

Despite this, whales still face many threats—from pollution, climate change, and even continued hunting. Norway officially objected to the moratorium when it was adopted and resumed commercial whaling in 1993. Japan and Iceland exploit loopholes in the Convention and continue to hunt whales under the guise of “scientific whaling,” despite the fact that the scientific committee of the IWC has decry the need for and condemned the quality of this science.

At the same time, Japan is calling for the IWC to once again sanction commercial whaling in the form of “coastal” whaling, “community” whaling, or some other iteration of small-scale commercial whaling that will effectively eviscerate the moratorium, threatening to leave the IWC and resume larger-scale whaling operations unless their request is met.

The issues of commercial whaling under the guise of scientific or community whaling will likely be debated at this year’s IWC meeting, and many will claim that the future of the organization is in jeopardy. We must be very careful, however, that our efforts to fix what some people perceive as a broken institution, do not come at the expense of the very species that institution is intended to protect.

H. Con. Res. 350 calls on the U.S. delegation to remain firmly opposed to commercial whaling in all its forms at the upcoming meeting of the IWC. The resolution urges the U.S. not only to oppose the unnecessary lethal taking of whales for scientific purposes, but also to reject proposals that would weaken or lift the moratorium by creating the new category of coastal or community whaling that is nothing more than commercial whaling in disguise.

Now, it is more critical than ever that the U.S. maintain its leadership role in shaping global whale conservation policies through the IWC. The American people strongly oppose commercial whaling of any kind, and the Administration must not undo more than 20 years of whale conservation by yielding to a few nations who threaten to leave the IWC.

In supporting this resolution, Congress recognizes the intrinsic value of these majestic animals, as well as the vital role whales play in the world’s marine ecosystems. Conserving them for future generations requires us to uphold strong international agreements and maintain an unwavering commitment to protect these magnificent species from killing for commercial gain.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Having no additional speakers, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 350.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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.

PUBLIC HOUSING DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 2008

Mr. CAZAYOUX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6276) to repeal section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6276

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 “Public Housing Disaster Relief Act of 2008”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL.

Section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (k); and
- (2) by redesignating subsections (l), (m), and (n) as subsections (k), (l), and (m), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAZAYOUX) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAZAYOUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6276, the Public Housing Disaster Relief Act of 2008. I am proud to stand here with my colleague, Congressman CHILDERS, in bringing this legislation to the floor.

This legislation is the product of a joint subcommittee hearing with the Financial Services Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity and the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness and Response.

The purpose of the hearing was to examine the roles and responsibilities of both HUD and FEMA in responding to the affordable housing needs of the gulf coast following emergencies and natural disasters.

Nearly 3 years after Katrina and Rita, we are still struggling with how to better streamline the process of delivering relief through our administrative agencies. This burden is very well known to members of my delegation, Congressmen MELANCON, JEFFERSON, BOUSTANY, and SCALISE, whose districts were directly impacted by hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

The testimony at the hearing revealed that the Office of Capital Improvements within HUD, which awards capital funds to public housing authorities to maintain and repair public housing stock, also administers the public housing emergency and natural disaster grant program.

The Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act included a provision, provision 9(k), which permits HUD to award natural disaster grants to housing authorities. However, since 2000, Congress has prohibited HUD from using appropriated amounts under section 9(k) and provided a separate appropriation for emergencies and natural disasters. However, since its inception, this fund has diminished every year.

In 2005, the year that Katrina and Rita struck the gulf coast, the funds appropriated for this purpose was \$29 million. According to HUD, this funding was quickly consumed in New Orleans and Biloxi.

The current funding level for 2008 is \$18.5 million, which is woefully inadequate for any disaster, especially ones on the scale of Katrina and Rita. HUD has not asked for funding for this purpose in 2009. In fact, HUD’s proposed budget for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 request no funding for disaster relief.

Normally, public housing authorities’ losses in natural disasters are mitigated through insurance. But the magnitude of the damage caused by these hurricanes was more than preexisting insurance could handle. When the PHAs that faced these shortfalls sought public assistance funding through FEMA pursuant to section 405 of the Stafford Act, they got caught in a bureaucratic mess.

