the Republican version of this bill, if passed, would have a devastating impact on these same communities nationwide. In my district, Florida's third, the effects of these cuts will prove disastrous and could reach the millions of dollars.

These families will be devastated, those that rely on public housing. The number of families with worst case housing needs, defined as paying more

than 50 percent of income on rental, remains at an all time high. Furthermore, families in the traditional welfare-to-work have special needs for assistance, as housing is typically the greatest financial burden. Yet this bill strips all funds from welfare to work. Let me repeat that: This bill strips all funds from welfare-to-work.

The slight increase in the VA-HUD bill provided for Section 8 funding does not go far enough, since virtually all of the housing programs designed to help the neediest are being cut.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I like the scripture, ''To whom God has given much, much is expected.'' The people are expecting us to do our job and represent all of the people, not just the wealthy; the elderly, the old people, the people in need, and I am hoping that there will be some leadership from the other side on what is right for the people.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, as we know of no remaining amendments to title II, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 47, line 6, through page 52, line 6, is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

FINANCING ADJUSTMENT FACTORS

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–628; 102 Stat. 3224, 3268) shall be rescinded, or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

FAIR HOUSING AND FREE SPEECH

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2001 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a nonfrivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS GRANTS

SEC. 203. (a) ELIGIBILITY.—Notwithstanding section 854(c)(1)(A) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)(1)(A)), from any amounts made available under this title for fiscal year 2001 that are allocated under such section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall allocate and make a grant, in the amount determined under subsection (b), for any State that—

(1) received an allocation in a prior fiscal year under clause (ii) of such section; and

(2) is not otherwise eligible for an allocation for fiscal year 2001 under such clause (ii) because the areas in the State outside of the metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) in fiscal year 2001 do not have the number of cases of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome required under such clause.

(b) AMOUNT.—The amount of the allocation and grant for any State described in subsection (a) shall be an amount based on the cumulative number of AIDS cases in the areas of that State that are outside of metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) of such section 845(c)(1)(A) in fiscal year 2001, in proportion to AIDS cases among cities and States that qualify under clauses (i) and (ii) of such section and States deemed eligible under subsection (a).

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—Section 856 of the Act is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end:

''(h) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—For purposes of environmental review, a grant under this subtitle shall be treated as assistance for a special project that is subject to section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994, and shall be subject to the regulations issued by the Secretary to implement such section.''.

ENHANCED DISPOSITION AUTHORITY

SEC. 204. Section 204 of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997, is amended by striking ''and 2000'' and inserting ''2000, and thereafter''.

MAXIMUM PAYMENT STANDARD FOR ENHANCED VOUCHERS

SEC. 205. Section 8(t)(1)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting ''and any other reasonable limit prescribed by the Secretary'' immediately before the semicolon.

VOUCHERS FOR DIFFICULT UTILIZATION AREAS

SEC. 206. Section 8(o)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''subparagraph (D)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

''(E) DIFFICULT UTILIZATION AREAS.—

''(i) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish criteria setting forth requirements for treatment of areas as difficult utilization areas with respect to the voucher program under this subsection, which may include criteria specifying a low vacancy rate for rental housing, a particular rate of inflation in rental housing costs, failure to lease units by more than 30 percent of families issued vouchers having an applicable payment standard of 110 percent of the fair market rental or higher, and any other criteria the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(ii) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—Any public housing agency that serves a difficult utilization area may—

''(I) increase the payment standard applicable to all or part of such area for any size of dwelling unit to not more than 150 percent of the fair market rental established under subsection (c) for the same size of dwelling unit in the same market area; and

''(II) use amounts provided for assistance under this section to make payments or provide services to assist families issued vouchers under this subsection to lease suitable housing, except that the cost of any such payments or services for a family may not exceed the agency's average cost per family of 6 months of monthly assistance payments.''.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, $28,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, including hire of passenger vehicles, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, $8,000,000, $5,000,000 of which to remain available until September 30, 2001 and $3,000,000 of which to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

To carry out the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for ES–3, $105,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, of which $5,000,000 shall be for technical assistance and training programs designed to benefit Native American Communities, and up to $9,500,000 may be used for administrative expenses, up to $23,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to $1,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $53,000,000: *Provided further*, That administrative costs of the Technical Assistance Program under section 108, the Training Program under section 109, and the costs of the Native American Lending Study under section 117 shall not be considered to be administrative expenses of the Fund.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate

equivalent to the maximum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, $51,000,000.

Mr. MOLLOHAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill to page 54, line 20 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

OPERATING EXPENSES

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 106–74, the Corporation for National and Community Service shall use such amounts of such funds as may be necessary to carry out the orderly termination of the programs, activities, and initiatives under the National Community Service Act of 1990 (Public Law 103–82) and the Corporation: *Provided*, That such sums shall be utilized to resolve all responsibilities and obligations in connection with said Corporation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARR of California:

Restore funding for Corporation for National and Community Service.

Strike lines 23 on page 54 through line 6 on page 55 and insert the following:

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community service in carrying out programs, activities and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990, $533,700,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 2215

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, it has been a long day and night. I want to say how much I appreciate the good leadership of the chairman in conducting tonight's business.

I rise on a very sad note. It was a note that was just read by the Clerk, that the majority of that party in this House wants to strike all of the funding for the Corporation for National Service.

We have funded, fully funded, an all voluntary military. We have partially funded, and I applaud that, funding for the Peace Corps. But when it gets to supporting our own, ensuring our own domestic tranquility and taking a program that is one of America's most successful, the American Corporation for National Service, or AmeriCorps, we cut the funding to zero.

The time I think has come for Congress to realize the lasting contribution that volunteerism has given to America by fully funding the national service programs. This includes AmeriCorps, the National Senior Service Corps, the Service Learning Programs.

I know the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), cares about this because he served in the Peace Corps at the same time I did, and we know the value of service. That is, as the American Heritage Dictionary reads, to give or to offer to give on one's own initiative.

What we are striking and hopefully refunding tonight is these public-private partnerships that are transforming our communities and successfully challenging our young people to make something of themselves.

As communities and as a Nation, we are stronger and healthier because of these volunteers. They tackle problems like illiteracy in America, crime in America, poverty in America, while instilling a commitment to public service for Americans of all ages in every community throughout this Nation.

Our society works precisely because lots of folks out there are helping other folks in many different ways. In fact, we have a social contract to help each other. In this country, we have young people in need of basic reading and writing skills. We have teenagers in need of mentors and role models. We have homebound seniors in need of food and a little companionship. We have families in need of homes. We have communities in need of disaster assistance.

Solutions to these problems can best be found when individuals, families, and communities come together in service to their neighbors and to their fellow citizens.

We can make a difference, but volunteers are critical to finding these solutions and touching these lives. That is where the Corporation for National Service comes in. AmeriCorps members and service volunteers fill these needs by providing essential people power at the local level.

In my own State of California, we have more than 145,000 people of all ages and backgrounds working in 289 national service projects. Nationwide, we have more than 62,000 Americans serving in AmeriCorps from 1998 to 1999, bringing the total number of current and former members to more than 100,000 Americans who have served in Americorps.

They have taught, tutored, and mentored more than 2.6 million children, served 564,000 at-risk youth in after-school programs, operated 40,500 safety patrols, rehabilitated 25,180 homes, aided more than 2.4 million homeless individuals, and immunized about 500,000 people. They have accomplished this all while generating $1.66 in benefits for each dollar that is spent.

Most people do not know how AmeriCorps operates and assume that some top-down Washington bureaucracy runs the program and deploys members around the country. The opposite is exactly true. AmeriCorps is one of the most successful experiments in State and local control the government has ever supported.

In fact, the bulk of AmeriCorps funding is in the hands of our Nation's Governors, who make grants to local nonprofits in our communities. The nonprofits then select the participants and run the programs.

This is very important because studies have found that people are more likely to volunteer if they know someone who volunteers regularly or who was involved as a youth in organizations using volunteers. AmeriCorps members generate an average of 12 additional volunteers around the Nation. Not only are they helping our communities, they are setting examples for others to follow.

It is critical to recognize that under the leadership of former Senator Harris Wofford, AmeriCorps has embraced its critics and reinvented itself as a leaner, more decentralized, and nonpartisan operation. AmeriCorps has devolved more and more of its authority to States and local nonprofits in recent years, including a major commitment to faith-based institutions.

