

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 28, 1990

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we anticipate the season of celebration of our Nation's birth, we are grateful, O God, for those traditions that have given opportunity and freedom to many. We express our gratitude for those good gifts even as we are aware of those who have not received the bounty of these blessings. May we be diligent and unflinching in our work for justice that these gifts may be with us and be shared by every person. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McMILLEN] will please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2514. An act amending subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

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

H.R. 3045. An act to amend chapters 5 and 9 of title 17, United States Code, to clarify that States, instrumentalities of States, and officers and employees of States acting in their official capacity, are subject to suit in Federal court by any person for infringement of copyright and infringement of exclusive rights in mask works, and that all the remedies can be obtained in such suit that can be obtained in a suit against a private person or against other public entities.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be permitted to sit today, June 28, 1990, while the House is under the 5-minute rule.

This request has been cleared by the minority leadership of both the House and the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

INCREASED TAXES MUST BE COUPLED WITH TAX CODE REFORM

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, so now the President, who solemnly promised in 1988 there would be no new taxes, has changed his mind. At the risk of being penalized for piling on, I will not join the chorus criticizing him for this about-face. But if honesty and candor are now the watchwords at the White House, I hope the President will admit two other facts.

The economic mess which caused the President to change his mind is the savings and loan crisis, and the mismanagement of this savings and loan crisis has caused the debt which this country did not anticipate and the President did not anticipate. The proper management of the savings and loan mess holds out the possibility that this tax increase may be kept under control.

Second, working families across America do not need an increase in their income taxes. We need to see real reform in our Tax Code where the wealthy Americans who can afford to pay start to pay. If that is going to happen, it certainly will not include any capital gains break for the wealthiest of American families.

GOVERNMENT WASTE

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, let us cut Government waste, not raise taxes.

Once Congress creates a program, it rarely lets it die. Hundreds of congressional programs have fulfilled their purpose, yet have not been abolished. Therefore, billions of dollars are poured into useless or dead causes.

The military commissary system was created to provide foodstuffs to the cavalry on the Western plains in the 1800's. The program continues today, although over 80 percent of military commissaries are within 10 miles of two or more commercial supermarkets.

The Export-Import Bank was created in 1934 to finance exports to Russia. Sixty-five years later the Bank loses about \$400 million a year financing exports for some of America's largest international corporations.

The Rural Electrification Administration was created in 1935 to bring electricity, and later telephone service, to rural areas of the country. Today, 99 percent of rural Americans have electricity and 96 percent have telephones. Yet, the REA still exists at a cost to taxpayers of \$2 billion per year.

These are but a few examples of the outrageous spending habits of Congress. Need I say more?

TAX INCREASES SHOULD GO TO THE RICH, NOT MIDDLE-INCOME TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, would it seem possible to you that disgraced S&L executives may get a tax break? No; you say. Well, let us see.

First, the American people are disgusted that jail doors are not slamming on the S&L crooks, who will cost every American taxpayer \$2,000. Put the S&L crooks in jail, they tell me.

Second, along comes President Bush, who says it is time for tax increases. So where do the tax increases come from?

I predict that President Bush intends for the same working people paying for the S&L bailout to pay the new taxes, with no taxes on the upper income folks while middle-income taxpayers pay excise taxes and gasoline taxes. They might give a capital gains cut to the rich and meanwhile ignore the middle income.

And where will the new taxes go? We all know where—to bail out the S&L's. Middle-income taxpayers have their taxes raised to pay for defunct

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

S&L's. And what about the people responsible? They get a capital gains tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, if Charles Keating and other S&L moguls end up bailed out and with their taxes cut, read my lips—"it's wrong—wrong—wrong."

THE NEXUS BETWEEN THE S&L CRISIS AND CAMPAIGN REFORM

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what I am hearing. The President is to blame for the S&L mess? Just a second. Was it not the President who, even before he took office in January 1989, created an S&L bailout program to solve the problem created by the Congress of the United States in the 1980's?

If we want to talk about the S&L issue, then let us talk about it relating to campaign finance reform. Is it any secret that over 80 percent of the money the S&L's donated in political action committee money went to the Democrats in the Congress and in the Senate?

There is a way to solve that. It is called campaign reform. Our Republican leader, BOB MICHEL, has listed 15 different campaign reform initiatives that he has introduced.

Dave Broder, the political columnist, has said this, and I want the Members to listen to it:

"But the Democrats seem bent on writing a partisan bill, which, even if it passed, would draw a Presidential veto. To add insult to injury, they are planning to muzzle MICHEL's ability to offer his amendments when they finally bring their bill to the floor."

"That's a pretty shabby record. BOB MICHEL is not the only one who ought to be angry about it."

Mr. Speaker, I say to the majority, if you want to clean up the S&L mess, if you want to clean up campaign reform, give us campaign reform on the floor of the House in July, and give it to us with an open rule.

A REALISTIC PLAN NEEDED FOR THE FUTURE OF THE S&L INDUSTRY

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

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, Treasury Secretary Brady commented that the Congress should have acted earlier in halting the savings and loan crisis. Well, it is pretty hard to solve a crisis that, according to the Bush-Reagan administrations, did not exist.

The Danny Wall era at the Home Loan Bank Board could be classified as

the "don't worry, be happy" age of regulation. Consistently, Danny Wall and the Republican administrations publicly understated the cost of the S&L crisis. As late as October 1988, 1 month before the election, Danny Wall testified that the cost of the thrift bailout would be no more than \$30 billion. Well, 1½ years later we have a \$500 billion bailout and it's growing daily.

Not only have the last two Republican administrations tried to sweep the actual cost of the crisis under the carpet, but the agency they created to end the bailout has been an unmitigated disaster. The Resolution Trust Corporation [RTC] has helped to increase the cost of the bailout as well as precipitate a credit crunch. The RTC has proved again that the Government has trouble selling anything, let alone complicated real estate assets and junk bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that the administration stop trying to rewrite the history of the S&L crisis, and begin preparing a realistic plan for the future of the industry.

□ 1010

JULY 17 IS THE MAGIC DAY

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, next month, when we get back here from our 4th of July recess, the liberals will have one of the most exciting things they enjoy doing in this body. They will again be able to raise the debt limit above \$3 trillion. They will also be able to impose more taxes on the American people.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing we are also going to do next month. It is going to be the key vote for everybody that is running in November, and that is the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

July 17 is the magic date. That is when we can separate everybody who is a spender from everybody who wants to start putting some real restraint on this body.

Mr. Speaker, these voting cards that they give us, and there are 435 of them loose in this building, are the cards that can charge trillions of dollars to our children and our grandchildren.

We owe it to those folks, Mr. Speaker, to put some limits on our spending, and the only way we can do it is on July 17 when we vote in favor of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

S&L CRISIS THREATENS TO TURN INTO A CALAMITY

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

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about the S&L crisis.

As we all know, problems do not go away by themselves. Left unattended, they turn into crises. And a crisis is exactly what we have on our hands. The administration has not responded quickly or appropriately to the failure of S&L's across this country.

Last year, Congress authorized \$75 million for the Justice Department to appoint needed investigators and prosecutors to deal with this situation.

The administration rejected the authorization approved by Congress, and the Justice Department was appropriated only \$50 million.

The Department has 21,000 fraud referrals pending. They do not have the resources to pursue those referrals, and they have only attained one indictment connected with the S&L fraud.

The cost of this crisis will be the burden of our taxpayers. Today that price tag is estimated to be anywhere from \$100 billion to \$500 billion, and that estimate seems to grow everytime we turn around.

Mr. Bush's resounding campaign promise was "no new taxes." Mr. President, the American taxpayer should not be expected to pay for the administration's failure to act in the mist of this crisis. And that, Mr. President, means no new taxes to bail out those responsible for the S&L crisis.

It is time the administration and the Justice Department act quickly and responsibly. We cannot afford to let a crisis turn into a calamity.

ODE TO OUR ANCIENT FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

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

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, I quote from Time magazine:

In Oregon's Umpqua National Forest, a lumberjack presses his snarling chain saw into the flesh of a Douglas fir that has held its place against wind and fire, rockslide and flood, for 200 years. The white pulpy fiber scatters in a plume beside him, and in 90 seconds, 4 feet of searing steel have ripped through the thick bark, the thin film of living tissue and the growth rings spanning ages. With an excruciating groan, all 190 feet of trunk and green spire crash to earth * * * and the ancient forest of the Pacific Northwest has retreated one more step.

Day after day the chain saws snarl
In forests primeval belonging to all;
Vanishing remnants of what clothed our land,

Victims of greed, some shipped to Japan.

Shame on a nation to not quickly command
An end to destruction of nature so grand.

THE IRS SAYS, "WE'RE SORRY"

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the IRS is being audited. The IRS is being accused of ripping off the Postal Service for \$3 million.

Mr. Speaker, the IRS said, "We're sorry. This was an honest mistake."

Now let me ask Members, "What about Joe Sixpack when he makes an honest mistake? What does the IRS say to him?"

Mr. Speaker, they drag him to court. He has to pay huge legal fees. They compound the interest daily. Joe may even end up losing his house, and, worse yet, the IRS even takes Joe's pickup truck.

Honest mistake? Very sorry? My God, they may, they may have to go to Tax Court. Do my colleagues really think the IRS is in any trouble? Maybe the IRS should consider the lament that the American people are being taxed to death and being forced into courts a little bit unfairly.

A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT—FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, as a result of years of bipartisan effort in this House, on July 17 this body will have an opportunity to vote up or down on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. It will come to the floor under an open rule so everyone can participate in the debate and offer changes as they see fit.

However, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line will come, and that vote will be, "Are you in favor of setting in motion a process that will reform our budget and provide what the American people have been asking for, fiscal responsibility instead of political economics?"

I ask the President of this country, and the Speaker and all who join in the summit to solve our budget crisis, to consider that a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution just might fit as part of what we can offer the American people in a reasonable solution to our budget concern.

Today, at 11 o'clock on the grassy triangle in front of this body, there will be a press conference to announce the date of the 17th, and we would ask all who are in favor of a balanced budget amendment and who would join with us on the 17th in debate and in the consideration to join in telling the American people that we are going to become part of the solution instead of the ongoing problem.

POOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN SUFFER WIC PROGRAM SHORTFALLS

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

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express deep concern about the health of 240,000 women, infants, and children.

The Select Committee on Hunger and several national studies have reported that the WIC Program is in serious financial trouble.

States are experiencing shortfalls which are forcing them to cut, and in some cases, eliminate altogether the health and nutritional services low-income women and their families so desperately need.

Low weight infants literally fight for their lives.

They face a much greater risk of having a lifelong disability.

The \$11 million my home State of Maine gets in WIC funds, gives Maine women a chance to bring healthier babies into this world.

The Hunger Committee reports that we will need an additional \$67 million this year to avoid terminating thousands of poor women and children from WIC.

I ask my colleagues to join me in urging the Appropriations Committee to provide the necessary funds for 240,000 poor women and children.

I cannot think of a better and more humane use of our tax dollars, than support for the WIC Program.

ELECTIONS IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the last year, fair elections have taken place in Taiwan, Nicaragua, Poland, Hungary, and the Soviet Union. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason that they cannot be held in Afghanistan, as well. Yes, in Afghanistan.

Secretary Baker and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze appear close to an agreement, but our country must remain resolved that Najib must go before the transition period, and that free and fair elections must be absolutely ensured.

The people of Afghanistan have endured untold horror and violence since Soviet tanks invaded more than a decade ago. Now that peace may be near, it's time for the military commanders to step aside and allow the people of Afghanistan to decide who will lead them.

The United States cannot play favorites or interfere in this process. Our policy must be primarily directed toward a fair electoral process. It is the only morally just position for us to

take. And it is the only hope for future freedom in Afghanistan.

□ 1020

DECLASSIFICATION OF LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES AS BELOW REGULATORY CONCERN

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

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, what in the world is going on in the minds of our friends over at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that would compel them to want to deregulate the disposal of low-level nuclear wastes? What kind of mindset would tolerate this kind of insensitivity?