Despite a memorandum of agreement between HUD and FEMA in 2007 that would have made it possible for PHAs to apply for FEMA assistance as a last resort when insurance proceeds and disaster grants from HUD were inadequate, because section 9(k) exists, FEMA funding is not available because FEMA states that it violates congressional appropriations law.

The administration has called for the elimination of section 9(k) and the set aside disaster grants to eliminate this confusion and to make it possible for housing authorities to have access to section 406 of the Stafford Act through FEMA.

I agree with that assessment, and it is my belief that repealing this section will cut some of the bureaucratic mess that has prevented public housing authorities from doing the work of reconstruction in the aftermath of Katrina and Rita.

We see today the importance of this legislation as our hearts go out to the people of Iowa, Illinois and Missouri who struggle against the flood waters that continue to threaten and wreak devastation on their homes and on their communities.

While we are still learning the extent of the damage caused by the flooding in Iowa, and the anticipated flooding in Illinois and Missouri, we do know that this legislation will help them when it is time to rebuild. When this change is enacted into law, funds will become

immediately available for public housing authorities struggling to rebuild affordable housing for Americans devastated by natural disasters whether in the gulf coast or in the heartland.

We in Congress should always work to streamline government so that assistance gets to you where it is needed most as quickly as possible.

I would like to thank Chairmen FRANK and THOMPSON and subcommittee Chairs WATERS and CUELLAR for bringing this issue to light. I would also like to thank Ranking Member CAPITO for her support of this important legislation. In the nearly 3 years since hurricanes Katrina and Rita devastated the gulf coast, they have worked tirelessly to help our residents get the assistance they need. The entire gulf coast is thankful for their diligence on these matters.

I hope that my colleagues join me in passing this bill today so we can eliminate one more bureaucratic hurdle that hampers the efforts of our citizens to rebuild in the aftermath of a natural disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. CHILDERS), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6276, the Public Housing Disaster Relief Act. This legislation will repeal section 9(k) in the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act, and clears the way for public housing authorities in need of repair following a disaster to be eligible for FEMA section 406 funds under the Stafford Act.

Today, there are two programs that are designed to assist public facilities and private nonprofit facilities in times of disasters. Section 9(k) within HUD was set up to provide natural disaster grants to public housing authorities. Section 406 of the Stafford Act permits the use of FEMA funds for repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities and private nonprofit facilities, as well as associated expenses.

Since the 2000 appropriations, Congress has repealed section 9(k) and separately appropriated a set-aside amount within the Public Housing Capital Fund for emergencies and natural disasters. Congress has reduced this fund over the past 8 years. The funding has gone from a high of \$75 million from 2000 through 2002 to a low of \$16.8 million last year.

In 2004, four hurricanes struck Florida, completely depleting the \$39.7 million available in funding for that year. In 2005, hurricanes Katrina and Rita hit the gulf coast, and that year's funding of \$29.8 million was not adequate to re-

store public housing that was damaged or destroyed.

□ 1445

In 2006, Hurricane Wilma came ashore in Florida during the first month of the fiscal year, using much of the \$16.8 million funding for 2006.

Despite the lack of funding available under the section 9(k) emergency reserve account, public housing developments have remained ineligible for FEMA funds under section 406.

While current law is intended to prevent duplication by both HUD and FEMA for public housing facilities, it has put public housing facilities at a distinct disadvantage relative to other types of housing in disaster areas.

In testimony before a joint subcommittee hearing on June 4, 2008, with the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity and the Emergency Communications, Preparedness and Response Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee, HUD testified that it did not believe that Congress intended to limit the ability of public housing authorities to access Stafford Act funding by providing funding under section 9(k).

Specifically, HUD's testimony, stated this: "In recent years the President has proposed eliminating both the portion of section 9(k) that provides the disaster grant funding and the set-aside for disaster grants in an attempt to alleviate the confusion about disaster assistance and make it possible for housing authorities to have access to section 406 Stafford Act funding."

HUD went on to suggest several ways to resolve this current situation: "One potential solution to disaster funding shortfalls for public housing authorities would be the permanent repeal or amendment of section 9(k)."

H.R. 6276, the Public Housing Disaster Relief Act, clearly paves the way for public housing authorities in need of repair following a disaster to be eligible for FEMA section 406 funds under the Stafford Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6276, the Public Housing Disaster Relief Act of 2008. I'm honored to join my colleagues in supporting this bill, specifically Chairman FRANK and Congressman CAZAYOUX from Louisiana, Mrs. CAPITO from West Virginia and Mr. NEUGEBAUER from Texas.