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

(On request of Mr. MILLER of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FARR of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, about 15 percent of AmeriCorps members serve in faith-based institutions, and the number is growing.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we reclaim the bipartisan tradition and support national service that has long been the hallmark of American politics. Members of Congress now have an opportunity to separate policy from politics, to reach a bipartisan consensus on the value of AmeriCorps.

I might add in closing, Mr. Speaker, this is an election year, and we have 62,000 AmeriCorps volunteers in the field. Each of those has two parents, 120,000 voters, and each has four grandparents; 240,000 people out there who have sons and daughters and relatives that are in the Peace Corps, including staff that are in this room right now whose daughters are serving in AmeriCorps.

We have to get this re-funded. It is absurd that the Republican party has decided to zero out this in our budget.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman very much for his comments on AmeriCorps and for the case that he has made.

It is essentially unbelievable, for those of us who know the role

AmeriCorps plays in so many of our communities, as the gentleman points out, whether it is mentoring our children or helping our communities with substance abuse problems or working with communities to organize themselves and to make positive contributions.

Recently in Vallejo, California, I had a chance to work with our community organization that is funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation called Fighting Back. AmeriCorps volunteers came in to help the community organize neighborhood cleanups and substance abuse programs.

We have worked in a number of different programs around Vallejo. In each case, after we had finished spending the weekend in those communities cleaning up, getting rid of the junk, getting rid of the old cars, getting the shrubbery cut back and all the rest of it, the contacts and the calls to the police department plummeted in those communities.

Where there used to be drug dealing on the street, where there used to be abuse in the families, contacts with criminal activity in the neighborhood, they went down by 30 and 40 percent in those neighborhoods because of the work of the AmeriCorps volunteers to go in, to organize community watch programs, neighborhood watch programs, programs for schoolchildren, programs on substance abuse. There were dramatic changes in these neighborhoods basically run by volunteers with the coordination AmeriCorps brings to those.

Talk about cost-effective, in terms of just the savings to emergency responses, in that one city we are talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars that has been saved in that effort because of AmeriCorps volunteers.

To zero out their funding is just to simply turn our backs on these communities, and to turn our backs on young Americans, for the most part, but older Americans, too, who are doing what we say is the best of what we want in our citizens, and that is to volunteer. These are people who come in and coordinate and get those kinds of community involvement that we all aspire to in our own communities.

So I thank the gentleman very much for raising this issue and discussing this.

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

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FARR of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman too for his statement here tonight. I want to say, I find much the same in the State of Washington in the Tacoma-Bremerton area, that the AmeriCorps volunteers are doing an outstanding job working with young people in after-school programs, working with people, juvenile offenders.

It is a program that I think has tremendous credibility. I think Harris Wofford has done a great job of it. I am just shocked that again, for partisan reasons, I guess, because people do not like the President, we are cutting out a program that has tremendous merit.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, they have totally zeroed out this program. I ask the gentleman from California (Mr. WALSH) as chairman of this committee, when he goes into conference to fight as hard to get this reestablished as he did to get the Peace Corps funded, as I did to get the Peace Corps funded.

We cannot just have a foreign Peace Corps and not have a domestic Peace Corps. This is absolutely essential to America to give youth a chance. To give America a chance to invest in an ounce of prevention, which is all these Members of Congress have said, is certainly worth a pound of cure.

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, for many years I have supported the Youth Conservation Corps, which has been a tremendous organization. Our national parks, our national forests, the Fish and Wildlife Service, these young people are out there doing tremendously credible things in our public lands.

Again, this is a program that we had to fight to save during the Reagan and Bush administrations. For some reason, these programs get targeted when we need to be doing these things. We need to be cleaning up these areas.

The Campaign to Keep America Beautiful has kind of fallen on deaf ears here in this new generation. We need to explain to people again how important that is, and here are our young people out there doing this good work.

I am stunned that we are again trying to take the funding out for this program. I think it is one of the President's finest accomplishments.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If the gentleman will continue to yield, earlier this evening some were fortunate enough to go over to the Library of Congress and listen to a young teacher, the California teacher of the year.

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

(On request of Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FARR of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, she was head of the New York corporation, the Americorps Corporation. I believe the gentleman was from Buffalo. They had been taking about what they had been able to do in terms of AmeriCorps volunteers in the classrooms to help with these difficult schools, to help with students and to reclaim these students' lives because of the attention these AmeriCorps volunteers were able to provide, two young students who were turning their lives around.

She wrote a rather remarkable book about the Freedom Riders and what happened in Long Beach, and she is now out replicating that in schools of education and with AmeriCorps volunteers all across the country.

Yet, we are saddled this evening with seeing that is zeroed out, and obviously it is a national program zeroed out in this budget, zeroed out in California, in New York, in the State of Washington. It is a tragedy that we would not capitalize on the resources that these young people in the Americorps Corporation bring to civic life in America. I thank the gentleman again for raising this issue.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership.

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand the constraints under which the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) is working, and commend him for doing a very admirable job under difficult circumstances. However, I am deeply concerned about a number of programs reduced or eliminated in this bill.

Of greatest concern to me, this legislation would terminate most programs under the Corporation for National Service, including AmeriCorps. As a fiscal conservative, I believe national service is one of the wisest and least costly investments our government can make. Every $1 spent on AmeriCorps generates $1.66 in benefits to the community. Every full-time AmeriCorps members generates an average of 12 additional volunteers.

AmeriCorps is one of the most successful experiments in State and local controls the Federal government has embarked upon: Two-thirds of AmeriCorps' funding goes directly to the Governor-appointed State commissions, which then make grants to local nonprofits.

Since 1994, more than 150,000 Americans have served as AmeriCorps members in all 50 States. They have taught, tutored, or mentored more than 2.5 million students, recruited, supervised, or trained more than 1.6 million volunteers, built or rehabilitated more than 25,000 homes, provided living assistance to more than 208,000 senior citizens, and planted more than more than 52 million trees.

AmeriCorps Members are not only helping meet the immediate needs in our communities, they are also teaching through their example the importance of serving and helping others.

As a former Peace Corps volunteer, I know the significance of this long-lasting lesson. Our youth want so desperately to take hold of their destiny

and work to ensure a brighter and more prosperous future. There is so much they can do. All they need is the opportunity.

Secondly, I am troubled by proposed cuts in the community development block grant program, CDBG, which would be funded at $4.5 billion, a level $300 million below fiscal year 2000, despite a 417 to 8 vote by this House on H.R. 1776 to increase this program's authorization to $4.9 billion.

□ 2230

CDBG is the largest source of Federal community development assistance to State and local governments. It is one of the most flexible, most successful programs the Federal Government administers. The CDBG program puts development funds where they can most effectively be allocated: in local communities. Communities may use CDBG money for a variety of community development activities, including housing, community development, economic development and public service activities.

The bottom line for me, Mr. Chairman, in closing, is I believe strongly in AmeriCorps. I regret it is not in the bill. I understand why it was not placed in the bill, because some Members on either side of the aisle will decide to fund veterans programs or some other program and offset it with the National Service Programs, and Republicans and Democrats alike will vote for a veterans program over this.

But this program, like veterans programs, has its place. And I hope and I expect when we vote out this bill and the conference committee meets, that we will see the CDBG money restored and AmeriCorps and the National Service Program restored. If it is not, I would vote against the conference report. But I do intend to vote out this bill, hopefully this evening or tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in strong support of the AmeriCorps program.

I rise in strong support of the countless volunteers that are working on teaching projects, projects for the homeless, projects for the environment across the country, and I rise in strong support of a program that is working extremely well.

Mr. Chairman, as we look for ways to solve some of the problems in America, many of us so-called new Democrats have looked for ways to delegate responsibility at the State or the local level, but to give them some of the resources at the local level, whether it be in education, whether it be working with existing infrastructure or with people at the local level to try to solve some of these vexing and difficult problems.

We have come up with a very, very innovative and now successful program called AmeriCorps that gives money at the Federal level not to a 10-story building in Washington, D.C. but to local communities and volunteers in places like South Bend, Indiana, and Elkhart, Indiana, and Mishawaka, Indiana that are working with the homeless on a day-to-day basis to try to teach the homeless every-day skills; balancing their checkbooks, taking care of their children, working to solve some of the personal and faith-based problems that they experience as individuals. This is taking place in South Bend, Indiana at the Center for the Homeless, and it is also in conjunction with AmeriCorps that is funded at the Federal level.