We have a nuclear waste problem that will cost hundreds of billions of dollars to remedy. We have nuclear plants that are deemed unsafe across the country because the NRC has not been doing its job; so the NRC, already suffering a severe credibility, decides that the wisest thing to do now is to let low-level nuclear wastes be thrown out with the ordinary trash.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents will not stand for this. The States will not stand for this, and I certainly hope this Congress will not tolerate this cavalier disregard of public health and safety.

Nobody knows precisely how many additional Americans would suffer a significantly higher risk of radiation-induced cancer because the NRC chooses to walk away from its responsibility, but no one doubts that additional radiation casualties would be the result of this decision.

Perhaps the most extraordinary thing is that the NRC decided to do this dastardly deed against the advice of their own professionals and the advice of the Environmental Protection Agency. What kind of agency ignores its own experts?

It is time, I suggest, that we take a very careful look at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Its very limited credibility has been further damaged by its recklessness. If ever there were a reason for congressional oversight, it is now.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Kalbaugh, one of his secretaries.

ENCOURAGING PROSPECTS FOR PEACE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, when we got the encouraging news yesterday that Nicaraguan Democratic Resistance Leader Commander Franklin had turned his gun in to Mrs. Chamorro, it was a very encouraging sign for the movement toward peace. In the well of this House and at all these other tables throughout the past decade we have had vitriolic debate over aid to the Democratic resistance in Nicaragua.

Well, I am very encouraged by the prospect of peace. Commander Franklin turning in his gun to Mrs. Chamorro yesterday, he was the 19,000th to do it, bringing to an even higher level than most of us had anticipated the size of the Democratic resistance in Nicaragua.

But Mr. Speaker, it is important that as we congratulate them for bringing about this great victory that we monitor closely the fact that Yasser Arafat and Mu'ammar Qadhafi are the people to whom the Sandinistas are now looking for support and organization. That news has come out in the past few weeks, and I think that we will need to continue to be very vigilant, as will the people in the duly-elected Government of Nicaragua, as we face that challenge.

BALANCED-BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, the time for a balanced-budget amendment has come.

Until a balanced budget is the law of the land, we will never find our revenue matching our expenditures.

Until a balanced budget is the law of the land, we can summit and shadow-box and read lips or read tea leaves for that matter, but we will still not have our fiscal house in order.

I join my colleagues who support this amendment as the only sensible way to solve our budget deficit.

Forced discipline is not what we want, but it appears to be the only way for us to make progress on this issue.

If we in this Congress are asking every household in this country to balance their checkbooks, we ought to expect no less of ourselves.

The weight of trillion-dollar deficits is riding heavily on the backs of American workers. This balanced-budget amendment is the best chance we have to lift that load.

DARE PROGRAM EFFECTIVE TO COMBAT ILLEGAL DRUGS

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

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, in galvanizing our young people against illegal drugs, DARE, which stands for Drug Abuse Resistance Education, has become a powerful new tool in many schools across our Nation.

It is a 16-week course for children that is taught by uniformed police officers. The DARE Program does more than just tell children to say no to drugs. It teaches them how to say no to drugs.

Children in this program learn how to respond to the inevitable peer pressure to use drugs, about risktaking, about effective decisionmaking techniques, about how to deal with stress and how to build a stronger self-image.

The cities of Norfolk and Virginia Beach in my district have wisely committed substantial resources to the DARE Program. On each day that schools are in session, 20 uniformed police officers are busy making their rounds to teach DARE classes. By all accounts, the DARE Program is making a difference. In schools where the DARE Program is offered, studies show that drug use has gone down, school performance and self-esteem have gone up, and fewer young people fall victim to drugs and the violence they spawn.

Mr. Speaker, the DARE Program is a ray of light in our country's battle against drugs. I commend the educators and police officers who make this program work. And I would urge any community not using the DARE Program to implement it in their schools promptly.

PRESIDENT WANTS TO BALANCE BUDGET ON BACKS OF THE POOR

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

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, President "read-my-lips-but-not-my-mind" Bush says now that he wants new taxes. Is this the first step to balancing the budget?

Well, before he asked for anything else, what he asked for was to review the entitlement programs.

Do you know what that means? He is talking about when you review, that means you want to cut Social Security. You want to cut veterans' hospitalization and medical care, their compensation and their pensions. You want to cut black lung benefits. You want to cut Medicare. These are America's most deserving and neediest people. You cannot start balancing the budget on their backs.

We spend billions of dollars on foreign aid. We spend billions of dollars on defense. Why do we not take a look at that? Yet he wants to review these, and he did not even mention to review or take a look at the 5-percent discount that they give to the wealthiest people in this country. They pay less than the people under them pay.

I think before we do anything else, I think we had better get our heads screwed on properly and find out what our real priorities are to the people of this country.

THE RETIRED TEACHERS ACT

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, over the next decade 1.3 million teachers will leave the profession. To replace this loss, it is necessary that 23 percent of each college graduating class enter the teaching field.

To help meet this need I have introduced the Retired Teachers Act with my distinguished colleague, Mr. BYRON DORGAN. This legislation recognizes that the attraction and retention of qualified and caring teachers must be made a national priority. The act would exempt teachers, who have a lifetime worth of knowledge and experience, from the Social Security earnings test. By enabling these talented seniors to work part time as a teacher, a teacher's aide, or a provider of before- and after-school care, we can help to alleviate the impending crisis faced by our public school system.

This part April, I introduced legislation that would meet the education needs of homeless children. Together, these bills would help to provide desperately needed assistance to educational agencies that are confronted with new and more rigorous demands.

DUAL BASING OF AMERICAN TROOPS

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, as the budget summit begins to reveal the gravity and severity of the true Federal deficit to the American people, Members of Congress are searching diligently for ways to reduce Federal spending. We are literally looking under every rock in Washington for ways to reduce Federal spending.

One of the most ingenious proposals that I have heard that is now being discussed around the Halls of Congress has been advanced by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Colora-

do [Mrs. SCHROEDER], and that is the idea of dual basing, the idea of bringing our troops that are assigned to foreign bases back to home base then in the United States, but to assign them to their foreign assignments for the purpose of training and for combat and for an emergency should it be needed.

The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] wrote an article which was published in the Washington Post last Sunday, which I included in my remarks last evening in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I would hope that the legislative staff around the Capitol would pay attention to that wonderful article, that ingenious article. Later I will send it around to my colleagues, hoping for their interest and their consideration.

□ 1030

SOCIAL SECURITY NOTCH

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

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about fairness. We pride ourselves on fairness, on justice, although some Americans are unfairly penalized because of their birthdate.

In meeting after meeting with constituents, I am continually asked "When is Congress going to help the notch babies?" Most of those affected by the notch recognize that when Congress acted in 1977 to stop the Social Security system from being bankrupted, it did not intend to cause injustice. However, an injustice was created, and notch babies feel that Congress is waiting for them to die so the problem will go away.

Notch babies want nothing more than what they are entitled to. Right now, a retiree born in 1917 who did the exact work, for the exact pay, for the exact number of years gets substantially less in Social Security than a retiree born just 1 year before. That is unfair, and the longer we allow this to continue, the longer we are complicit in perpetrating this injustice.

I call on my colleagues in the Ways and Means Committee to allow the various notch bills to come before the full House. I call on all of my colleagues in the House to sign the discharge petition and allow us to debate the notch. Simply put, I call on my colleagues to act in the name of fairness.

SUPPORT URGED FOR MANDELA AND ANC IN EFFORTS TO ABOLISH APARTHEID

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

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning out of great concern about the negative views that have been expressed by a few of my colleagues regarding Mr. Nelson Mandela. Some are long held views and others have recently been formulated based on statements made by Mr. Mandela during his visit to the United States.

Unfortunately, many of my colleagues are selective listeners. Those who objected to Mr. Mandela's appearance before this body did so because he advocated violence as an alternative to eliminating apartheid in South Africa. Others objected to his appearance because he allied himself with movements that are not embraced by the United States or the interests of certain ethnics within the United States. Where were United States interests when the majority of blacks in South Africa needed them when petty apartheid laws were implemented in 1948?

Just where were these colleagues when South African security forces massacred more than 60 people in Sharpeville in 1960? Did we hear their voices of outrage in 1960? Did we hear their voices of indignation after Mr. Mandela and thousands of other political prisoners were jailed in South Africa in the early 1960's for denouncing the most racist regime since Hitler's Germany? Did they raise their voices in righteous indignation at the implementation of the so-called State of Emergency in 1985? The answer to all three of these questions is a resounding "No."

However, these same critics of Mr. Mandela supported so-called freedom fighters and advocated the use of violence in the overthrow of the Ortega regime in Nicaragua. These are the same people who also advocated the use of violence to overthrow the Soviet dominated regime in Afghanistan.

I must say that there is a clear and racist double standard operating here. If you are white, it is fine to use force or violence as a means of gaining control or defending your government. On the other hand, however, blacks and other people of color must achieve their goals by any other means but violence. In other words, they must remain submissive and wait another 300 years to gain the basic human rights that they are due from the white minority government of South Africa.

I would suggest that my colleagues heed the comments of an enlightened member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. WOLPE, who recently stated that, "Only in the case of South Africa has the doctrine of nonviolence emerged as a central element of our policy. * * * Race gets in the way of seeing the South African struggle * * * as the same as our own." I urge my colleagues to support Nelson Mandela

and the efforts of the African National Congress to abolish apartheid in South Africa by any means necessary.

THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years I have advocated negotiations of a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement. Now that we are at the brink of realizing this goal, I want to continue to press Congress to recognize the great benefits such an agreement would hold for both the United States and Mexico.

A United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement will benefit both our countries. We will benefit from increased access to investment opportunities, a growing market for our products, protection for intellectual property rights, and stability and prosperity along our border. Mexico will benefit from greater access to technology, increased investment flows, and renewed economic growth and development they so desperately need after a decade of negative growth and tough economic reforms.

With questions of competitiveness central to so many of our trade and economic debates, we should not hesitate to take advantage of the opportunity presented to us by Mexico to link our markets and eventually provide for the free flow of goods through the entire North American continent. As other parts of the world become more closely integrated, we should also take advantage of opportunities to strengthen our ties in this hemisphere. The economies of Mexico and the United States uniquely complement each other, and a free-trade agreement will enhance the ability of both our countries to compete in an increasingly global market.

As this discussion continues throughout the remainder of this year, I urge my colleagues to look closely at the great benefits to be found in a free-trade agreement with Mexico, and to join me in working toward this goal.

THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS BUDGET

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I note with great interest today in the Washington Post an article indicating that now the President of the United States has embraced the issue of raising taxes

that the debate on the budget has not ended but just begun.

In that regard, I would then remind my distinguished colleagues that the 24 members of the Congressional Black Caucus just several weeks ago when we debated the national budget brought forward a budget rooted in competence, based on compassion, and framed in integrity. I would remind my colleagues that in that budget we presented to them and through them to the American people we were the only budget that had the courage and the integrity to address the issue of taxes. In that budget we said, "Stop the wealthy who are paying at the 28-percent marginal tax rate; make them pay at the 33-percent marginal tax rate." We would derive \$3.1 billion. We said, "Take the top 10 percent of the corporate earners in this country and levy a 10-percent surtax upon them, the powerful and the wealthy." We would derive \$6.5 billion. Take \$8.2 billion of the President's 13-plus billion dollars of so-called new revenue options and reject the reactionary aspects of it. Cut \$23.7 billion from the military budget. Reject that part of the science and technology budget that studies war at a time when the world is crying out for peace, and we can indeed derive over \$40 billion in revenue options to address the human misery of this country and march America along a direction that not only seeks peace but reduces the budget deficit in this country.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M. TUESDAY, JULY 3, 1990, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3950, FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES ACT OF 1990

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Agriculture may have until 6 p.m. Tuesday, July 3, to file the report on H.R. 3950, the Food and Agricultural Resources Act of 1990.

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

There was no objection.

SPEND ON RETRAINING AT HOME, NOT FOREIGN MILITARY AID

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost respect for our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and his chairmanship of the

debate on the foreign aid bill yesterday was extraordinarily well done.