The Public Housing Disaster Relief Act is a commonsense approach to reducing ambiguity between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Emergency Management Agency by striking section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act which was implemented in 1998.

While certainly well-intended to encourage the Department of Housing and Urban Development to set aside funds in the event of a natural disaster,

section 9(k) has proven to become an overburdensome authorization that has stalled Federal dollars from being disbursed to public housing authorities following a presidentially-declared natural disaster.

Since 2000, the Appropriations Committee has allocated zero dollars toward section 9(k), and, instead, separately appropriated a specified amount within HUD's capital fund to be used for emergencies and natural disasters.

We are all reminded of the devastating impact Hurricanes Katrina and Rita had on the gulf coast in 2005, specifically, in the Fourth Congressional District of Mississippi, represented by my friend and colleague, Congressman GENE TAYLOR.

I would also like to acknowledge Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON for his hard work in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

To date, the confusion associated with section 9(k) of the Housing Act has blocked FEMA from disbursing any Federal disaster related funds to multiple public housing authorities in Mississippi due to an internal government disagreement on whether HUD or FEMA is responsible for providing natural disaster relief to public housing authorities across the gulf coast.

The State of Mississippi was forced to allocate \$100 million of its Federal Community Development Block Grant allocation to rebuild various public housing units, and the State is still in the process of receiving final approval to actually use the Federal grant dollars which were approved almost 2 years ago.

Recently, the House Financial Services Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development held a hearing in conjunction with the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness and Response on this matter where Jeffrey Riddell, Director of the Office of Capital Improvements, Public and Indian Housing at HUD noted, "One potential approach to disaster funding shortfalls for public housing authorities would be the permanent repeal or amendment of section 9(k)."

The physical revitalization of communities following a natural disaster is critical to strengthening economic development. As a local county official for over 16 years prior to coming to Congress, I have witnessed the benefits and resources local public housing authorities offer to communities across the United States, even communities that are routinely impacted by natural disasters.

I believe that H.R. 6276 removes unnecessary bureaucratic red tape between HUD and FEMA in order to provide tangible Federal support dollars for rebuilding affordable housing to communities struck by overwhelming natural disasters.

Additionally, I would note the Congressional Budget Office has scored this legislation as budget neutral over 5 years.

In conclusion, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 6276.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, we're today talking about making sure that, in the event of a disaster, that we have the funds and we don't have to go through a lot of red tape to make sure that we can restore this housing, when it's repairable, in a feasible way, and to make sure that we continue to provide the shelter for some of our very needy Americans.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there aren't bills on the floor today. There should be bills on the floor, and there should be a bipartisan bill that works on another disaster that is impacting a lot of needy Americans today, and that's the fact of the rising electric costs, utility costs for many of the people that live in these housing authorities. The mass transit that they use to go to and fro work is going up. They're having to raise their fares. Even gasoline for them to go to their work and back.

And so, Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill which certainly we support, I support. I would hope that we would bring some other bipartisan bills to the floor that would address probably one of the most looming disasters for many of these families, as well as families all across the country.

I get to thinking about the fact that today America had to write a check for about a billion dollars to provide energy supplement for the energy that we already produce in this country. I think about the fact that \$170 million of that went to Hugo Chavez. I think about what we could do together if we were to begin to have an energy policy in this country today where we were investing \$170 million in America every day rather than investing \$170 million in a dictator from Venezuela, that we can create jobs, and that maybe many of the folks that are in the housing authorities around America today, with those jobs, that they could move into conventional for-rental housing, or even experience the American dream of owning their own home.

So while I support this bill, I would hope that we could take this same bipartisan spirit, working in the future, to solve America's energy needs instead of solving the financial needs of many folks or countries around the world that don't really care whether our folks in public housing have a nice, clean, safe place to live or not.

But we care, and we need to show the American people that we care about them, not just the people that are in public housing, but the families all across America today that are struggling with double the price of a tank of gasoline.

Just the other night I was on the phone with some constituents back in Texas, and this gentleman was on the phone. He said, "Congressman, I have to get dialysis three times a week. I

have to drive over 100 miles to do that. And now I'm down to making a decision whether I'm going to be able to afford gasoline, groceries, or the rent."