This program should not be zeroed out by this budget because we are doing exactly what the American people want us to do: Solve problems with local people at the local level. Not with big bureaucracy, not with 10 story buildings in Washington, D.C., not with committees in Congress, but with local people with strong hands and big hearts.

We also have a program, Mr. Chairman, at the University of Notre Dame called the Alliance for Catholic Education. And there we are working with both Catholic schools and the public school system in South Bend to recruit teachers, something every community in America is having problems with, and getting these teachers through the University of Notre Dame with advanced degrees in teaching; having them teach in the summer school in South Bend, Indiana to students that are having problems learning, that might fall behind; helping them with remediation and tutoring skills. And then these teachers go on to 12 States across the south to teach in schools in very poor areas where they cannot recruit teachers to teach math and science and technology. Some of those are Catholic schools.

What a fantastic partnership between the Federal Government, local public schools and parochial schools in poor inner-city areas. That is AmeriCorps. That is working in South Bend and branching out to 12 States. We should not cut it. We should support it. And I would encourage my colleagues in Congress in a bipartisan way to fight hard to restore these funds in conference for a very successful program at the local level.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of budget totals for fiscal year 2001 on June 20, 2000, House Report 106–683. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee suballocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the Act.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is authoritatively guided by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to section 312 of the Budget Act, that an amendment providing any net increase in new discretionary budget authority would cause a breach of the pertinent allocation of such authority. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California would increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill. As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act. The point of order is, therefore, sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $5,000,000.

COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 7251–7298, $12,500,000, of which $895,000, shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102–229.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to explain to the House that we have reached an agreement, both sides, on the continued debate of this bill, and I would just like to make sure everyone is aware that there will be no further votes this evening. We will take up the VA-HUD bill tomorrow after the conclusion of the debate on the WTO.

We have agreement on all amendments, all points of order are protected, we have time for all the amendments, and we will be coming in at 9 a.m. to work on WTO. Once that is concluded, we will work on the VA-HUD. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and I have agreed to try to conclude debate on the VA-HUD bill by 9:00 p.m. tomorrow evening.

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

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), has stated the agreement as we understand it. All amendments that are going to be in order tomorrow are contained in the unanimous consent agreement and associated with each amendment is a time certain for debate. We will have no objection to the unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $17,949,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, $60,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended, and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, $70,000,000, to be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund Trust Fund pursuant to section 517(a) of SARA (26 U.S.C. 9507), to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That not withstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited health care providers: *Provided further*, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during the fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $650,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2002.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the VA–HUD appropriations bill and its inadequate funding levels for our nation's housing need.

The bill currently provides $2.5 billion less than the President's request and would underfund almost every program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

This inadequate funding would severely impact our nation's communities and roll back much of the progress we have made towards making affordable housing and economic development opportunities available to all Americans.

As the nation enjoys its longest sustained economic boom, now is the time to meet our critical housing needs and fully fund our housing services and programs—not neglect them.

I have deep concerns about this bill because, among other things, it:

Fails to fund the administration's request for 120,000 rental assistance vouchers. This includes 10,000 vouchers to construct the first affordable housing units for families since 1996.

It cuts the President's proposed funding levels for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program by almost $400 million, and it fails to provide funding for America's Private Investment Companies (APIC) which stimulate private investment in distressed communities.

These are just a few examples of how the VA–HUD bill in front of us today short changes the millions of lower income Americans who critically need the assistance provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

We can and must do better. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this inadequate bill.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with regard to the establishment of an outpatient clinic in the Seventh Congressional District of Georgia. There are more than 670,000 veterans in Georgia, and a significant number live in the Seventh Congressional District 55,000 veterans live in Cobb County alone. Some 4,000 of these veterans utilize the veterans health care system. The nearest clinic is on the east side of Atlanta, which means the veterans who reside in the western part of my congressional district must travel up to 70 miles each way, to get VA medical attention. This is an extremely long distance to travel for any type of medical care. It is even more of a hardship for the elderly, sick or those who cannot drive themselves.

On September 9, 1999, the House of Representatives considered the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriation bill for Fiscal Year 2000, H.R. 2684. During that debate, Chairman WALSH and I had a colloquy, in which he pledged his support to assist me in establishing an outpatient clinic in the congressional district. I want to take this opportunity to thank the Chairman for all his assistance with regard to the establishment of this outpatient clinic.

On September 27, 1999, Chairman WALSH wrote me a letter stating that, ''the establishment of an outpatient clinic is the decision of the local VISN Director based on resources and need. We will make inquiries to the VA and the Director of VISN regarding the situation in your district.'' In addition, to follow-up on that pledge the Subcommittee conference report to H.R. 2684 included the following provision: ''the conferees direct the VA to submit a report on access to medical care and community-based outpatient clinics in Georgia 7th Congressional District 30 days after the enactment of this bill.'' President Bill Clinton signed this legislation on October 20, 1999.

On January 14, 2000, I met with R.A. Perreault, Director of the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Georgia, who pledged his support to establish an Outpatient Clinic in the Seventh Congressional District in Fiscal Year 2000. In addition, on January 27, 2000, the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Subcommittees sent to my congressional office a document entitled ''Access to Care in Georgia 7th Congressional District'' from the Department of Veterans Affairs. This evaluation stated:

[W]ithin the past year, there has been significant amount of interest from Congressman Barr on the implementation of a Community Based Outpatient Clinic in the 7th Congressional District of Georgia . . . the VISN 7 Primary Care Service Line recently completed an evaluation of potential sites for future CBOCs using specific criteria . . . a proposed CBOC in Cobb County has been identified as a high priority and is noted in the Strategic Plan.

As you are aware, the VA has a goal of improving access to care and timeliness of service. The VISN 7 has set aside funds to be used to activate additional CBOCs in fiscal years 2000 and 2001. The proposed Cobb County CBOC is planned for a fiscal year 2000 activation. The VA notes in its report, future decisions regarding the implementation of new initiatives will continue to be based in part on the budget forecast. The report states, ''the opening of additional CBOCs remains subject to the availability of funds and other significant factors.''

The Atlanta office of the Department of Veterans Affairs has already approved the facility and I am pleased to announce to Chairman WALSH, and the Members of the House of Representatives, that in the next several weeks an outpatient clinic will open in the Seventh Congressional District in Georgia.

Given the large number of veterans in the western and northern parts of the 7th District, I pledge to continue working with the Chairman, and with the Department, to build additional outpatient clinics in the 7th District; including near the I–20 corridor to the west of Atlanta, and northwest of Atlanta along the I–75 corridor.

These clinics are a win-win; they save money, and they are a tremendous benefit to our veterans.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4635) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs

and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4635, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4635 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 525, no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except:

(1) Pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

(2) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

Ms. KAPTUR regarding VA Mental Illness Research;

Mr. PASCRELL regarding VA Right to Know Act;

Mr. SAXTON regarding EPA Estuary Funding;

Mr. ROEMER regarding Space Station; and

The amendments printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17, 33, 41 and 43;

(3) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes:

Mr. EDWARDS regarding VA Health and Research; and

The amendments printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 23, 34, and 35; and

(4) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes:

Mr. OBEY regarding National Science Foundation;

Mr. COLLINS regarding Clean Air;

Mr. BOYD regarding FEMA;

Mr. OLVER regarding the Kyoto Protocol; and

The amendments printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 3, 4, 24, 25, and 39.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, and shall be considered as read. Each additional amendment shall be debatable for the time specified equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; shall not be subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan agreement was joined with the proviso that we complete our work on the bill by 9:00 p.m. tomorrow evening.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2000

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2345

CONGRATULATING THE LOS ANGELES LAKERS ON THEIR VICTORY

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to congratulate the Los Angeles Lakers for a job well done last night.

As we can see on the sports page of the L.A. Times, it says ''Great Lakers.'' I agree. I am one of the Members who represent Los Angeles, and we were all proud when they brought home the victory last night.

Mr. Speaker, before this playoff season started, my dear friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), got on the floor and said that the Indiana Pacers would win, that the L.A. Lakers would not get the championship.

I only want to say to him that I told him that night that I would give him a tissue, but instead I am going to give him this ball. Hopefully, the Pacers will bounce back next year. That is, if they are not playing the Lakers.