However, as sympathetic and as disposed to him as I am, I could not vote for his bill. His bill was one of the very best foreign aid bills ever brought to this floor, but still about one-third of the money, of the \$15 billion appropriated, was devoted to military foreign aid.

In a very happy era of world history in which we are finding tensions eased around the globe and we are encountering sharply curtailed U.S. spending on defense issues, it seems to me that the same reduction ought to have appeared in the foreign aid bill. It did not, relative to recent foreign aid bills, with, again, about one-third devoted to military spending.

I think the money needs to be spent here at home, Mr. Speaker. We will need to transition our communities, including my own of Louisville and Jefferson County, from a defense-spending posture to a non-defense-spending posture. We will need to help workers be retrained for the civilian jobs. That is where the money ought to be spent, Mr. Speaker, not on foreign military aid.

ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has launched a bold new initiative designed to support and strengthen the economic growth of our neighbors in Latin America. This new program—enterprise for the Americas—will provide the framework for nations in Latin America and the Caribbean to become full trading partners in this hemisphere and in the highly competitive global markets.

Enterprise for the Americas provides a positive response to our friends in Latin America who seek our cooperation in effecting mutually advantageous trade agreements, stimulating new investment from domestic and international sources, and seeking innovative ways to deal with the crushing debt service problems faced by these governments.

The President is to be commended for his thoughtful and innovative approach to find solutions to long-standing economic and social problems. We should join the President and support his effort to bring about these critical changes in the Americas which will benefit so many.

□ 1040

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5158, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 426 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 426

Resolved, That all points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 5158) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, for failure to comply with the provisions of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXI are hereby waived. During consideration of the bill, all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived: beginning on page 4, lines 13 through 17; beginning on page 4, line 20 through page 5, line 22; beginning on page 6, lines 9 through 15; beginning on page 6, line 17 through page 7, line 6; beginning on page 7, line 11 through page 9, line 11; beginning on page 12, line 14 through page 17, line 15; beginning on page 18, line 1 through page 20, line 7; beginning on page 20, line 20 through page 24, line 8; beginning on page 24, line 19 through page 28, line 15; beginning on page 28, line 23 through page 33, line 3; beginning on page 34, line 15 through page 35, line 2; beginning on page 35, line 19 through page 36, line 11; beginning on page 36, line 22 through page 37, line 18; beginning on page 37, line 24 through page 38, line 22; beginning on page 39, line 5 through page 41, line 21; beginning on page 42, line 21 through page 43, line 8; beginning on page 43, line 13 through page 45, line 3; beginning on page 46, line 1 through page 50, line 2; beginning on page 50, lines 12 through 16; and beginning on page 54, lines 8 through 14; and all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 12, line 14 through page 16, line 12; beginning on page 20, line 20 through page 21, line 15; beginning on page 26, lines 4 through 15; and beginning on page 44, lines 3 through 22.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my dear friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 426

is the rule waiving points of order against H.R. 5158, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year 1991.

Since general appropriations bills are privileged, the legislation will be considered under the normal legislative process for consideration of appropriations bills. The time devoted to general debate will be determined by a unanimous-consent request. The bill will be open to amendment under the 5-minute rule. Any amendment which does not violate the rules of the House will be in order.

The rule waives section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of measures that would cause the relevant subcommittee level ceilings to be exceeded. This waiver is needed to continue the FHA single-family mortgage insurance limit at \$124,875. Continuing the mortgage insurance limit at this level, which has the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, Mr. GONZALEZ, results in a higher level of mortgage activity than would occur if the mortgage insurance level reverted to \$101,250—the level that would be effective on October 1, 1990, without further legislation. This resulting increase in mortgage activity causes CBO to score the subcommittee as being \$3 billion above the limit on primary loan guarantees. However, it actually results in outlay savings of \$197 million, due to an increase in insurance premiums being deposited into the FHA fund. This same waiver was contained in the rule providing for consideration of last year's VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill. The Rules Committee knows of no one who objects to the requested waiver.

The rule before us also waives clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI, requiring a 3-day layover, and clause 7 of rule XXI, requiring relevant printed hearings and report to be available for 3 days prior to consideration of a general appropriation bill. These two waivers are necessary to permit the House to consider H.R. 5158 before breaking for the Fourth of July district work period.

In addition, the rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in general appropriations bills, and restricting the offering of limitation amendments to such bills. This waiver is necessary because Congress has not yet enacted laws authorizing various programs funded in the bill, and because some bill language constitutes legislation. Authorization for programs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, H.R. 1180, has been reported by the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Af-

fairs. The rule before us also waives clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations in a general appropriation bill.

I urge adoption of this rule so that the House can proceed to consideration of this important measure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the able leader of the Committee on Rules, for explaining the provisions of the rule in detail. I also want to commend the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for all the work they have put into this bill. In taking the lead on legislation of this magnitude, they have had to balance many competing priorities, and they have done a good job.

The largest single item in this bill is funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs. Providing assistance to our Nation's veterans and their widows and orphans should always be a top priority. Veterans are the people who served the Nation in its hour of need, and the Nation should not forget them when they need help.

Mr. Speaker, I should note that since the rule does not add any restrictions to the normal amending process, Members will be free to offer any amendments which comply with the House rules. Because the rules prohibit legislation on appropriations bills, and because the Budget Act prohibits spending over the subcommittee's budget allocation, most of the amendments which would be in order would either cut funding or strike provisions already in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very well drafted bill, honestly presented, and it deserves the support of the Members of this body. I urge adoption of the rule and passage of the bill when it is debated this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule. I would call attention to the Members of this body that even though an explanation of the rule which may appear on your desks or in front of you now does call for a waiver of the Congressional Budget Act, it in no way exceeds the budget as far as moneys spent is concerned. It simply raises the mortgage cap. In other words, it raises the credit ceiling. It does not exceed the budget authority in moneys spent. I think all Members of this body should know that. Consequently, Members really should support the rule.

□ 1050

I also would like to commend the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], for the really yeoman work that they do on the veterans' portion of this budget. We all know the terrible problems we have had over recent years with properly and adequately funding the VA budget, particularly the medical care delivery system. And because of the work done by these gentlemen and their staffs on both sides of the aisle we are finally coming close to being able to provide for the needs, particularly in the veterans' hospitals and some of the psychiatric centers across this Nation. So again I want to commend both of them for the great job that they have done, and I hope that after the rule does pass unanimously that we go ahead and we pass the HUD and independent agencies bill. It is a well-developed bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], indicated that he did not know anybody who was opposed to the rule. I am.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] indicated we are going to pass the rule unanimously. We may do that, but only if I am closeted in a summit somewhere and not able to be on hand.

I want to apologize to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] for not appearing before his committee on this bill. I was beginning to feel I had worn out my welcome up there, and I had hoped the gentleman would assume that I was opposed to most of his rules, at least those which waived the Budget Act as this one does.

But seriously, Mr. Speaker, I rise in vigorous opposition to the rule. It, as usual, waives the Budget Act and waives the House rules. This rule means that we are again showing that we cannot even accept those tiny little shreds of self-discipline we attempt to lay upon ourselves. It is another major act of profligacy by this House.

The bill provides, as the distinguished chairman told us, \$3 billion of additional VA loan guarantees over the amount assumed in the House-passed resolution. Members will remember we deemed the 302(b) levels by the passage of a previous bit of ingenuity from the Rules Committee which provided for a \$30 billion increase in discretionary domestic spending over the budget resolution of last year.

This particular bill goes billions over our own budget resolution and, therefore, it is the worst of the bills that have proceeded from the Appropria-

tions Committee through the Rules Committee.

Many of my colleagues will remember that the budget resolution attempted to impose a credit ceiling. This is a bill that busts the credit ceiling. Some may also remember that the President's budget had a new section this year in which it showed that we had about \$6 trillion of liability for Federal guarantees of Government-sponsored enterprises in various loan programs.

This bill is adding an enormous amount to those particular guarantees. The \$6 trillion liability and efforts like this bill to add to that amount are going to be a problem leading to continuing fiscal despair in the future.

As I say, not only are we not following good fiscal sense, we are not even following the rules that we laid down for ourselves when we passed a very open handed budget resolution.

What the bill does when it provides this extra credit authority is exactly as the chairman described earlier. The extra credit authority generates \$197 million more in premiums. The committee cleverly seized the opportunity to spend that money. And, were it not for the excess of credit provided over and above the budget resolution, the bill would be \$200 million over the 302 limits in outlays.

So what the appropriations subcommittee has done for us in providing this \$3 billion of extra credit, and shattering our credit budget, was simply to provide \$200 million more spending for itself, which was not allowed in the already generous 302(b) allocation. This subcommittee has distinguished itself again, at least at this stage, as being the champion spender of the appropriation subcommittees so far this year.

Let me illustrate. The revised 1990 appropriation is \$48.5 billion. This particular bill is around \$63.5 billion, so we have managed to spend \$15 billion more than we appropriated last year. This is perhaps not a world's record, but it is 30 percent more than last year, and even when we separate out some of the housing commitments it still is 17 percent more than last year.

So if Members like big spending, if they think the taxpayers are not paying enough, if they think the Federal Government is the most efficient way to spend their money, vote for the rule. I do not intend to, and I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but the opposition to the rule to the contrary notwithstanding, I urge the adoption of the rule and the bill when it is presented before the Members of this body. It is a good rule and it should be adopted.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. 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 351, nays 59, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—351

Ackerman	Dellums	Hertel
Alexander	Derrick	Hiller
Anderson	DeWine	Hoagland
Andrews	Dickinson	Hochbrueckner
Annunzio	Dicks	Holloway
Anthony	Dingell	Horton
Applegate	Dixon	Hoyer
Armey	Dorgan (ND)	Hubbard
Aspin	Douglas	Huckaby
Atkins	Downey	Hughes
AuCoin	Durbin	Hutto
Baker	Dwyer	Inhofe
Barnard	Dymally	Ireland
Bates	Dyson	Jacobs
Bennett	Early	James
Bentley	Eckart	Jenkins
Bereuter	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (CT)
Berman	Emerson	Johnson (SD)
Bevill	Engel	Johnston
Bilbray	English	Jones (GA)
Bilirakis	Erdreich	Jones (NC)
Bliley	Espy	Jontz
Boehlert	Evans	Kanjorski
Boggs	Fascell	Kaptur
Borski	Fazio	Kastenmeier
Bosco	Feighan	Kennedy
Boucher	Fields	Kennelly
Boxer	Fish	Kildee
Brennan	Flake	Kleczka
Brooks	Flippo	Kolter
Broomfield	Foglietta	Kostmayer
Browder	Ford (MI)	LaFalce
Brown (CA)	Ford (TN)	Lancaster
Bruce	Frank	Lantos
Bryant	Frost	Laughlin
Byron	Gallo	Leach (IA)
Campbell (CA)	Gaydos	Leath (TX)
Campbell (CO)	Gejdenson	Lehman (CA)
Cardin	Gephardt	Lehman (FL)
Carper	Geren	Levin (MI)
Carr	Gibbons	Levine (CA)
Chapman	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Clarke	Gilman	Lewis (FL)
Clay	Gingrich	Lewis (GA)
Clement	Glickman	Lipinski
Clinger	Gonzalez	Livingston
Coleman (TX)	Gordon	Lloyd
Collins	Goss	Long
Condit	Gradison	Lowery (CA)
Conte	Grandy	Lowey (NY)
Cooper	Grant	Luken, Thomas
Costello	Gray	Machtley
Coughlin	Green	Madigan
Courter	Guarini	Manton
Cox	Gunderson	Markey
Coyne	Hamilton	Martin (NY)
Craig	Hammerschmidt	Matsui
Crockett	Hansen	Mavroules
Darden	Harris	Mazzoli
Davis	Hatcher	McCloskey
De la Garza	Hawkins	McCollum
DeFazio	Hayes (IL)	McCrery
DeLay	Hefner	McCurdy

McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morella
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard

Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Salki
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schiff
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (VT)

Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Walsh
Washington
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weidon
Wheat
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wyle
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)

NAYS—59

Archer	Gekas	Packard
Ballenger	Goodling	Petri
Bartlett	Hancock	Porter
Bateman	Hastert	Rogers
Brown (CO)	Hefley	Schaefer
Buechner	Henry	Sensenbrenner
Bunning	Herger	Shays
Burton	Hopkins	Shumway
Chandler	Houghton	Shuster
Coble	Hunter	Smith, Denny
Coleman (MO)	Kasich	(OR)
Combust	Kolbe	Smith, Robert
Crane	Kyl	(NH)
Dannemeyer	Lagomarsino	Smith, Robert
Dornan (CA)	Lightfoot	(OR)
Dreier	Lukens, Donald	Stump
Duncan	Marlenee	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (OK)	Martin (IL)	Upton
Fawell	McCandless	Ucanovich
Frenzel	McEwen	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Moorhead	

NOT VOTING—22

Barton	Hall (TX)	Ridge
Beilenson	Hayes (LA)	Russo
Bonior	Hyde	Schulze
Bustamante	Lent	Vander Jagt
Callahan	Martinez	Walker
Conyers	Morrison (CT)	Wilson
Donnelly	Nelson	
Hall (OH)	Nielson	

□ 1120

Mr. SHAYS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HOLLOWAY, and Mr. ROHRA-

BACHER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 770. An act to entitle employees to family leave in certain cases involving a birth, an adoption, or a serious health condition and to temporary medical leave in certain cases involving a serious health condition, with adequate protection of the employees' employment and benefit rights, and to establish a commission to study ways of providing salary replacement for employees who take any such leave.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO HAVE UNTIL 5 P.M., FRIDAY, JULY 6, 1990, TO FILE SUNDRY REPORTS

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until 5 p.m. on Friday, July 6, 1990, to file the committee's reports on H.R. 5115, Equity and Excellence in Education Act of 1990; H.R. 4982, Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Amendments Act of 1990; H.R. 5064, Drug Abuse Resistance Education Act of 1990; H.R. 5124, Anti-Drug Education Act of 1990; H.R. 5140, School Dropout and Basic Skills Improvement Act of 1990; and H.R. 5149, Child Nutrition Act Amendments regarding WIC Program.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1990, OR FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1990 TO TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1990, AND ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1990, OR FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1990, OR SATURDAY, JUNE 30, 1990 TO TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1990

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 347) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 347

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the

House adjourns on Thursday, June 28, 1990, or Friday, June 29, 1990, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, July 10, 1990, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Thursday, June 28, 1990, or Friday, June 29, 1990, or Saturday, June 30, 1990, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, it stand in recess or stand adjourned until 9:30 ante meridiem on Tuesday, July 10, 1990, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. HOYER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Concurrent Resolution 347 be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESCISSIONS AFFECTING PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 101-207)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, June 28, 1990.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAXLER. 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. 5158 and that I be able to include tables, charts, and other extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1991

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5158) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILSON] as the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1124

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 consideration of the bill, H.R. 5158, with Mr. FASCELL, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to express my deep appreciation to the members of the subcommittee, most especially my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking minority member. This committee's jurisdiction includes, in my judgment, some of the most important matters to be considered by this body. In addition to that I think

the members of the subcommittee are just outstanding, and without their valuable contributions this very fine work product would not be available to us today. In addition, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not recognize the important contributions that the staff, both at the full committee level and at the subcommittee level, have made to this product, and for that I am extremely grateful. I should also say that we have associate staff members who have been most helpful in this process to their members, to the full committee and to myself.

Mr. Chairman, we bring before the House today the 1991 appropriations bill for VA, HUD, and independent agencies. This is never an easy bill to mark up, it covers a variety of agencies and interests that represent the diversity of this Nation.

First, the Department of Housing and Urban Development deals with the very poorest of the poor in our housing programs. Further, the Department of Veterans Affairs deals with our veterans and their dependents, many of whom are low- and middle-income individuals, both in terms of the medical care for the veterans themselves and for the compensation for themselves and their survivors. Additionally, NASA deals with the leading edge of American technology in the Space Program and the national aerospace plane. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Protection Agency has the responsibility for protecting our air, and water and cleaning up the environment. Additionally, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has been very important to the disaster-struck parts of our Nation, and States and the people. They play an important role in the rehabilitation following those disasters. Additionally, the bill provides continued support for the highest quality and the most outstanding research that is done in the world through the National Science Foundation. Additionally, the National Science Foundation provides student grants and graduate stipends; in addition, summer continuing education for high school and elementary science teachers are very important to the technological future of this Nation. Additionally, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and Office of Consumer Affairs, deal with the important areas of consumer protection and protecting our children and citizens through their efforts—and it goes on with the various other agencies within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment no other appropriation bill coming before the House has such a broad spectrum and diversity of Federal contributions to such a range of our citizenry as this one. But, Mr. Chairman, in these times of extreme budget constraints, I believe that we bring before you a bill

that is very creditable, one that we have tried to balance very carefully among the needs and interests of the various agencies within our jurisdiction.

Let us take a closer look at this bottom line, the financial bottom line. This is a little technical, but the 302(b) allocation that we received from the full committee for this subcommittee is about \$700 million in outlays—in outlays—below the President's budget request. Mr. Chairman, on top of that we added some budget authority in very selected programs that will cost us roughly another \$300 million in outlays.

□ 1130

However, what that means is that even if we had not added a penny to the President's budget, we would still have had to make cuts in order to meet our 302(b) allocation.

Before we talk about those cuts, let me say a word or two about where we added some money, and I hope this will meet with the approval of the body.

First, we added about \$100 million to the President's request for the VA medical care and medical research programs. In my judgment, we should have done better. We could have done better to meet the needs of the veterans, but these are very difficult financial times and under the circumstances I think we have done as well as could be expected.

I must say that our VA hospitals, and I am very proud of this, as each and every Member must be of the VA medical staffs, operate with a staff to patient ratio that is one-half of that of the private hospitals in the District of Columbia, a remarkable achievement and a remarkable record. But if we cannot keep that minimum staffing in place and unless we add money to the VA medical care above the President's request, and I do not believe that we have added enough, I hope that we can find in the course of the coming months another \$100 million for this valuable account, I fear that in the future VA medical care will suffer some deterioration, something that no one in this body wants. We made this very clear to the committee over these past months.

Next we added about \$175 million for public housing and operating subsidies. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has consistently underestimated the performance of funding formula requirements for public housing operations, and without these moneys, in my judgment, all we are doing is helping the drug pushers.

Now, why is that? Well, because without sufficient public housing operating funds, the local PHA's are going to pay the utility bill and lay off security people, and that plays into the

hands of the drug dealers, drug pushers, and drug handlers that are inclined to hang out in public housing areas.

Finally, we added about \$150 million to the operating programs of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I want to congratulate the President for sending us one of the best EPA requests that this subcommittee has seen in many years. He deserves our support for that.

But that request included virtually no funding for nonpoint source pollution, which I consider to be one of the biggest problems we face in the environmental area today, and it included no funding, regretfully, for asbestos removal in schools.

We added about \$40 million for nonpoint source abatement and \$48 million for the asbestos-in-schools program, bringing both of those to roughly the levels of last year.

So, Mr. Chairman, those were the major add-ons that increased our outlays.

Now, what about our cuts? What did we do to meet our 302(b) ceiling that was imposed upon us? Well, first, NASA had a 24-percent increase in the President's budget. Regretfully, because of the constraints that were placed upon us in that 302(b) allocation, we reduced NASA by \$828 million, something no one in this committee is proud of, but still we provided—and this is vital—we still provided a 17.5-percent increase for NASA over last year's appropriation. That is the biggest increase that NASA has had in the last 10 years, and every penny of that, in my judgment, is justified and necessary.

We also cut the EPA Superfund Program by about \$160 million. That program has had a number of problems. We think it can handle this reduction, but let us not kid ourselves, this is one of the most serious areas in the EPA jurisdiction. We hope that we can continue to work with them on a positive basis. They have a fine administrator and we think that the Agency is on the right path and the right course in this problem-plagued program thus far.

We cut disaster assistance by about \$170 million, which we believe we can accommodate because there is a sufficient carryover of funds appropriated during the disasters of last year that we think will bring us through the 1991 fiscal year.

Now, there are one or two other things we have done in this bill that add money to critical programs, but because of the odd way in which we score outlays, by counting only the first-year impact, these add-ons do not impact on our outlay problem, but they do use up budget authority. We think they will meet with your approval.

First, we added about \$4.3 billion to HUD's subsidized housing program for the poor. New, that is the largest increase we have been able to fund in more than 10 years. It brings the assisted housing account up to about \$11 billion, still a far cry from the \$25 billion that we appropriated to this program in 1981.

Now, that additional budget authority has allowed us to increase funding for Indian housing, for incremental housing voucher and housing certificate units, for new public housing units, and for section 202 housing for the elderly and handicapped units.

Furthermore, we have increased rental rehabilitation grants.

We added \$244 million to the Community Development Block Grant Program. That should please all of your constituencies in the urban areas and elsewhere. It brings it up to the \$3 billion level.

Finally, we added about \$400 million to the Wastewater Treatment Construction Grant Program in the EPA.

We once again restored that program to the 1990 level, and I do not believe there is anything more important that we could do to clean up our waters than this particular appropriation.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us includes virtually no budget gimmicks. We have only two "creative financing" proposals in here. They both have been cleared by the CBO.

First, we delay the obligation of \$278 million of VA medical care equipment funds until August 1 of next year. That saves us about \$170 million in outlays.

Second, we extended the FHA mortgage ceiling, which was raised in the bill last year to \$124,875. We have extended that for an additional year until October 1, 1991. That provided us with another \$197 million in outlays.

That, Mr. Chairman, was done with the full permission and consent of the authorizing committee and its chairman. I am extremely grateful for their

cooperation. This language is contained in the housing bill and we lifted it in its entirety from the housing bill.

We think it is a good bill. It is balanced. It is a bill that does not fully fund one activity at the expense of another. We do not favor one child over another, and it is a bill that I think the entire membership can easily support; but you know, that probably will not be the case. I have discovered that you cannot please everyone and that 435 Members can have differences of opinion.

Even though we have recommended a 17.5-percent increase for NASA, some people will not agree that that is enough. They probably will have some amendments dealing with that issue.

Mr. Chairman, on the whole, I would commend and recommend this bill to the membership. It deserves everyone's support.