That's not a decision we want people in America making. And so certainly, in the future, I hope that we will be able to not only address some of these important housing issues, as we've done in the Financial Services Committee, but I hope, also, that we would remember that part of the American dream is also having the ability to have a nice place to live, but also to be able to have an economy where we can grow and prosper and make, hopefully, some of our subsidized housing a temporary spot for American people and not a permanent spot. But with these rising costs of utilities and gasoline, I'm afraid we may be locking them into a scenario from which they would like to get out.

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

Mr. CHILDERS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I guess as I get older my memory is even worse than I thought. I thought I remembered what it was like when the Republicans were in power. But I don't seem to remember any of those bills my friend from Texas was just talking about. Apparently they were saving them up until we came to power, because I don't remember them ever bringing them up when we were here.

Having said that, I do want to apologize to my friends on the other side for talking about the legislation under consideration. I hope they will indulge me as I do that.

And as I do it, I want to say that I think what we've seen in the bill being brought forward by our newest colleagues from Louisiana and Mississippi is the importance of timing. We've had this problem in which public housing authorities in Louisiana and Mississippi were being treated unfairly. This is not singling them out for special treatment. This is ending a bureaucratic glitch that disadvantaged them. And we're doing it in the way that was suggested by the Bush administration, and I give them credit for that.

But it ought to be clear to people that having new Members here from Louisiana and Mississippi, the areas affected, had an impact. They are both on the Financial Services Committee, and I'm very proud that the Financial Services Committee on which they are now members gave them the opportunity to bring this bill forward.

I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Texas, the Chair and Subcommittee Chair of the Homeland Security Committee.

One of the things that plagues this institution is jurisdictional arguments and turf fights. I'm very pleased that

we've been able, my colleagues particularly on the Homeland Security Committee, to work so closely together on this. I'm also glad to say that this is genuinely a bipartisan issue, and I appreciate the Republicans supporting us.

But I do want to stress again, this is no special deal for Louisiana and Mississippi. By a bureaucratic glitch, the existence of a provision that has never been funded keeps them from getting money to replace public housing that was destroyed. And there's a Federal program under FEMA that provides Federal funds for public buildings that are destroyed. This simply allows public housing a fair share.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise also to salute the two newest members of this committee for introducing this legislation.

This legislation, the Public Housing Disaster Relief Act of 2008, will strike section 9(k) of the U.S. Housing Act and clarify the funding structure of public housing authorities in the wake of disasters.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Financial Services Committee and Homeland Security Committee held a joint hearing to examine the housing conditions of individuals displaced by Hurricane Katrina in 2005. During this hearing, the testimony provided by the FEMA and HUD witnesses revealed that there is confusion between the two agencies over who is responsible for providing disaster recovery funds to public housing authorities that are damaged by disasters.

□ 1500

A number of public housing authorities received significant damage. Mr. Speaker, during Hurricane Katrina. But these housing authorities did not receive any funds from the 9(k) account because there simply were not any funds available.

Public housing authorities did receive some assistance from the Public Housing Capital Fund Emergency Needs Account, but the funds were quickly exhausted and left many housing authorities without the resources they needed to repair their units.

In total, Mr. Speaker, only \$29 million was made available to the housing authorities along the gulf coast. If you are familiar with the degree of devastation caused by Hurricane Katrina and Rita, you know this was not enough.

H.R. 6276 will eliminate an account that has historically been underused and clarify the funding structure by making it clear to FEMA that public housing authorities are eligible for Stafford Act assistance.

I urge the passage of this important legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) 3 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. CHILDERS. I also want to thank Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON of the Homeland Security Committee and Chairman BARNEY FRANK of the Financial Services Committee, as well as Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity and our ranking members, also, for working together on this piece of legislation.

I, too, congratulate our two newest Members of the House, Congressman CAZAYOUX from Louisiana and Congressman CHILDERS from my home State of Mississippi for drafting H.R. 6276.

As you know, earlier this month, Ms. WATERS and I teamed up to hold a hearing examining the roles and responsibilities of HUD and FEMA in providing affordable housing to disaster victims under the direction of Chairman FRANK and Chairman THOMPSON. During this hearing, there was confusion as to which agency is responsible for providing disaster recovery funds to public housing authorities damaged during disasters.