Go Lakers.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ALLEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BRADY of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DRUG ABUSE AND ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 35 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, tonight is Tuesday night and it is the night that I reserve to come before the House on the issue of illegal narcotics and how the problem of drug abuse and illegal narcotics affects our Nation and the impact that illegal narcotics has upon our society, this Congress, and the American people.

Tonight I want to provide a brief update of some of the information that we have obtained. Our subcommittee, which I am privileged to chair, the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, has as one of its primary charters and responsibilities to help develop a coherent policy, at least from the perspective of the House of Representatives, and working with the other body, the United States Senate and also the White House, the administration, to come up with a coherent strategy to deal with the problem of drug abuse and illegal narcotics.

I have often cited on the floor the impact which really knows no boundaries today in the United States. Almost every family is affected in some way by drug abuse, illegal narcotics, or the ravages of drug-related overdose and death.

I have cited a most recent statistic, which is 15,973 Americans died in 1998, the last figures we have total for drug-related deaths. And according to our drug czar, Barry McCaffrey, who testified before our subcommittee, over

52,000 Americans died in the last recorded year of drug-related deaths either directly or indirectly.

We do not know the exact figure because sometimes a child who is beaten to death by a parent who is on illegal narcotics is not counted as a victim. Sometimes a spouse who is abused to the point of death is not counted as a victim. Sometimes a bus driver who is on an illegal narcotic that has had a fatal vehicle crash, the number of victims there are not counted in the tally. But we do know the total is dramatic.

This past week our subcommittee had the opportunity to hear from the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta and officials came in and briefed our subcommittee, some of the Members in the House, about some of the most recent findings. And the findings are quite alarming, particularly among our young people.

They confirm what most Americans know and what many parents fear, that illegal narcotics are more prevalent on our society. The study that they reviewed for the members of the subcommittee revealed, in fact, that there have been some dramatic increases in drug use and abuse among our young people.

I brought tonight some charts from that study and also from a study on national youth risk behavior. This shows the percentage of high school students who have used methamphetamines, some figures that show in 9th grade we were up to 6.3 percent, in 10th grade 9.3 percent, 11th grade 10 percent, and 12th grade 11½ percent.

These are pretty dramatic figures when we stop and think that we are talking about young people and having as high a percentage as we have reported here have used methamphetamine. And methamphetamine, if my colleagues are not familiar with methamphetamine, can be more damaging and create more bizarre behavior than the crack epidemic that we had in the 1980s. To have these percentages of our young people having experimented or used methamphetamine is quite disturbing.

The other thing many people do not realize about methamphetamine is methamphetamine does an incredible job of destroying the brain and it is not a drug which allows you to have some replenishing of damaged brain cells. It is not a narcotic that leaves temporary damage. Methamphetamine induces an almost Parkinson's-like damage to the brain and does incredible damage and results in bizarre behavior.

Now, we have conducted hearings throughout the United States, some in California, some in Louisiana. Next Monday we will be in Sioux City, Iowa, the heartland of America, which is also experiencing an incredible methamphetamine epidemic. That area has been hit by Mexican methamphetamines and we have reports again of incredible numbers people throughout the Midwest, the far West, now in the South and East, who are falling victim to methamphetamine.

This chart should be a shocker to every parent out in America, to every Member of Congress who sees this. These are some pretty dramatic figures. When we stop and consider that these figures really were not even registering some 6 or 7 years ago, there was almost no meth available, shows that we have got to do a better job of first of all controlling the substance, law enforcement going after those who traffic in this deadly substance.

Also, it is absolutely incumbent that we do a better job in educating our young people and preventing people from getting hooked on this drug. Now, getting hooked on drugs is bad enough. But this drug does incredible damage, as I said.

We have had Dr. Leschner, who heads up the National Institute of Drug Abuse, testify before our subcommittee about the permanent damage that is done to the brain with this drug. This is not a question of addiction or use a little and come out of it. This is a question of becoming a victim of this. And the question of addiction is really too late for those who get on methamphetamine. There is no recovery. There is no turning back. Because they have induced some incredible damage to their brain and to their ability to function as a normal human being.

□ 2300

Addiction and treatment might sound good and well-intended, but in fact methamphetamine is the end of the road for many people. Again this is absolutely a disturbing chart and figure to show us that 11.5 percent of our 12th graders are now reported having ever used methamphetamine, a shocking figure.

Another figure that we have from 1991–1992 during the beginning of this administration, we had about 2 percent of our high school students being reported as using cocaine. That figure in 1999 is now up to 4 percent, a 100 percent increase in cocaine use among our young people. This again is another dramatic increase in a hard and a very destructive narcotic. These figures are reported to us again last week by CDC and indicate a disturbing trend. This is in spite of the Congress, Republican and Democrat efforts to put together a massive educational campaign, $1 billion in public funding over a 3-year period supplemented by $1 billion in donated service and time toward that effort, so a multi-billion-dollar education campaign. I know some of my colleagues have seen those ads on television but quite frankly with the results that we are experiencing with our young people, we are missing the target. We see a dramatic increase in cocaine use, particularly among our young people, a skyrocketing figure for methamphetamine, both shocking for parents and again Members of Congress who have attempted, I think, to stem some of this illegal narcotics abuse.

This is the percentage of high school students who ever used cocaine from 1993. From the beginning of this administration to the current time we see a doubling in use, another dramatic figure. Somehow the message must have gotten lost in this period here, the beginning of this administration, that illegal narcotics were something that could be tolerated and possibly used and that is unfortunate that any message that condoned or gave any message other than ''Just Say No.'' Actually we have had incredible results from that lack of a direct specific message. A doubling again of the percentage of high school students who have ever used cocaine, disturbing, I am sure, to parents in the latest statistic we have from the Centers for Disease Control.

I think this next chart and again this information is provided to us by the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta to our subcommittee last week is another startling figure. Go back to 1991–1992. Thirty-one percent of the students had used marijuana in that period. Now we have almost half of the students reported last week, 1997–1999 have used marijuana. Many people refer to marijuana as a soft drug and maybe some of the boomers who used marijuana in college or in school in the 1960s and 1970s were not much affected by use of marijuana. Unfortunately, the marijuana that is on the streets today has very high levels of purity. We have some testimony in our subcommittee about the damage that the current high purity marijuana does to young people. I was shocked to learn, also, from NIDA, our National Institute of Drug abuse, that marijuana is now the most addictive narcotic. Even though it is again commonly referred to as a soft drug, it is the most addictive drug and it is also referred to as a gateway drug. So young people who think it is fashionable to use marijuana are on the increase. It is unfortunate that this administration gave sort of a ''Just Say Maybe'' policy with the appointment of a liberal and I think mixed message chief health officer of the United States and that officer was Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders and she said just say maybe. I do not think that the President of the United States really showed the leadership and provided the direction to get the message out to our young people about the problem of illegal narcotics use. That actually I think has been substantiated by a little research we did.

I mentioned last week, and we only had 15 minutes of special order last week, that a lady had come up to me during one of our recent visits home and she said, ''I have never heard President Clinton talk about the war on drugs.'' Out of curiosity, I had our staff run a tally of all of the public recorded accounts. I think most people have a computer or access to Nexus research which has most of the public statements recorded there can plug in ''President Clinton'' and then ''the war

on drugs.'' What was absolutely startling is the President has referred to the war on drugs eight times, you can count it on just eight fingers, since he took office in public recorded statements, he has referred to the war on drugs. Basically what happened in 1992–1993 is we closed down the war on drugs.

If we take another chart and look at the drug use and abuse and prevalence particularly among our young people, we see a decline in the Bush and the Reagan administration, and then we see an incline during this administration, the administration tolerating this use, and it is recorded again in the drug figures that we see, some of them nearly doubling in drug use and abuse.

If methamphetamine, marijuana and cocaine are not bad enough, we see some dramatic increases in suburban teen heroin use. These statistics were just provided last month, in May. It shows that we have risen in suburban teen use from 500,000 in 1996 to nearly 1 million in 1999, a startling figure for one of the drugs again that is about as deadly as you can find on the streets across this land. The purity levels of the heroin that we are finding are not the purity levels again of the 1970s and 1980s. These drugs, this heroin is a deadly substance, sometimes 70 plus percent purity level. That is why we have incredible overdose deaths from heroin that is on the street today, another dramatic figure and another dramatic increase in a particularly deadly illegal narcotic.