I will include a table comparing the amounts recommended with the 1990 appropriations and the revised 1991 budget requests at this point:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1991

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1990 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with new budget (obligational) authority, 1990 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (6)
TITLE I					
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Benefits Administration					
Compensation and pensions.....	15,555,495,000	15,204,451,000	15,684,551,000	+ 129,056,000	+ 480,100,000
Readjustment benefits.....	497,813,000	502,500,000	502,500,000	+ 4,687,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	13,940,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	+ 1,470,000
Loan guaranty revolving fund.....	558,500,000	512,200,000	670,200,000	+ 111,700,000	+ 158,000,000
Guaranty and indemnity fund.....	80,800,000	80,800,000	+ 80,800,000
Direct loan revolving fund (limitation on direct loans).....	(985,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+ 15,000)
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration.....	16,625,748,000	16,315,361,000	16,953,461,000	+ 327,713,000	+ 638,100,000
Veterans Health Service and Research Administration					
Medical care.....	11,419,706,000	12,227,066,000	12,310,490,000	+ 890,784,000	+ 83,424,000
Medical and prosthetic research.....	212,652,000	198,537,000	216,795,000	+ 4,143,000	+ 18,258,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	46,697,000	47,729,000	52,047,000	+ 5,350,000	+ 4,318,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	492,000	484,000	484,000	-8,000
Total, Veterans Health Service and Research Administration.....	11,679,547,000	12,473,816,000	12,579,816,000	+ 900,269,000	+ 106,000,000
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses.....	811,628,000	902,514,000	902,514,000	+ 90,886,000
Office of Inspector General.....	21,786,000	26,859,000	26,859,000	+ 5,073,000
Construction, major projects.....	408,542,000	530,000,000	575,456,000	+ 166,914,000	+ 45,456,000
Construction, minor projects.....	91,637,000	145,640,000	146,140,000	+ 54,503,000	+ 500,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(43,452,000)	(44,420,000)	(44,420,000)	(+ 968,000)
Parking garage revolving fund.....	28,543,000	18,900,000	28,900,000	+ 357,000	+ 10,000,000
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities.....	41,349,000	42,000,000	65,000,000	+ 23,651,000	+ 23,000,000
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries.....	4,288,000	3,946,000	3,946,000	-342,000
Total, Departmental Administration.....	1,407,773,000	1,669,859,000	1,748,815,000	+ 341,042,000	+ 78,956,000
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	29,713,068,000	30,459,036,000	31,282,092,000	+ 1,569,024,000	+ 823,056,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(985,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+ 15,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(43,452,000)	(44,420,000)	(44,420,000)	(+ 968,000)
TITLE II					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Housing Programs					
Annual contributions for assisted housing.....	7,799,355,000	7,352,317,300	11,625,086,000	+ 3,825,731,000	+ 4,272,768,700
Rescission of assisted housing deobligations (budget authority, indefinite).....	-311,236,000	-236,375,000	-236,375,000	+ 74,861,000
(By transfer).....	(157,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(+ 70,000,000)	(-87,000,000)
Total, annual contributions for assisted housing (net).....	7,488,119,000	7,115,942,300	11,388,711,000	+ 3,900,592,000	+ 4,272,768,700
Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts.....	1,074,492,000	7,734,985,400	7,734,985,400	+ 6,660,493,400
Rental rehabilitation grants.....	127,985,000	70,000,000	135,000,000	+ 7,015,000	+ 65,000,000
Rental housing assistance:					
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite.....	-48,000,000	-46,000,000	-46,000,000	+ 2,000,000
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund:					
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(472,664,000)	(282,543,000)	(491,570,000)	(+ 18,906,000)	(+ 209,027,000)
Authority to borrow, indefinite.....	412,969,000	220,480,000	437,044,000	+ 24,075,000	+ 216,564,000
Congregate services.....	5,829,000	7,000,000	+ 1,171,000	+ 7,000,000
Payments for operation of low-income housing projects.....	1,865,031,000	1,825,731,000	2,000,000,000	+ 134,969,000	+ 174,269,000
Housing counseling assistance.....	3,446,000	3,500,000	5,000,000	+ 1,554,000	+ 1,500,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1991--Continued

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1990 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with new budget (obligational) authority, 1990 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates of new (obliga- tional) authority, 1991 (6)
Federal Housing Administration Fund.....	350,093,000	317,366,000	-32,727,000	+ 317,366,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(73,837,500,000)	(75,000,000,000)	(+ 1,162,500,000)	(+ 75,000,000,000)
Temporary mortgage assistance payments (limitation on direct loans).....	(87,227,000)	(151,125,000)	(+ 63,898,000)	(+ 151,125,000)
FHA - Mutual Mortgage and Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Funds:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(62,000,000,000)	(-62,000,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans, TMAP).....	(123,500,000)	(-123,500,000)
FHA - General and special risk insurance funds.....		317,366,000			-317,366,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(13,000,000,000)	(-13,000,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans, TMAP).....	(27,625,000)	(-27,625,000)
Total, Federal Housing Administration Fund.....	350,093,000	317,366,000	317,366,000	-32,727,000
Nonprofit sponsor assistance (limitation on direct loans).....	(1,069,000)	(530,000)	(1,100,000)	(+ 31,000)	(+ 570,000)
Homeworkership and opportunity for people everywhere grants (HOPE grants).....		250,000,000			-250,000,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing.....		150,000,000	100,000,000	+ 100,000,000	-50,000,000
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities (limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(81,713,500,000)	(80,000,000,000)	(80,000,000,000)	(-1,713,500,000)
Total, Housing Programs (net).....	11,279,964,000	17,642,004,700	22,079,106,400	+ 10,799,142,400	+ 4,437,101,700
Homeless Assistance					
Emergency shelter grants program.....	73,164,000	71,285,000	75,000,000	+ 1,836,000	+ 3,715,000
Transitional and supportive housing demonstration program.....	126,825,000	143,592,000	150,000,000	+ 23,175,000	+ 6,408,000
Supplemental assistance for facilities to assist the homeless Section 8 moderate rehabilitation: Single room occupancy ...	10,830,000 73,185,000	161,000,000 49,571,300	15,000,000 100,000,000	+ 4,170,000 + 26,815,000	-146,000,000 + 50,428,700
Total, Homeless Assistance.....	284,004,000	425,448,300	340,000,000	+ 55,996,000	-85,448,300
Community Planning and Development					
Community development grants.....	2,926,514,000	2,756,000,000	3,000,000,000	+ 73,486,000	+ 244,000,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(141,768,000)	(140,000,000)	(-1,768,000)	(+ 140,000,000)
Urban development action grants (rescission).....	-11,450,000	-10,000,000		+ 11,450,000	+ 10,000,000
Urban homesteading.....	12,995,000	50,000,000	15,000,000	+ 2,005,000	-35,000,000
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	2,928,059,000	2,796,000,000	3,015,000,000	+ 86,941,000	+ 219,000,000
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology.....	20,426,000	23,000,000	30,000,000	+ 9,574,000	+ 7,000,000
(By transfer).....	(25,000,000)	(-25,000,000)
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities.....	12,410,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	-210,000
Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	345,407,000	426,124,000	426,124,000	+ 80,717,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(385,659,000)	(380,342,000)	(390,342,000)	(+ 4,683,000)	(+ 10,000,000)
Office of Inspector General.....	23,795,000	29,283,000	29,283,000	+ 5,488,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(6,391,000)	(8,557,000)	(8,557,000)	(+ 2,166,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1991--Continued

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1990 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with new budget (obligational) authority, 1990 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (6)
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	14,894,065,000	21,354,060,000	25,931,713,400	+ 11,037,648,400	+ 4,577,653,400
Appropriations	(14,851,782,000)	(21,425,955,000)	(25,777,044,400)	(+ 10,925,262,400)	(+ 4,351,089,400)
Authority to borrow	(412,969,000)	(220,480,000)	(437,044,000)	(+ 24,075,000)	(+ 216,564,000)
Rescissions	(-370,686,000)	(-292,375,000)	(-282,375,000)	(+ 88,311,000)	(+ 10,000,000)
(By transfer)		(182,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(+ 70,000,000)	(-112,000,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite) ..	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)		
(Limitation on direct loans)	(560,960,000)	(434,198,000)	(643,795,000)	(+ 82,835,000)	(+ 209,597,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(155,692,768,000)	(155,000,000,000)	(155,140,000,000)	(-552,768,000)	(+ 140,000,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended)	(392,050,000)	(388,899,000)	(398,899,000)	(+ 6,849,000)	(+ 10,000,000)
TITLE III					
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
American Battle Monuments Commission					
Salaries and expenses	16,032,000	15,402,000	15,900,000	-132,000	+ 498,000
Consumer Product Safety Commission					
Salaries and expenses	35,147,000	35,609,000	37,109,000	+ 1,962,000	+ 1,500,000
Court of Veterans Appeals					
Salaries and expenses	3,893,000	9,560,000	9,560,000	+ 5,667,000	
Department of Defense - Civil					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses	12,374,000	12,236,000	12,236,000	-138,000	
Environmental Protection Agency					
Salaries and expenses	864,409,000	999,700,000	995,000,000	+ 130,591,000	-4,700,000
Office of Inspector General	30,903,000	38,709,000	37,000,000	+ 6,097,000	-1,709,000
Research and development	229,820,000	249,000,000	254,900,000	+ 25,080,000	+ 5,900,000
Abatement, control, and compliance	798,434,000	865,300,000	1,006,525,000	+ 208,091,000	+ 141,225,000
Buildings and facilities	14,652,000	13,000,000	34,000,000	+ 19,348,000	+ 21,000,000
Subtotal, operating programs	1,938,218,000	2,165,709,000	2,327,425,000	+ 389,207,000	+ 161,716,000
Hazardous substance superfund	1,530,228,000	1,740,000,000	1,610,200,000	+ 79,972,000	-129,800,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(213,825,000)	(230,000,000)	(233,000,000)	(+ 19,175,000)	(+ 3,000,000)
Leaking underground storage tank trust fund	74,097,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	+ 903,000	
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(5,834,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(+ 166,000)	
Construction grants	1,991,720,000	1,600,000,000	2,000,000,000	+ 8,280,000	+ 400,000,000
Rescission	-47,700,000			+ 47,700,000	
Total, Environmental Protection Agency (net)	5,486,563,000	5,580,709,000	6,012,625,000	+ 526,062,000	+ 431,916,000
Executive Office of the President					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	1,465,000	2,780,000	2,780,000	+ 1,315,000	
National Space Council	983,000	1,363,000	1,000,000	+ 17,000	-363,000
Office of Science and Technology Policy	2,829,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	+ 471,000	
Total, Executive Office of the President	5,277,000	7,443,000	7,080,000	+ 1,803,000	-363,000
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Disaster relief	1,248,450,000	270,000,000	100,000,000	-1,148,450,000	-170,000,000
Salaries and expenses	138,572,000	143,334,000	143,459,000	+ 4,887,000	+ 125,000
Office of Inspector General	2,563,000	3,905,000	3,905,000	+ 1,342,000	
Emergency management planning and assistance	270,643,000	277,042,000	275,423,000	+ 4,780,000	-1,619,000
Emergency food and shelter program	130,092,000	124,991,000	134,000,000	+ 3,908,000	+ 9,009,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	1,790,320,000	819,272,000	656,787,000	-1,133,533,000	-162,485,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1991--Continued