The Public Housing Disaster Relief Act of 2008 will strike section 9(k) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 clarifying the funding structure for public housing authorities in the wake of disasters. After Hurricane Katrina, housing authorities received no funds from the 9(k) account, and it's not hard to see that this account is no longer needed. In fact, this account only caused us confusion as to who is responsible for providing disaster recovery funds to public housing authorities. Let's do our part to eliminate this confusion.

This legislation, H.R. 6276, will eliminate the 9(k) account and clarify the funding structure by identifying FEMA as the responsible party for providing assistance to public housing authorities through the Stafford Act. We need to streamline government and provide services to our constituents in a more efficient and effective manner, and this is exactly what H.R. 6276 does.

So I encourage our Members, all of my colleagues, to support H.R. 6276.

Again, I congratulate both Mr. CAZAYOUX and Mr. CHILDERS for bringing up this good piece of legislation.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) 2 minutes.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, no place on the planet needs this more than my district in Louisiana. Before the storm, there were some 5,000 families in public housing representing some 30-or-so thousand people who were living there. Since the storm, there are some 800 people or so, well down from our prior number. That's because the storm damaged almost all the public housing virtually thoroughly to the point now that the areas where public housing used to occupy are laid as a wasteland,

and we have had nothing but administrative fighting and confusion over this issue.

And what is happening here today that Chairman FRANK and our two newest colleagues, Mr. CAZAYOUX and Mr. CHILDERS, are bringing today is a bill that is very much needed.

In my area, the cost to rebuild public housing is going to be astronomical, but the families who are depending on it, it's quite a large number of people. And there is no way we can restore affordable housing in our area without restoring public housing. There is no way to restore public housing unless there is an agency that has a tradition of dealing with bringing public buildings back into place as FEMA does. It's an unusual argument for us to make that we want FEMA to do more in our area, to have more responsibility, given the record it has of being far less than perfect. But that is a case where it makes sense for FEMA to take over and fill the gap.

So I want to congratulate you again for coming forward. This legislation is going to mean a lot to our people in Louisiana, a lot to the folks I represent in New Orleans, and a lot to the families who are struggling to get back into their homes.

So thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I was going to inquire to see if the gentleman has other speakers.

Mr. CHILDERS. I actually have one more speaker.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 2½ minutes, to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, Members, I would like to commend all of our authors and co-authors on this legislation. We learned a lot because of Hurricane Katrina. We learned that FEMA and HUD are confused. They don't work together. As a matter of fact, they work against each other. And the most vulnerable of those who were victimized by Hurricane Katrina, the public housing residents, were so negatively impacted by all of this.

We found that when there was a subcommittee hearing that we held, this joint hearing with Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency, Communications, Preparedness, and Response, we talked about the roles of HUD and FEMA in responding to affordable housing needs following natural disasters and emergencies. At that hearing, we learned that HUD Section 9 program, the public housing reconstruction, has never been funded because of language in appropriations acts that has barred the program from receiving any appropriations. Although HUD has been providing a limited amount of funds from its already underfunded capital fund this year, the department proposes not to provide any emergency capital funds.

In addition, because section 9(k) is authorized, FEMA has refused to allow PHAs to access funds under its section 406 reconstruction program. This is in spite of the fact that there is no statutory or other prohibition on PHAs using these funds. FEMA is simply refusing to grant PHAs access to section 406 funding because it says that PHAs have another source for this purpose, section 9(k), which has never been funded.

You've heard a lot from Members here today about this, and I'm going to yield back my time so that the gentleman can do a close appropriate to this legislation that he so courageously authored.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. CHILDERS).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I would like to say I think this does go a long way to probably eliminate some confusion between these two agencies. It makes sense to do this.

I want to welcome the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAZAYOUX) to the committee and thank him for his willingness to participate in this issue.

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

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to thank those who spoke on behalf of this today. And in conclusion, I simply, again, urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 6276.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAZAYOUX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6276.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN VETERANS DISABLED FOR LIFE COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 634) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of veterans who became disabled for life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

On page 3, strike line 24 and all that follows thru page 4 line 3 and insert:

(1) DESIGN.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the service of our disabled veterans who, having survived the ordeal of war, made enormous personal sacrifices defending the principles of our democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from