One of the myths that we often hear and we had a debate on the House floor about whether we should restart the war on drugs. Again, I must point out to my colleagues that in fact the war on drugs was closed down by the Clinton administration in 1993. The Democrat-controlled House of Representatives, the Senate, and the White House from 1993 to 1995 did inestimable damage to what had formerly been a formal and organized war on drugs. They cut the source country program stopping drugs in a cost-effective manner at their source, certainly a Federal responsibility. They took the military out of the interdiction, and that was mainly a surveillance role in finding drugs and spotting drugs as they came from the source countries, certainly a role that local and State law enforcement cannot do, a responsibility of the Federal Government to protect us from a danger coming towards our border.

□ 2310

They closed down and cut these programs by 50 percent, took the military out or deployed the military and other deployments around the globe, and what happened really was an emphasis to move toward treatment. They started putting all of the eggs in the treatment basket.

I often think of what they did as a little bit like fighting World War II or any armed conflict that we have been in. Can you imagine not going after the enemy; not going after the source of the destruction, the enemy's reigning on us? That is basically the strategy that was adopted, a strange strategy that actually said let us just treat the wounded in battle.

Of course, the policy and the legislation adopted by this Congress under the control of the democratic majority from 1992 to 1995 put the money into treatment, and we can see the trend. We often hear this debate, oh, we need to just treat people. We can treat our way out of this problem.

This is a chart that I had staff graph for us, and it shows Federal drug treatment has dramatically increased. We go up here to the period of 1992–1993, right in here, a steady amount of money going up, a little bit of leveling off during the takeover of the Republican control. Even under the Republican control, I am told in the last several years, we, the majority side, have increased treatment spending some 26 percent just in this period of time.

We have had a dramatic increase in treatment. The problem is we have an incredible addiction population, so we are getting more wounded in the battle, but not fighting the battle on all the fronts that are particularly a Federal obligation and cannot be fought by local or state officials.

This, again, I think debunks some of the myths that are out there that we do not spend enough money on treatment. We have doubled, in some cases tripled, the amount of money on treatment, and we have an incredibly larger and larger addicted population. Unfortunately, I do not think people pay much attention to what it means to be addicted. Once you get addicted, your chances of being cured are, at very best, with hard narcotics, about 50 percent.

Unfortunately, we have a 60 percent to 70 percent failure rate in our treatment programs that are public. The faith based and some of the other private treatment programs are much more successful. I will talk about Baltimore, which has one of the biggest addicted populations in the country, partly a direct result of a liberal drug policy, a policy where they have needle exchange, a policy where the former police chief had said, well, we are not going to enforce, not going after all the drug markets. We are not going to enforce the law. We are not going to take advantage of Federal law enforcement assistance to go after drug dealers and pushers and traffickers.

That policy has had a very dramatic effect in Baltimore. Baltimore, in fact, has had a steady number of murders which have exceeded 300 for each of the past recent years, while other areas like New York, with a zero tolerance policy, like Richmond, with the Project Exile going after tough enforcement, have cut the murders by some 50 percent in those cities and even more dramatically.

The zero tolerance policies, and we will show them, and the facts support this, it is not something I am making up, have worked and cut drug abuse and crime at every level across the board.

The tolerant liberal, the nonenforcement attitude of Baltimore has resulted in a disaster for that city by any measure, by deaths. The number of addicts in Baltimore have jumped, according to one city council person who has said publicly, 1 in 8 in the population, that is some 60,000 to 80,000 heroin and drug addicts in Baltimore as a result of a liberal policy, as a result of lack of enforcement, as a result of only going to a policy of treatment.

It has not worked. It does not work. And this is the path that we have been headed on, as far as Federal policy. This is an interesting chart that we had the staff make up, and we wanted to put altogether in one chart what we are doing with treatment.

People say we are not spending enough money again in treatment. This line here, this blue line shows treatment. It shows that on a steady increase we see what has happened in interdiction, dramatic decreases. They start in the period of the Clinton administration, where a Democrat-controlled House and Senate, the White House making a policy to cut interdiction.

These are international programs, that would be stopping drugs at their source; that is also cut. If we look at where we are heading, we are trying to get back to the 1992–1993 levels in terms of those dollars of that time in spending in international programs, again, stopping drugs at their source and also in the interdiction, getting the intelligence information.

If we have intelligence on people who are trafficking in narcotics, and it is real information, it is accurate information, we can go after those who are dealing in that death and destruction. When we cut that out, we have an incredible volume of illegal narcotics coming into the United States, and that is exactly what has happened now.

To compound the problem, what has happened is our major operations center for our illegal narcotics advance work for surveillance, going after drug traffickers was basically closed down last May 1 when the administration failed to negotiate with Panama for not keeping our military base open, but keeping our forward drug surveillance operations operating in Panama.

General Wilhelm who is in charge of our Southern Command. The Southern Command overlooks the drug production and trafficking zone. General Wilhelm provided our subcommittee a letter last week and said we are down to about a third of our former capability prior to the time that we had Panama open and the main center of operations for forward-operating locations.

This chart does again debunk that we are not concentrating on treatment. Certainly, we have put a ton of money in treatment. It is doubled as we saw from the other one. Where we have lost

the momentum is going after these huge supplies of illegal narcotics, both at their source and on the way to our shores.

□ 2320

Now, one of the things that we know is where these narcotics are coming from. This is not rocket science, it does not require a Ph.D. or a lot of study. We knew that in 1993, when this administration took over, that we had 90 percent of the cocaine coming from Bolivia, Peru, a tiny bit from Colombia. This chart shows Colombia and Andean cocaine production. This shows Colombia here, and you see very little produced, 1991–1992. These figures have not been doctored in any way. This is just graphing cocaine production in that era. Almost none in Colombia, most of it was coming from Peru, up here, and from Bolivia, about 90 percent of it.

The former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, and Mr. Zeliff, who came in immediately before him and had assumed the responsibility for helping develop a drug strategy under the new majority, said we know where these narcotics are coming from. Let us take a few dollars and put it in going after the drugs at their source. That is what was done in 1995 by the new majority.

We targeted three areas, Peru, Colombia and Bolivia. That is because those are the only places where they produce cocaine. We were able to establish programs in Peru and Bolivia with the cooperation of President Fujimori, which this administration has trashed recently and who won a legitimate reelection, and still this administration trashed. I can tell you, having gone to Lima, Peru, and visited Peru before President Fujimori took over, there was absolute chaos in the country. The production of narcotics was running rampant, terrorists were killing and maiming in the villages, the City of Lima was understood under siege, and President Fujimori went after the drug traffickers, shot down those that deal with death and destruction and drugs, and brought that country to the order and the prosperity it is now seeing. He, in fact, with a little tiny bit of our aid, just several millions of dollars, took Peru from a major producer down by some 50 percent reduction, in fact a 65 percent reduction is our latest figure, in cocaine production in Peru.

Bolivia, with the help of President Banzer, who took over, and we went down and discussed these programs, a little bit of assistance, some crop alternatives so the peasants would be growing something other than coca, and those programs work. There has been more than a 50 percent reduction in Bolivia of cocaine.

We pleaded with this administration to get aid and assistance to Colombia, the other producing area, and on every occasion the President blocked aid to Colombia; on every occasion the State Department thwarted our efforts to get even a few helicopters up into the Andean region to go after the coca that was being produced, and, if you want to get into heroin, there was no heroin produced to speak of in 1992–1993, the beginning of this administration.

So the direct policy of this administration and the liberals in the Congress helped make Colombia the producer of 80 to 90 percent of the cocaine in 6 years, and probably 75 percent of the heroin in 6 years. Until early this spring, the President and this administration never brought before the Congress any type of cooperative plan to deal with the situation in Colombia. Unfortunately, now it has caught up in the legislative process.

I call on my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to bring this forth. This plan works. This is not, again, rocket science. We can stop hard drugs from coming into our borders. We are not going to stop all of them, but this shows exactly what has taken place, and I think one of the most graphic portrayals that has been produced from our subcommittee.

Again, this should be the ''chart of shame'' for this administration and the policies of the other side. This shows in 1993 the production of cocaine and heroine produced in Colombia. 1993, almost nothing for cocaine. For heroin, in 1993, almost none produced in Colombia. Now it produces 75 percent.