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1990 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with new budget (obligational) authority, 1990 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (6)
General Services Administration					
Consumer Information Center	1,339,000	1,540,000	1,540,000	+ 201,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(2,052,000)	(2,172,000)	(2,172,000)	(+ 120,000)
Department of Health and Human Services					
Office of Consumer Affairs	1,834,000	1,889,000	1,889,000	+ 55,000
Interagency Council on the Homeless					
Salaries and expenses	1,083,000	1,214,000	1,214,000	+ 131,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Research and development	5,227,776,000	7,074,000,000	7,034,094,000	+ 1,806,318,000	-39,906,000
Space flight, control and data communications	4,550,715,000	6,499,132,000	6,530,351,000	+ 1,979,636,000	+ 31,219,000
Portion applied to debt reduction		-1,209,732,000	-1,209,732,000	-1,209,732,000
Construction of facilities	443,960,000	497,900,000	485,000,000	+ 41,040,000	-12,900,000
Research and program management	1,990,464,000	2,252,900,000	1,446,212,000	-544,252,000	-806,688,000
Office of Inspector General	8,659,000	11,000,000	10,500,000	+ 1,841,000	-500,000
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration...	12,221,574,000	15,125,200,000	14,296,425,000	+ 2,074,851,000	-828,775,000
National Commission on American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Housing					
Salaries and expenses	500,000	-500,000
National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing					
Salaries and expenses	2,000,000	-2,000,000
National Credit Union Administration					
Central liquidity facility:					
Community development credit union revolving loan fund (transfer to Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation)	(-6,605,000)	(+ 6,605,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(590,700,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(+ 9,300,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds)	(851,000)	(893,000)	(893,000)	(+ 42,000)
National Institute of Building Sciences					
Payment to the National Institute of Building Sciences	492,000	250,000	-242,000	+ 250,000
National Science Foundation					
Research and related activities	1,702,411,000	1,954,000,000	1,854,000,000	+ 151,589,000	-100,000,000
Program development and management (limitation on administrative expenses)	(96,383,000)	(102,500,000)	(100,000,000)	(+ 3,617,000)	(-2,500,000)
Academic research facilities	19,690,000	20,000,000	+ 310,000	+ 20,000,000
United States Antarctic Program activities	71,953,000	175,000,000	100,000,000	+ 28,047,000	-75,000,000
United States Antarctic logistical support activities	79,729,000	75,000,000	-4,729,000	+ 75,000,000
Science education activities	204,265,000	251,000,000	285,000,000	+ 80,735,000	+ 34,000,000
Office of Inspector General	2,560,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+ 440,000
Total, National Science Foundation	2,080,608,000	2,383,000,000	2,337,000,000	+ 256,392,000	-46,000,000
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation					
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	26,554,000	17,895,000	24,500,000	-2,054,000	+ 6,605,000
(By transfer)	(6,605,000)	(-6,605,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1991--Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1990 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with new budget (obligational) authority, 1990	Bill compared with budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1991
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Selective Service System					
Salaries and expenses	25,905,000	26,635,000	26,635,000	+ 730,000
Total, title III, Independent Agencies:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	21,711,495,000	24,037,604,000	23,440,750,000	+ 1,729,255,000	-596,854,000
Appropriations.....	(21,759,195,000)	(25,247,336,000)	(24,650,482,000)	(+ 2,891,287,000)	(-596,854,000)
Rescission.....	(-47,700,000)	(+ 47,700,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(318,094,000)	(340,672,000)	(341,172,000)	(+ 23,078,000)	(+ 500,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(590,700,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(+ 9,300,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended).....	(851,000)	(893,000)	(893,000)	(+ 42,000)
TITLE IV					
CORPORATIONS					
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:					
FSLIC Resolution Fund 1/	4,962,000,000	2,915,744,000	2,915,744,000	-2,046,256,000
Resolution Trust Corporation:					
Office of Inspector General	10,785,000	10,785,000	+ 10,785,000
Total, title IV, Corporations.....	4,962,000,000	2,926,529,000	2,926,529,000	-2,035,471,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	71,280,628,000	78,777,229,000	83,581,084,400	+ 12,300,456,400	+ 4,803,855,400
Appropriations.....	(71,286,045,000)	(80,058,856,000)	(84,636,147,400)	(+ 13,350,102,400)	(+ 4,577,291,400)
Authority to borrow.....	(412,969,000)	(220,480,000)	(437,044,000)	(+ 24,075,000)	(+ 216,564,000)
Rescissions.....	(-418,386,000)	(-292,375,000)	(-282,375,000)	(+ 136,011,000)	(+ 10,000,000)
(By transfer).....	(182,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(+ 70,000,000)	(-112,000,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(361,546,000)	(385,092,000)	(385,592,000)	(+ 24,046,000)	(+ 500,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,152,645,000)	(1,035,198,000)	(1,244,795,000)	(+ 92,150,000)	(+ 209,597,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(155,692,768,000)	(155,000,000,000)	(155,140,000,000)	(-552,768,000)	(+ 140,000,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended).....	(392,901,000)	(389,792,000)	(399,792,000)	(+ 6,891,000)	(+ 10,000,000)
1/ Current indefinite authority, current estimate only					

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriation bill. I think the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has laid out the details of the bill. It is a very complicated bill; there are different financing mechanisms for different agencies involved in the bill. I think I could not improve on the explanation of the bill that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan, has given, and I shall not try to improve on it or to repeat it.

I should, however, like to make a few observations about the bill which may help place it in context for my colleagues.

During the debate on the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] made some comments about the bill. They were very critical of the size of the bill and the percentage of the increase over the current fiscal year's

funding for the departments and agencies involved in this bill.

I think it is important that my colleagues, and particularly those on this side of the aisle, understand that that has largely been driven by requests from the President. In fact, the outlays in this bill are some half billion dollars less than the outlays that would have resulted had the President's budget request for the departments and agencies involved in this bill been fully funded in this bill.

□ 1140

It is not any profligacy on the part of this subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations that leads to the size of this bill. It is the fact that we are trying, to the extent that we can and that we deem appropriate, to accommodate the requests of the President of the United States. That is nowhere more clear, for example, than in the funding for the space program where the President requested very,

very substantial increases for NASA. We were not able fully to accommodate those, but we do, indeed, have a very large increase for the NASA programs here.

Similarly, in the case of HUD, the President requested an additional \$7 billion that is necessary to provide budget authority to fund renewal of housing subsidy contracts that are expiring. Unless the families that are covered by those agreements are to be thrown out on the street, evicted from their dwellings, that money, we agree with the President, must be appropriated, but obviously \$7 billion is a lot of budget authority, and we recognize that. But the President saw the need for it, and we see the need for it, and I do not think it is appropriate to criticize either of us for doing what has to be done.

In the case of the VA medical account, again, we were delighted that the President asked for a substantial increase in that account. As the veter-

ans' population, the majority of which is of World War II vintage, becomes older, demand on the VA medical system for services increases, and that need has to be accommodated. The President requested the funds, and we provided the funds to address those needs.

In the case of the National Science Foundation, for example, the President wants to double the funding for the National Science Foundation over a 5-year period. We believe that that is a very important area for increased funding, in that the National Science Foundation does a great deal, not just to increase our store of basic scientific knowledge, but also to improve the competitiveness of the United States in a very competitive economic world. So we do have a substantial increase, not as much as I should have liked, but as much as we could afford in the National Science Foundation accounts.

I hope that my colleagues, particularly my colleagues on this side of the aisle, will not be put off by the very substantial percentage increase in this bill. We are simply responding to the very substantial percentage increase that the President of the United States requested for the departments and agencies involved in this bill.

Let me conclude my remarks by addressing one particular area, and that is the situation with respect to the proposals we have made for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We are very aware in our subcommittee that our colleagues on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs are hard at work on housing legislation on the House side. The Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs has a bill pending for us that I understand we shall be addressing shortly after we return from the district work period.

The Senate worked long hours yesterday and passed a somewhat different housing bill. However, at the time we marked up this bill, it was not possible for us to know what the final shape of the programs was going to be. Perhaps by the time we go to conference the issues between the House and the Senate will be resolved on the shape of this year's housing legislation. Maybe they will not be.

It is not appropriate for me to speculate as to that, but I certainly hope our friends on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs will understand that the reason we have not tried to deal with those new programs on which they are hard at work is the fact that we simply do not know what final shape they are going to take.

Moreover, because of the rules that the Congress has imposed on HUD in terms of drafting implementing regulations, that process typically takes a fairly substantial period of time, and so it seems to us wise to proceed with

this bill on the basis of the existing law, fully recognizing that by the end of this session we may be facing a new, and let us hope, improved housing law and fully cognizant of the very hard work that our colleagues on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs are putting in to bring us to that conclusion.

I do want to express my appreciation to our friends on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs for their understanding and also for permitting us to continue the \$124,750 ceiling on FHA mortgage insurance that the House voted for the current fiscal year.

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the Committee on Appropriations. They have worked pretty hard, too.

Mr. Chairman, the full committee did pass out the housing and community development bill. We had thought we would go to the Committee on Rules this morning, but legislative counsel did not have the necessary documentation, so it is scheduled for the first day upon our return after the July break.

In the meanwhile, I understand it will be scheduled for floor debate on July 13. I do want to assure the gentleman that the Senate's action whereby they reconciled two of their most difficult areas is very promising. I think that the action of the committee on the House side broke, or helped break, the logjam they were in over in the Senate, so some Senator said.

I wanted to recognize the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], on the Subcommittee on Housing, because we have worked together. We have what we consider to be a good bill. There will be some areas in which there is agreement, some areas in which we will appeal to the full House membership. They will be discussed thoroughly under an open rule, no qualifications whatsoever.

I wanted to express my gratitude to the gentlewoman and to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE], who is the ranking minority member of the full committee. We have had a bipartisan effort. It has come out that way to the committee, and it looks as if we will have an authorization bill for the Members.

I want to thank the gentleman for his kind and generous remarks.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the housing section

of the fiscal year 1991 VA/HUD appropriations bill.

As the ranking Republican of the Housing Subcommittee I regret that our authorization bill has not yet come to the floor for consideration and that several new programs and directions which we in the Housing Committee approved will not be funded in this appropriations bill. However, this appropriation is well within the levels of our bill and should come close to covering those additional initiatives. It is my expectation that we will consider the authorization bill soon after our district work period and we can conform this appropriations bill to our national housing policy. And, indeed, I too am optimistic that House and Senate will report a bill.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to confine my opening remarks today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the very important issue of lead-based paint abatement.

On April 1, HUD, in accordance with previous legislation and amendments to the McKinney Act, and direction from the Appropriations Committee, published its long-awaited guidelines relating to the testing and abatement of lead-based paint in our national public housing stock.

As the members of the Housing Committee know, I have been especially interested in this problem for some time, and I am cautiously optimistic that we have finally moved the overly reluctant Federal bureaucracy toward a more realistic approach to the issues related to lead-based paint.

The problem of lead paint is pervasive. Dr. Herbert Needleman, the most recognized expert on lead poisoning from the University of Pittsburgh, has said:

Childhood lead poisoning is a man-made disease and unlike other important illnesses, its nature is clear. Few mysteries surround it; the greater enigma is why lead has been permitted to persist in the human environment in the face of a mass of convincing data about where it is, what it does, and what is needed to get rid of it.

The effects of lead poisoning are devastating and well-documented as lead poisoning can impair children's intelligence, growth, ability to hear and perceive language, and to focus, maintain, and shift attention. It produces hyperactivity and aggression. It can lead to decreased play activity, lethargy, loss of motor skills, development of behavioral disorders, seizures, and even death.

In addition, substantial evidence has emerged over the last year indicating that many of the current abatement efforts around the country are being performed poorly and that abatement done improperly can do more harm than good. We now know that improper removal leads to the creation of lead dust which is then inhaled or in-

gested by children which further increases their risk of exposure.

In short, we are enduring a national tragedy, and something must be done now to address this problem. The time for foot dragging and buck passing is over. The law is clear and the Federal Government must act.

For the past 2 years, the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] has been developing regulations which include detailed standards and guidelines for testing and abatement of lead-based paint.

No one wants unsafe abatement to continue. But it does not have to. As far as I am concerned, we know how to clean up lead paint safely and effectively. It is being done in some parts of the country. What we needed was the issuance of the standards and guidelines so that everyone will do it safely. Now that this has been accomplished, it becomes the responsibility of the Congress to provide the funding necessary to carry out the program.

I recognize that the anticipated cost of this program will be expensive. In testimony before our Housing Committee we received cost estimates ranging from \$350 million to \$600 million needed in fiscal year 1991 alone. Beyond that, the total cost will be unknown until the testing program is complete.

Congress will have to directly appropriate these funds through the traditional HUD modernization programs. And, I am glad to see that the Appropriations Committee has increased the budget for public housing modernization by \$850 million to help cover the cost of lead paint abatement.

The lives and future well-being of our children cannot be measured in terms of cost to HUD or the Federal Government. "We can pay now or pay later but we will pay."

But if we have to pay later, we will not only be paying increased medical and educational expenses incurred for our exposed children, but we may pay with the lives of our next generations. I for one would rather pay now.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the efforts of the Appropriations Committee and their effort in attempting to fulfillment of the congressional mandate to rid this Nation of this lead-poisoning threat. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, who also shares my concern, for addressing this issue and assisting in the resolution of this terrible problem.

□ 1150

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER]. I want to congratulate the gentleman and the subcommittee for recognizing the need to increase the problem of lead-based paint and for increasing the amount of CIAP funds for this process. As the

chairman realizes, the lead paint program will be very expensive over at least a 5-year period. Is the committee in this appropriation committing itself to the long-term abatement of lead in our public housing stock?

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes. Let me say how much I appreciate the interest of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] in this area. The subcommittee is most grateful.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the continuing cooperation of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER]. Will the committee continue to fund this abatement through an increase in CIAP funding rather than creating a separate line item for the lead paint funding?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. The authorization committee will take a little different tack, I might note, but this is for clarification of the legislative intent here. Does the committee intend that HUD place any arbitrary limit on the fiscal year 1991 amount of CIAP funds to carry out the lead-paint abatement program?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the answer is no.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the clarification for the legislative record.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the honorable gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], and my fellow members of the subcommittee.