Congratulations to the Clinton Administration. This is a great legacy, that you have managed to concentrate the drug production of two of the most deadly drugs in nearly 7 years here in one country in which you have blocked any assistance. It is an incredible legacy, and, unfortunately, it has resulted in a rash of epidemics of the use of these, particularly, as I just cited, according to the CDC report we got last week, among our young people, an incredible volume being produced in those countries.

Again, this is not rocket science. We know where it is coming from. We know heroin is coming out of Colombia, 75 percent being used in the United States. We know that by any seizure that is done around the United States.

Madam Speaker, to wind this up, we do need a bipartisan and cooperative effort. We must learn by the mistakes that have been made. We must learn by putting together a plan that does work and move forward with it. Next week, hopefully, we will have an hour to tell the rest of the story, as Paul Harvey says.

MOVING THE ACCESSION OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA TO THE WTO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, on the eve of last year's meeting of the World Trade Organization in Seattle, I was joined by 11 of my colleagues in this House on a bipartisan basis in calling on U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky to help move the accession of the Republic of Armenia to the WTO. Recently the Trade Representative's office provided me with an update on the administration's negotiations with Armenia for its accession to the WTO. In his letter, Trade Representative official Richard W. Fisher indicates that the United States strongly supports Armenia's WTO membership and its integration into the world economy.

Quoting from Mr. Fisher's letter, ''Armenia has made impressive progress on economic reform and transition to a market economy under very difficult economic circumstances. We believe that Armenia's implementation of WTO provisions will facilitate further progress towards increased investment and economic growth and that its acceptance of WTO market access commitments will foster Armenia's further integration into the global trading system.''

□ 2330

Madam Speaker, the letter goes on to state that, ''In the last year, Armenia has made substantial progress in its negotiations to complete the accession process, both with the United States and with other WTO members. Market access negotiations on tariffs, services, and agricultural supports are very close to completion, and Armenia has reported that its efforts to enact legislation to implement WTO provisions are also in the last stages.''

Mr. Fisher notes that WTO delegations will meet in July to further assess Armenia's progress, and that the administration shares the goal of many of us in Congress that these negotiations be completed as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker, this is certainly very encouraging news. Since achieving its independence about a decade ago, Armenia has sought to integrate its economy with its immediate neighbors, as well as with the larger world.

While Armenia has achieved strong bilateral ties with the United States, Europe, and other regions of the world, unfortunately achieving economic integration in its immediate neighborhood has proven more difficult, through no fault of Armenia's, I should add.

Armenia's neighbors to the west, Turkey, and to the east, Azerbaijan, continue to maintain devastating economic blockades. Armenia has sought to normalize relations with its neighbors, but has been snubbed.

Still, despite the isolation imposed on this small landlocked Nation by hostile neighbors, Armenia endeavors to become an integral part of the world community through a range of international organizations, including NATO's Partnership for Peace program and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE, among others.

What Armenia needs most is economic development. Membership in the

WTO will help Armenia attract investment and reach new markets under a predictable international framework.

Madam Speaker, economic development for Armenia over the longer term will be based on that Nation's ability to establish trading networks, attract investment, and enact the kinds of free market economic policies that foster sustained prosperity.

Armenia's elected leaders know this, but in the shorter term, Armenia still needs the kind of assistance that a great Nation like the United States can provide. In the immediate years after independence, as Armenia coped with the effects of blockades and the destruction wrought by a devastating earthquake, there was a crying need for direct humanitarian assistance. In the years since, the thrust of assistance has shifted to development aid.

In order to help Armenia achieve self-sufficiency, the United States must continue to provide developmental and humanitarian assistance. We must also use our influence to bring about regional integration and confidence-building measures that will help Armenia and its neighbors achieve stability and become full-fledged members of the emerging global economy.

We must also do more to resolve the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict, recognizing the legitimate security and self-determination needs of the Karabagh people. This will create the kind of stability that lends itself to economic development.

Madam Speaker, I just wanted to say lastly this evening that I am encouraged by the support that the administration has demonstrated in helping Armenia's accession to the WTO. I will keep the pressure on the administration to help in the other areas through direct assistance and in fostering regional stability. That will make this anticipated accession to the WTO meaningful in the lives of the people of Armenia.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0010

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4690, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–684) on the resolution (H. Res. 529) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4690) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4516, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–685) on the resolution (H. Res. 530) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOLLOHAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KNOLLENBERG) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BRADY OF TEXAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON OF INDIANA, for 5 minutes, June 27.

Mr. ADERHOLT, for 5 minutes, June 21.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 101. Recognizing the 225th birthday of the United States Army.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 21, 2000, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the first quarter of 2000, by Committees of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
David Adams	1/5	1/7	Ecuador		301.00						301.00
	1/16	1/18	Venezuela		525.40						525.40
	1/18	1/19	Colombia		193.00						193.00
	1/19	1/20	Guatemala		140.00						140.00
	1/20	1/22	Mexico		442.00						442.00
Hon. Cass Ballenger	1/16	1/18	Venezuela		60.00						60.00
	1/18	1/19	Colombia		193.00				[3] 942.00		1,135.00
	1/19	1/20	Guatemala		92.35						92.35
	1/20	1/22	Mexico		100.00						100.00
Paul Berkowitz	1/3	1/7	India		1,263.00		173.00				1,436.00
	1/8	1/10	Philippines		732.00						732.00
	1/11	1/14	New Zealand		644.00						644.00
Commercial airfare							8,914.03				8,914.03
Nancy S. Bloomer	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Kevin Brady	1/12	1/15	Belgium		755.90						755.90

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2000—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Commercial airfare							6,597.26				6,597.26
Sean Carroll	1/15	1/18	Venezuela		765.85						765.85
	1/18	1/20	Colombia		386.00						386.00
	2/11	2/13	Haiti		369.00						369.00
Commercial airfare							1,166.80				1,166.80
Hon. William Delahunt	1/15	1/18	Venezuela		311.50						311.50
	1/18	1/20	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Commercial airfare							1,347.80				1,347.80
Nisha Desai	1/6	1/7	Holland								
	1/7	1/15	India		2,238.00						2,238.00
Commercial airfare							7,052.63				7,052.63
Mike Ennis	1/8	1/13	Korea		772.00						772.00
	1/13	1/17	Vietnam		636.00						636.00
	1/17	1/20	Hong Kong		929.00						929.00
Commercial airfare							5,797.40				5,797.40
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	2/11	2/13	Haiti		369.00						369.00
David Fite	1/8	1/13	Korea		934.00						934.00
Commercial airfare							3,814.80				3,814.80
Ricahrd J. Garon	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Sam Gejdenson	1/6	1/7	Holland								
	1/7	1/14	India		2,137.00				[3] 2,451.41		4,588.41
Commercial airfare							6,730.63				6,730.63
Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00				[3] 12,785.48		13,143.48
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00				[2] 7,392.00		8,008.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00				[3] 12,670.69		13,460.69
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00				[3] 11,271.87		11,789.87
Charisse Glassman	1/5	1/7	Papua New Guinea		348.81						348.81
	1/7	1/8	Australia		258.00						258.00
	1/8	1/9	New Zealand		73.00						73.00
	1/9	1/13	Australia		894.00						894.00
Commercial airfare							10,938.42				10,938.42
Jason Gross	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		516.00						516.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		690.00						690.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	1/12	1/15	Austria		504.00						504.00
Commercial airfare							5,207.16				5,207.16
John Herzberg	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Earl F. Hilliard	2/11	2/13	Haiti		369.00						369.00
Amos Hochstein	1/6	1/7	Holland								
	1/7	1/15	India		2,118.00						2,118.00
Commercial airfare							6,705.73				6,705.73
Hon. Amo Houghton	1/5	1/12	Australia								
Charmaine Houseman	1/9	1/13	Korea		851.00						851.00
	1/13	1/17	Vietnam		715.00						715.00
	1/17	1/20	Hong Kong		1,007.00						1,007.00
Commercial airfare							4,603.24				4,603.24
Hon. Peter King	1/15	1/17	Portugal		118.00						118.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Commercial airfare							523.21				523.21
Robert R. King	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/19	1/20	Australia		436.00						436.00
	1/20	1/23	East/West Timor		640.00						640.00
	1/23	1/26	Indonesia		741.00						741.00
Commercial airfare							7,336.57				7,336.57
	2/19	2/21	Marshall Islands		450.00						450.00
	2/22	2/28	Micronesia		992.00						992.00
Commercial airfare							6,659.94				6,659.94
Hon. Tom Lantos	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/13	Belgium		303.00						303.00
	1/17	1/20	London		306.00						306.00
Commercial airfare							207.99				207.99
John Mackey	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Marc Mealy	1/6	1/7	Holland								
	1/7	1/15	India		2,325.47						2,325.47
Commercial airfare							6,659.63				6,659.63
Kathleen Moazed	1/13	1/16	Vietnam		576.00						576.00
	1/16	1/20	Laos		600.00				[3] 782.23		1,382.23
	1/20	1/20	Thailand		199.00				[3] 50.51		249.51
Commercial airfare							7,786.41				7,786.41
Vincent L. Morelli	1/16	1/18	Venezuela		525.40						525.40
	1/18	1/19	Colombia		193.00						193.00
	1/19	1/20	Guatemala		140.00						140.00
	1/20	1/22	Mexico		442.00						442.00
Joan O'Donnell	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Donald Payne	1/5	1/7	Papua New Guinea		344.77				[3] 72.50		417.27
	1/7	1/8	Australia		258.00						258.00
	1/8	1/9	New Zealand		73.00						73.00
	1/9	1/13	Australia		894.00				[3] 89.43		983.43
Commercial airfare							9,858.67				9,858.67
Stephen Rademaker	1/23	1/25	Austria		336.00				[3] 41.93		377.93
Commercial airfare							4,026.15				4,026.15
Frank Record	1/9	1/10	Denmark		258.00						258.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		416.00						416.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2000—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		690.00						690.00
Commercial airfare							2,205.15				2,205.15
Grover Joseph Rees	1/17	1/18	Singapore		149.25						149.25
	1/19	1/21	Australia		280.00						280.00
	1/21	1/24	East/West Timor		340.00						340.00
	1/24	1/27	Indonesia		840.00				[3] 42.15		882.15
	1/27	1/28	Singapore		149.25						149.25
Commercial airfare							5,155.80				5,155.80
Matt Reynolds	2/19	2/21	Marshall Islands		450.00						450.00
	2/22	2/28	Micronesia		937.00						937.00
Commercial airfare							6,659.94				6,659.94
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	1/7	1/11	Philippines		776.00				[3] 356.37		1,132.37
	1/11	1/18	Thailand		1,393.00				[3] 1,764.86		3,157.86
	1/14	1/14	Cambodia								
Commercial airfare							1,871.11				1,871.11
Laura Rush	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	1/9	1/13	China		1,120.00				[3] 7,564.48		8,684.48
	1/13	1/15	Hong Kong		694.00				[3] 5,874.26		6,568.26
	1/15	1/18	Taiwan		530.00				[3] 5,589.96		6,119.96
Tom Sheehy	1/9	1/13	Korea		851.00						851.00
	1/13	1/17	Vietnam		715.00						715.00
	1/17	1/20	Hong Kong		1007.00						1007.00
Linda Solomon	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hillel Weinberg	1/9	1/10	Denmark		277.00						277.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		516.00						516.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		690.00						690.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		318.00						318.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		418.00						418.00
Committee total					74,935.95		127,999.47		69,742.13		272,677.55

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Indicates delegation costs.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8241. A letter from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule —Food Stamp Program: Payment of Certain Administrative Costs of State Agencies [Amdt. No. 385] (RIN: 0584–AB66) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8242. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Dairy, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the New England and Other Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders; Correction [Docket No. DA–97–12] received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8243. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule— Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced on the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 1999–2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00–985–3 FIR] received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Workforce Investment Act (RIN: 1205–AB20) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8245. A letter from the Director, Coporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits—received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8246. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Exports of Commercial Communications Satellite Components, Systems Parts, Accessories and Associated Technical Data on the United States Munitions List—received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

8247. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, Department of the Army, transmitting the Annual Financial Report For Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8248. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule— Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations—received April 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8249. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, OAR, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Improved Methods for Ballast Water Treatment and Prevention of Small Boat Transport of Invasive Species: Request for Proposals for FY 2000 [Docket No. 000404094–0094–01] (RIN: 0648–ZA84) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8250. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039–0039–01; I.D. 051200B] received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8251. A letter from the Executive Director, Oklahoma City National Memorial Trust, transmitting the Trust's final rule—Rules and Regulations for Oklahoma City National Memorial—received May 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8252. A letter from the Under Secretary, Intellectual Property and Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes to Permit Payment of Patent and Trademark Fees by Credit Card [Docket No. 99100008272–0123–02] (RIN: 0651–AB07) received May 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8253. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Emergency Control Measures for Tank Barges [USCG 1998–4443] (RIN: 2115–AF65) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8254. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Marquette, MI;

revocation of Class E Airspace; Sawyer, MI, and K.I. Sawyer, MI [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–42] received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8255. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30043; Amdt. No. 1992] received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8256. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Maule Aerospace Technology, Inc M–4, M–5, M–6, M–7, MX–7, and MXT–7 Series Airplanes and Models MT–7–235 and M–8–235 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–CE–04–AD; Amendment 39–11715; AD 2000–09–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8257. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–253–AD; Amendment 39–11720; AD 2000–08–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8258. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Visual Flight Rules [Docket No. FAA–2000–7110; Amendment No. 91–262] (RIN: 2120–AG94) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8259. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the designations of Stephen Koplan as Chair and Deanna Tanner Okun as Vice Chair of the United States International Trade Commission, effective June 17, 2000, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1330(c)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8260. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Delegation of Authority (99R–247P) [T.D. ATF–425] (RIN: 1512–AB98) received May 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8261. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Entry of Softwood Lumber Shipments From Canada [T.D. 00–36] (RIN: 1515–AC62) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8262. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Summary Forfeiture of Controlled Substances [TD 00–37] (RIN: 1515–AC60) received May 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8263. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—the Soley for Voting Stock Requirement in Certain Corporate Reorganizations [TD 8885] (RIN: 1545–AW55) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8264. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Coal Exports [Notice 2000–28] received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2001 (Rept. 106–683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[June 21 (legislative day of June 20, 2000)]

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 529. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4690) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and Sate, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–684). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 530. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–685). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H.R. 4694. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to require that the size of the public debt be reduced during each fiscal year by the amount of the net surplus in the Social Security and Medicare trust funds at the end of that fiscal year; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 4695. A bill to enhance the ability of law enforcement to combat money laundering; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4696. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to modify the provisions relating to drawback claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. ROTHMAN):

H.R. 4697. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to ensure that United States assistance programs promote good governance by assisting other countries to combat corruption throughout society and to promote transparency and increased accountability for all levels of government and throughout the private sector; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4698. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to authorize and direct the Director of the Congressional Budget Office to prepare estimates of the impact of proposed Federal agency rules affecting the private sector; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of research on breast cancer; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri (for herself and Mr. MOORE):

H.R. 4700. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 4701. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act with respect to the definition of a member business loan; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.R. 4702. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a special payment rate for Medicare-dependent psychiatric units furnishing services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 4703. A bill to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationship of the Burt Lake Band as a distinct federally recognized Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 460: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TURNER, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 488: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 531: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 534: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 583: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 736: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 765: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.R. 828: Mr. ISAKSON and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 860: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 919: Mr. RUSH and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 1168: Mr. BACA and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1217: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 1300: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1322: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.R. 1367: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1546: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1590: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1592: Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 1621: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 1644: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 1671: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1684: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1816: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1885: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1899: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2059: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2066: Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 2457: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2594: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2631: Mr. HALL of Ohio and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2633: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2697: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 2814: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 2870: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 2892: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2966: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2988: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 3032: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BACA, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 3113: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 3161: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 3193: Mr. DEMINT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 3241: Mr. SPRATT.
H.R. 3250: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 3256: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3308: Mr. SPRATT and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 3485: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 3487: Mr. KLINK.
H.R. 3518: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 3580: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3593: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 3806: Mrs. WILSON.
H.R. 3826: Ms. LEE and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3840: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 3850: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 3859: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. THUNE.
H.R. 3998: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4082: Mr. SISISKY and Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 4094: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. DANNER.
H.R. 4106: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 4213: Mrs. BONO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. TALENT.
H.R. 4215: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 4219: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 4239: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 4245: Mr. NORWOOD and Mr. BLILEY.
H.R. 4271: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4272: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4273: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4277: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4278: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 4311: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BARCIA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 4393: Mr. MOORE and Mr. KUYKENDALL.
H.R. 4481: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 4483: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 4503: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 4553: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 4552: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 4590: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4621: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 4652: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 4659: Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4660: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. HILLEARY.
H.R. 4680: Mr. KUYKENDALL and Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 4687: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FORD, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.J. Res. 102: Mr. BAKER, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H. Con. Res. 62: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. MOORE.
H. Con. Res. 225: Mr. BONIOR.
H. Con. Res. 275: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. BONIOR.
H. Con. Res. 307: Mr. TALENT and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Con. Res. 308: Mr. MCKEON.
H. Res. 458: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HORN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. PHELPS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MRS. CLAYTON

AMENDMENT NO. 31: Page 48, after line 25, insert the following:

NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP

For the National Rural Development Partnership established in the Department of Agriculture, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

H.R. 4635

OFFERED BY: MR. BERRY

AMENDMENT NO. 44: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any rule, regulation, or administrative directive on effluent limitations relating to aquaculture, including but not limited to rules, regulations or administrative directives which require disclosure of financial information to the Environmental Protection Agency or any other Federal department or agency.