I shall not at this time go into the various programs financed in the bill which our chairman the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has already done and which the ranking member the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has also explained.

Again, may I say this is a changing world, and much of the money in this bill is for the purpose of keeping up with scientific developments.

I think we have done a good job in trying to balance the various programs in this bill—veterans, NASA, housing and the like. Included are funds for housing for the elderly and the handicapped and other housing programs, community development grants, emergency shelter grants, supplemental assistance for the homeless, hazardous substance Superfund, waste water construction grants, disaster relief, emergency food and shelter program, the

National Science Foundation, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including funds for the advanced solid rocket motor program which will be constructed at Yellow Creek in my district.

Mr. Chairman, again, it has been a real pleasure as a member of this subcommittee to have firsthand knowledge of the great job the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has done with the support of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] and the other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and congratulate the chairman and ranking member and all of the members of the subcommittee for bringing us a good appropriations bill here today. I am pleased that the amount appropriated for NASA recognizes the excellent job and the excellent record that NASA has established over the years, and also the tremendous responsibility that we have given NASA as to further our efforts in space exploration and technology research and development.

Mr. Chairman, the main reason I rise today is because those of us in Florida are very proud that our State is home to one of the largest populations of America's veterans of any of the 50 States. In the last 12 months some 60,000 new veterans and their families have taken up residence in the great State of Florida. We are very happy to see the increase that the subcommittee has recommended for veterans programs. I think that it reaffirms that we are not going to renege on our commitment to our veterans. To the contrary, we are going to see that those programs that we have promised are funded.

Mr. Chairman, there is one point I would like to make as this legislation goes through the entire process. Because of the large growth in the veteran population in Florida and the many visitors we welcome to our State each year who are veterans, we need to understand that the way some of these increased funds are allocated, sometimes does not recognize the tremendous growth in Florida's veteran population. I would hope that we might recognize that as we go through the process.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5158, the fiscal year 1991 Department of Veterans Affairs appropriations bill. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am pleased to say this is the largest allocation for veterans programs ever recommended by our committee.

This legislation provides \$1.6 billion more in 1991 than is available for these benefits and

services in the current year and follows enactment earlier this year of a supplemental appropriations bill which provided an additional \$529 million for 1990 veterans services and medical care.

As the Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, I proudly represent one of the largest populations of veterans of any member of the House. In recognition of the great contributions veterans have made to our Nation, we have established in Pinellas County one of the best veterans service programs anywhere in our Nation. To meet their health care needs, we have at Bay Pines the most modern and technologically advanced medical facility in the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system. With the 1990 supplemental funding and the bill our committee brings to the House today, I continue my efforts to ensure that the Congress provides adequate funding to fully staff its operations. In fact, the 1991 Veterans Affairs appropriations bill provides for an almost 10-percent increase in the medical care account.

To further provide for the needs of Florida's veterans, St. Petersburg is home to the Department of Veterans Affairs Regional Office which handles benefits and claims for Florida's 1.5 million veterans. It handles one of the largest caseloads of any regional office.

Bay Pines and the St. Petersburg Regional Office are two of the most active VA facilities because they must meet the needs of our State's veterans population, which is increasing at a rate unmatched in our country. With as many as 5,000 veterans moving into Florida each month, I am leading an effort by our entire congressional delegation to ensure that our State receives an equitable share of the funds we appropriate for the Department of Veterans Affairs. There is no doubt that the increasing veterans population has strained the resources of VA facilities in Florida. Evidence of this strain is the 50-percent increase in the number of veterans treated as inpatients at Bay Pines between 1985 and 1989, and an almost 40-percent increase in outpatient visits during the same time period. If we are to realize the benefits of the increasing resources our committee provides for veterans programs, we must continue our work to change the way in which the VA distributes its medical care funds and personnel to make sure that Florida is fairly compensated for its increasing veterans population and caseload.

With the support of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and in our congressional delegation, we have taken great strides over the past 2 years to provide new and expanded facilities for the health care needs of our veterans. Last year this Committee provided funding for a new medical center at West Palm Beach, for expansion of the spinal cord injury clinic in Tampa, and the modernization of the psychiatric facilities in Gainesville. This year the Committee has included in its bill funding for a new nursing home at West Palm Beach and another in Lake City. The Committee also has indicated its support for construction of a major new medical center in east central Florida once final selection for the project is complete. When completed, this major expansion of VA facilities within our State will increase the number of hospital

beds by 50 percent and double the number of nursing home beds.

This long-term commitment to the veterans of Florida and our Nation makes good on a promise by a grateful Nation to those who came to the defense of our great country and the ideals of freedom, liberty, and democracy throughout the world. They served our Nation in its time of need and this member of the House will ensure that the Congress continues to provide the necessary funds to care for our veterans in their time of need.

For we must never forget, especially in this period of historic change throughout the world, that America's veterans are the real heroes of freedom in East Germany, Poland, and those on the verge of freedom elsewhere in Eastern Europe and the Baltic States of the Soviet Union. If not for our veterans, there would be no freedom in Western Europe or the United States for these countries to emulate.

American veterans, who fought against oppression in the name of freedom in combat all over the world, provided the beacon of hope for the people of those war ravaged lands. The courage and struggle of all Americans who have carried the Stars and Stripes into battle around the world showed the oppressed and downtrodden citizens under siege the value of freedom and the great lengths that our Nation is willing to go to preserve this inalienable human right.

There is a great debate in our Nation over how strong our national defense must be to preserve our freedom and the freedom of our allies. Throughout our history we have made the decision to maintain the strongest, most well-equipped, and best-trained military possible so that we could remain the lighthouse of hope and beacon of freedom for people throughout the world who were being denied their freedom and basic human rights. Through our strength we were able to give conviction and strength to the freedom movement in Poland, East Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Soviet Union. And we will continue to be that lighthouse of hope and beacon of freedom for these people until they realize the dream of living in a land governed by the leaders of their choice selected in free elections.

Our Nation has cause to be proud of our veterans and of our powerful military strength that we have never used to take away another country's rights or freedoms. Instead, we have used that force to restore freedom where freedom was threatened, to restore peace where peace no longer existed, and to deter aggression where otherwise small and defenseless nations would be overrun by tyrannical forces.

The memories of those who scaled the Iron Curtain and brought it down with hammers and picks last November were captured in pictures on the front pages of the world's newspapers and in the film of broadcasters from every continent. The world media, however, fails to recall the American heroes who preserved a free Europe on the other side of the wall. We must never lose sight or forget symbols of Communism such as the Iron Curtain which was built to keep its people in rather than to keep others from entering. Free nations, such as the United States, need no walls to keep their people from leaving. In

fact, we have to regulate the number of emigrants to our Nation because so many people dream of the day when they can come here to live and worship freely.

That dream is only possible because of America's veterans and their unselfish service. As we embark on a new decade, I believe the 1990's will bring new found freedoms for many more formerly communist nations. Let us hope that the euphoria surrounding the opening of every closed border and the tumbling of every wall does not overshadow the deeds of America's veterans who kept alive the dream of freedom in the hearts and minds of the newly liberated people of the world.

Mr. Speaker, today the Congress continues its enduring commitment to our Nation's veterans, a commitment so well stated more than 100 years ago by President Abraham Lincoln that it is carved into the walls of the Department of Veterans Affairs. It was in his Second Inaugural Address that Lincoln charged the Congress: " * * * to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan * * *."

We should give thanks for all those who "have borne the battle" every time we read or hear of another person or country gaining new found freedom. This is the message we send to America's veterans today with approval of this appropriations bill as we once again deliver on the promise of a grateful nation to provide for them in their time of need.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the ranking majority member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of final passage of H.R. 5158, the VA-HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991. I want to commend the distinguished Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], and the other members of the subcommittee for doing an exemplary job in bringing this legislation to the floor. The members of this subcommittee have labored arduously to ensure that our veterans, elderly, and poor receive the services they need and deserve. It is a good bill.

Many of the programs which are vital to the development of our Nation are contained in this bill. H.R. 5158 provides a total of \$83.6 billion in funding for our Nation's veterans, environmental, housing, science and space, and emergency management programs. This level of funding is \$5 million less than the 302(b) allocation approved by the Appropriations Committee.

Major highlights of the bill include significant funding increases for housing and space programs in fiscal year 1991, including \$22.1 billion for housing programs, over \$10 billion more than the amount provided in last year's appropriations; \$14.3 billion in

funding also was provided for our Nation's space programs. This level of funding is \$2.1 billion more than the amount provided last year.

The committee has provided \$100 million in drug elimination grants for public housing authorities; about \$680 million in homeless assistance programs; \$3 billion in community development block grants; \$12.3 billion in veterans medical care; \$2 billion for sewer construction grants; and \$2.3 billion for the development of the space station.

In addition to these initiatives, Mr. Chairman, there are several projects contained in this bill which are of special interest to me. Language contained in the bill directs both NASA and the EPA to provide 8 percent of the funds appropriated for contracts, grants, and awards to minority- and women-owned businesses. Similar language was included in last year's bill for NASA. This year the subcommittee added another provision to include EPA. I particularly want to thank the gentlewoman from Louisiana, LINDY BOGGS, for assisting me with this effort.

The serious dearth of minorities and women in the science and engineering fields may result in a crisis for our Nation if remedial programs are not adopted quickly at the Federal level. This is a conclusion which has been drawn by several studies, and which has been acknowledged by leading experts in the math, science, and engineering areas. During testimony before our subcommittee, for example, Dr. Bloch of the National Science Foundation, Admiral Truly, the NASA Administrator, and Dr. Bromley, the President's science adviser all expressed their concern about this issue. The consensus is that immediate, effective action must be taken.

Well over half of the money we appropriate to NASA and EPA each year is awarded to private businesses in the form of contracts and other awards. In many instances, minorities and women have received only a fraction of these funds. For instance—of the direct contracts awarded by EPA in fiscal year 1989, minorities only received 0.8 percent of these funds. The language I had included in this bill directing the EPA and NASA to provide at least 8 percent of these funds to minority- and women-owned business will assist them in addressing this problem.

Also under the EPA section of the report, I included language which appropriates \$2 million for Clark Atlanta University to enhance the participation of minority scientists, engineers, and students in emergency environmental Superfund research areas. Additionally, \$1.6 million has been provided to train union and minority workers in the areas of asbestos. Minority contractors also will receive

funding for training purposes in the radon and Superfund areas.

Under the housing section, language was included in the report which directs the Department of Housing and Urban Development to coordinate its lead-based paint abatement efforts with the centers for disease control. Currently, many children being treated under CDC programs are being returned to public housing which has not been abated. Oftentimes, they become poisoned again, and suffer adverse health effects.

HUD also has been directed to work to ensure that public housing authorities in large cities receive grants under the Drug Elimination Grant Program. Last year, no large cities were selected as grantees. Considering the severity of the drug problem in cities like New York, Cleveland, and elsewhere, the exclusion of large cities seriously undermines the agency's efforts.

Mr. Chairman, these are just a few of the many programs being funded by this bill. As you can see, the committee has reported a fine bill, despite the difficult choices it had to make. I have enjoyed serving as a member of this subcommittee, and I, again, commend Chairman TRAXLER, BILL GREEN, and the other members of the subcommittee for the leadership they provided in guaranteeing the funding of these important programs. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support final passage of H.R. 5158.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

In the past, the subcommittee has included report language to encourage the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to make greater use of Senior Environmental Employment [SEE] enrollees. The report for the fiscal year 1991 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act does not have this report language.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee intend for EPA to make greater use of SEE enrollees in environmental-related activities. Moreover, both the subcommittee and the full committee strongly urge EPA to make greater use of SEE participants in the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act [AHERA] initiative, Superfund activities, and Earth Day-related activities. Additionally, EPA should encourage State programs which are funded by EPA to utilize SEE enrollees to provide technical assistance in emerging environmental concerns, such as monitoring the quality of indoor air, inspecting leakage in underground tanks, and others.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr.