H.R. 4635

OFFERED BY: MR. BERRY

AMENDMENT NO. 45: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any rule, regulation, or administrative directive on effluent limitations relating to aquaculture that requires disclosure of financial information to the Environmental Protection Agency or any other Federal department or agency.

H.R. 4635

OFFERED BY: MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 46: Page 30, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $395,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $395,000,000)''.

H.R. 4635

OFFERED BY: MR. EDWARDS

AMENDMENT NO. 47: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. (a) The amount provided in title I for ''VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—Medical Care'' is hereby increased by $500,000,000, and the amount provided in title I for ''VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—Medical and Prosthetic Research'' is hereby increased by $65,000,000.

(b) Any reduction for a taxable year beginning before January 1, 2003, in the rate of tax on estates under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is enacted during 2000 shall not apply to a taxable estate in excess of $20,000,000.

H.R. 4635

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 48: Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,100,000,000) (increased by $300,000,000)''.

Page 73, line 18, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $290,000,000) (increased by $20,000,000) (increased by $6,000,000) (increased by $49,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $405,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $62,000,000)''.

Page 78, line 5, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $34,700,000)''.

Page 78, line 21, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,900,000)''.

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MR. ALLEN

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 2, line 9, after ''expended'' insert '', and of which $5,000,000 shall be expended by the Criminal Division, Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, for the hiring and training of staff, travel, and other necessary expenses, to prosecute obscenity cases, including those arising under chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code''.

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MR. CAPUANO

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 107, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 624. (a) Within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Common Carrier Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission shall conduct a study on the area code crisis in the United States. Such study shall examine the causes and potential solutions to the growing number of area codes in the United States, including the following:

(1) Shortening the lengthy timeline for implementation of the Federal Communications Commission's recent order mandating 1,000 number block pooling.

(2) Repealing the wireless carrier exemption from the Federal Communications Commission's 1,000 number block pooling order.

(3) The issue of rate center consolidation and possible steps the Commission can take to encourage or require States or telecommunications companies, or both, to undertake plans to deal with this issue.

(4) The feasibility of technology-specific area codes reserved for wireless or paging services or data phone lines.

(5) Strengthening the sanctions against telecommunications companies that do not address number use issues.

(6) The possibility of single number block pooling as a potential solution to the area code crisis.

(7) The costs and technological issues surrounding adding an additional digit to existing phone numbers and potential ways to minimize the impact on consumers.

(b) Within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall submit to the Congress a report on the results of the study required by subsection (a).

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MR. LARGENT

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 2, line 9, after ''expended'' insert '', and of which $5,000,000 shall be expended by the Criminal Division, Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, for the hiring and training of staff, travel, and other necessary expenses, to prosecute obscenity cases, including those arising under chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code''.

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MRS. LOWEY

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 32, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $150,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 2, before the comma, insert the following: ''$150,000,000 shall be for the State and Local Gun Prosecutors program, for discretionary grants to State, local, and tribal jurisdictions and prosecutors' offices to hire up to 1,000 prosecutors to work on gun-related cases.''

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MRS. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 40, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 45, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 45, line 19, after ''activities;'', insert the following: ''of which $5,000,000 is for activities related to the planning of a census of Americans abroad, to be taken by December 31, 2003;''.

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MR. MCGOVERN

AMENDMENT NO. 7: In title I, in the item relating to ''GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER COMPLIANCE FUND'', after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $4,479,000)''.

In title V, in the item relating to ''SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', after the second dollar amount insert ''(increased by $4,479,000)''.

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MR. OXLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 89, line 22, insert before the period the following: '': *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or enforce the Federal Communications Commission's report and order entitled 'In the Matter of Creation of Low Power Radio Service' (MM Docket No. 99–25, FCC 00–19), adopted January 20, 2000, or to issue any license or permit pursuant to such report and order.''.

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MR. RUSH.

AMENDMENT NO. 9: In title I, in the item relating to ''FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $8,500,000)''.

In title I, in the item relating to ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—WEED AND SEED PROGRAM FUND'', after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $8,500,000)''.

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MR. RUSH

AMENDMENT NO. 10: In title I, in the item relating to ''FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

In title I, in the item relating to ''COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES'', after the 1st and 6th dollar amounts, insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MR. RUSH

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

Small Business Administration

PROGRAM FOR INVESTMENT IN MICROENTREPRENEURS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the PRIME Act (as added by section 725 of the Gramm-Leach Bliley Act (Pub. L. 106–102)), to be derived by transfer from the aggregate amount provided in this Act under the heading ''National Oceanic And Atmospheric Administration—Operations, Research, and Facilities'' (and the amount specified under such heading for the National Weather Service), $15,000,000.

H.R. 4690

OFFERED BY: MR. WEINER

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Beginning on page 32, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 33, line 14, and insert the following:

For activities authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Public Law 103–322 (''the 1994 Act''), $1,335,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the Attorney General may transfer any of these funds, and balances for programs funded under this heading in fiscal year 2000, to the ''State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' account, to be available for the purposes stated under this heading: *Provided further,* That administrative expenses associated with such transferred amounts may be transferred to the ''Justice Assistance'' account. Of the amounts provided:

(1) for Public Safety and Community Policing Grants pursuant to title I of the 1994 Act, $650,000,000 as follows: not to exceed $36,000,000 for program management and administration; $20,000,000 for programs to combat violence in schools; $25,000,000 for the matching grant program for Law Enforcement Armor Vests pursuant to section 2501 of part Y of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended; $17,000,000 for program support for the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia; $45,000,000 to improve tribal law enforcement including equipment and training; $20,000,000 for National Police Officer Scholarships; and $30,000,000 for Police Corps education, training, and service under sections 200101–200113 of the 1994 Act;

(2) for crime-fighting technology, $350,000,000 as follows: $70,000,000 for grants to upgrade criminal records, as authorized under the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601; $15,000,000 for State and local forensic labs to reduce their convicted offender DNA sample backlog; $35,000,000 for State, Tribal and local DNA laboratories as authorized by section 1001(a)(22) of the 1968 Act, as well as improvements to State, Tribal and local forensic laboratory general forensic science capabilities; $10,000,000 for the National Institute of Justice Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Centers; $5,000,000 for DNA technology research and development; $10,000,000 for research, technical assistance, evaluation, grants, and other expenses to utilize and improve crime-solving, data sharing, and crime-forecasting technologies; $6,000,000 to establish regional forensic computer labs; and $199,000,000 for discretionary grants, including planning grants, to States under section 102 of the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601), of which up to $99,000,000 is for grants to law enforcement agencies, and of which not more than 23 percent may be used for salaries, administrative expenses, technical assistance, training, and evaluation;

(3) for a Community Prosecution Program, $200,000,000, of which $150,000,000 shall be for grants to States and units of local government to address gun violence ''hot spots'';

(4) for grants, training, technical assistance, and other expenses to support community crime prevention efforts, $135,000,000 as follows: $35,000,000 for a youth and school safety program; $5,000,000 for citizens academies and One America race dialogues; $35,000,000 for an offender re-entry program; $25,000,000 for a Building Blocks Program, including $10,000,000 for the Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative; $20,000,000 for police integrity and hate crimes training; $5,000,000 for police recruitment; and $10,000,000 for police gun destruction grants (Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2000, as enacted by section 1000(a)(1) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–113)).