STOKES] is absolutely correct in his understanding. He has stated accurately the intent of the subcommittee and the committee on this matter.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5158, providing fiscal year 1991 appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and sundry independent agencies.

Mr. Chairman, it is never easy for any of the Appropriations Subcommittees to order the spending priorities of the Federal Government. The task is enormously complicated, however, when a particular subcommittee is called upon to balance the competing demands of programs as diverse and as varied as the national aerospace plane and prosthetic research. Veterans medical care and civil defense. Disaster assistance and teacher training. Emergency housing shelters and battle monuments. Consumer information and home mortgage insurance. Draft registration and toxic waste cleanup. The Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies must establish funding priorities for all of these programs, along with many, many others. It is an extraordinarily difficult task, and yet the subcommittee has developed a spending package that is comprehensive, fair and worthy of this body's support.

It is, of course, impossible to do everything we would like to do in this bill, but the measure provides generous increases for programs that desperately need additional resources. For example, the bill provides \$12.3 billion for veterans medical care in fiscal year 1991.

□ 1200

This is an increase of \$83 million over the President's request and nearly \$900 million more than last year. The bill also provides \$217 million for VA medical and prosthetic research, an increase of \$18.3 million over the budget estimate. The subcommittee has once again demonstrated its commitment to the living heroes of this country who have sacrificed life and limb in defense of our liberty.

Mr. Chairman, I am especially pleased that the committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], chairman of the committee, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] accepted my amendment to provide an additional \$6 million for VA medical care to preserve needed services at long-term psy-

chiatric hospitals in the VA health care system.

In many ways, these psychiatric facilities have become the poor orphans of the VA system. The veterans who require psychiatric care lack a political voice and risk neglect by the system.

I have learned just how great the need is for additional psychiatric care resources in my own district at Luds Hospital, and I understand the problem is national in scope. I am proud that the committee has taken forceful action to ensure that the provision of needed services will be maintained at these institutions, especially at Luds in Northampton.

The subcommittee has also provided generous support for assisted housing, homelessness programs, and community development efforts administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The \$11.6 billion appropriation for assisted housing will support 118,000 incremental housing units in fiscal year 1991; provide \$2.7 billion for public housing modernization; and sustain a diverse mix of housing options for low-income Americans in need of assistance.

The subcommittee has also provided an overall funding increase for the Environmental Protection Agency, an agency which I would like to see—and all of us would like to see—operating as a Cabinet-level department in the near future. The bill provides over \$6 billion for the agency, \$431 million more than requested by the President and over a half billion dollars more than we appropriated last year. This level permits continuance of the EPA's Construction Grants Program at the \$2 billion level for fiscal year 1991. Given increasing financial constraints at the State and local level, communities across the Nation have come to depend on these funds as a source of assistance for the construction of wastewater treatment plants.

The bill also contains \$20 million to continue Federal participation in the cleanup of Boston Harbor.

This is very very important for that polluted harbor in Boston, and the appropriation keeps the Federal Government right on track to satisfy by fiscal year 1992 its obligation under the Clean Water Act to assist in this extraordinary public works effort. The cleanup project will help restore one of America's most historic natural resources to its former beauty. It got polluted when they started throwing tea in there, you know, many years ago in the Boston Harbor, and we will be cleaning all of that up. It is going to be swimmable and fishable some day.

The subcommittee was unable to provide two important agencies—the National Science Foundation and National Aeronautics and Space Administration—with the full amount of new money sought by the administration.

But in both cases the bill provides healthy increases over last year. At \$14.3 billion, NASA receives an increase in excess of \$2 billion over last year. This 17-percent funding boost will doubtless represent one of the largest percentage increases of any agency in the Federal Government this year.

Boy, I would love to have this increase for the National Institutes of Health for research on cancer, heart disease, and diabetes. I think it is more important to find a cure for AIDS and a cure for cancer than to fund the space programs, and I am glad we are going to have an amendment here to knock out \$6 million to find the little green monsters trying to come down here to a Chicago ballfield.

Likewise, the bill's appropriation of \$2.337 billion for the National Science Foundation is a \$256-million increase over last year. Although the committee would have liked to commit even more funds to the worthy programs of NSF, it was unable to do so because of fiscal constraints.

I am also pleased to note that the bill provides full funding—\$3.3 million—for the Office of Science and Technology Policy. OSTP will be using some of these funds to develop an interagency program for Government-sponsored research relating to the diseases and disorders of the brain and nervous system. OSTP has been designated by the Appropriations Committee as the lead agency to coordinate Governmentwide activities pertaining to the "Decade of the Brain," and I am optimistic that the Office's efforts will lead to a coordinated and comprehensive approach by the Federal Government to harness our knowledge about brain physiology and function during the 1990's. We sure need it.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend my dear friend and colleague, the wise, and dedicated chairman of the subcommittee, the honorable gentleman from Michigan, BOB TRAXLER, for the outstanding job he has done in developing this legislation. He has been a master. He has been tough but he has been fair. I appreciate the enormity of his job and congratulate him on a job well done.

I would also like to recognize my dear and beloved friend, the astute ranking member of the subcommittee, the sage and honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], who maybe knows more about housing than anyone in this Congress. His knowledge of this bill, his keen grasp of its complexities, and his determined work have been invaluable assets to the committee.

I would also like to thank all of the other members of the subcommittee for their difficult work in crafting this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my good friend of many years, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. The gentleman is right, we are big friends.

I wanted to ask the gentleman and my friend, what did he say about green monsters?

Mr. CONTE. Yes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I wanted to ask if they had anything to do with the gentleman's attire? The reason I am asking is that I am envious, and I would like to contact them. I would like to get something like that.

Mr. CONTE. They dropped them on the west front lawn, and I picked them up.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], a member of the full committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, while I believe that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the distinguished chairman and the members of the committee have brought a bill to the floor today that is an excellent piece of legislation, especially the sections dealing with veterans' programs, housing, and environmental protection, I cannot lend full support to the bill and, therefore, will vote "present" this afternoon. I wanted to place on the record the reasons for that.

I think it is unfortunate that the laws of the land as a result of the passage last year of the Financial Institutions Recovery and Reform Act of 1989 require the committee to include in the bill \$2.9 billion more to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to pay for the controversial thrift bailout deal put together by the former Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Mr. Danny Wall. We know that the committee had to do this to protect the depositors. But I can remember well as a member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the Reagan-Bush appointed Chairman Danny Wall of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board consistently coming before the Committee back in 1988 stating that FSLIC had adequate private resources to fund his controversial Southwest plan. And, of course, it could not be done, and we are forced to do this today, to take tax dollars for

general revenue and put this monkey on the back of our taxpayers. I am unwilling to do so.

Of course, the American people now understand that the Wall plan was a massive failure. The \$2.9 billion in taxpayer dollars appropriated to the FDIC in this bill will go to meet long-term obligations incurred by Mr. Wall under his failed plan.

To summarize, the \$2.9 billion will go to the FDIC to pay for the costs of administering the FSLIC Resolution Fund [FRF]. The FRF was established in the FIRREA to liquidate the remaining obligations of the former FSLIC—that is, pre-1989 thrift resolutions. These obligations were principally incurred by Danny Wall in the controversial deals that he entered into under the Southwest Plan. These deals typically included three major elements:

First, "FICO notes"—"FSLIC Notes" were issued to private acquirers of failed thrifts to cover the negative net worth of the failed thrifts; these notes were in lieu of cash because FSLIC was at the time bankrupt. Tax dollars are now being appropriated to pay interest on these notes or to pay-off the note—that is, substitute the note with cash—which is cheaper and is in the interest of the taxpayer since we avoid interest costs on the notes.

Second, "capital loss coverage" provided payment for the difference between book value and net sales proceeds on "covered assets." "Covered assets" were typically nonperforming assets such as real estate loans. The amount and nature of covered assets was negotiated in each agreement. Tax dollars are now being appropriated to make up this difference when an acquirer sells a covered asset.

Third, "yield maintenance agreements" ensured acquirers a defined rate of return on covered assets—usually 100 to 200 basis points above a thrift industry cost-of-funds index. For example, an acquirer would agree to manage, maintain and try to sell a vacant office building for the FSLIC. However, this approach was fundamentally flawed because acquirers had no incentive to sell the property since FSLIC guaranteed a profit to the acquirer to hold on to the asset. Tax dollars are now being appropriated to fund these yield maintenance agreements.

The \$2.9 billion in the HUD/VA appropriations bill will go to pay the above obligations incurred under the Danny Wall Southwest Plan. Therefore, I cannot lend my vote for the HUD/VA appropriations bill since taxpayer dollars are being appropriated to fund a bailout. That is fundamentally ill-conceived and unworkable.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], a member of the subcom-

mittee and its former ranking minority member.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1991 VA, HUD and independent agencies appropriation bill which we are considering today. I have served on this subcommittee I believe as long or longer than any other Member, and I want to particularly congratulate the chairman who has done, with unfailing good humor, an excellent job on this bill; and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking member and vice chairman who, as has been pointed out, is perhaps the most knowledgeable person in this House about hands-on housing programs. This is a very difficult bill always to put together because it has such disparate functions, but the chairman and the ranking member have done a marvelous job, as has the staff in doing this.

Under the able leadership of our panel's chairman and vice chairman, we bring before the House today a measure which appropriates \$83.6 billion for the varied programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, NASA, and the NSF. Funds for many other vital Government functions are also allocated with this bill.

Throughout the formation of H.R. 5158, our subcommittee was forced to choose between many different national priorities. Federal assistance for the homeless, public housing, environmental protection initiatives, hazardous waste cleanup, space exploration, and scientific exploratory research are all key Government initiatives. I think the product we bring before you today balances the priorities in an effective manner.

We were able to propose needed funding increases over last year's level for these acknowledged national priorities. The subcommittee also recommends that additional funds be appropriated to enable key agencies to respond to new responsibilities like those proposed in the pending Clean Air Act reauthorization. Our panel has, in my opinion, made hard choices. While not everyone will agree with the hundreds of allocations proposed, I believe—in total—the bill warrants adoption.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5158.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a distinguished member of our subcommittee.

□ 1210

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise also in support of the work of the Subcommittee on Veterans, Housing and independent agencies. I

could not begin to duplicate the praise extended to my two colleagues, the chairman and the ranking member, as it was extended by the gentleman from Massachusetts a moment ago. There has been a very effective bipartisan effort within the subcommittee which deserves to be commended.

I might bring to the attention of the Members and others who are interested in this subject matter, that the subcommittee does have a very difficult process through which it must operate. It is a most difficult situation when we take important programs like housing for the poor and veterans' medical care and research, and place them in competition, in the same subcommittee, with programs such as those at NASA, and the National Science Foundation. It is very important that we recognize that these programs deserve consideration that is positive. In the future we may very well place a significant demand upon the subcommittee's allocation for just these exact scientific programs and endeavors.

NASA, for example, is in the midst of moving forward on a manned space station. We have contracts in place that are going to cost more money. Whether we like it or not, that competition will be very real. If America is going to continue to play an effective role in space, if indeed we are going to use that manned space station effectively, we are going to have to be willing to commit to these dollars in the years ahead.

I must say I was somewhat concerned that we cut the \$309 million that would help better evaluate alternatives for manned exploration of Mars utilizing a space station. I was pleased with the committee's projected expansion of the National Science Foundation. Within that activity, for example, we were able to lift the cap on salaries of scientists who are employed as NSF rotators. This is a meaningful and perhaps overdue change on behalf of the best and the brightest in American academic life.

The bill includes, also, a piece of funding that is necessary for AIDS. It reserves some 500 housing units for victims of AIDS. These section 202 units for people with AIDS are the result of the work of my colleague, the gentleman from New York, which is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to mention one other item. We have up to \$15 million in funding for medical research at the VA, an opportunity not only to provide needed service, but also to get a better understanding of some of the

services that are needed in connection with this dread disease.

One of the very unique programs within housing is the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. It has received additional funding and, indeed, is one of those new areas where real progress is being made in providing neighborhood housing for those people who are truly in need.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate both gentlemen yielding time to me, and would like to add my voice to the support for this bill.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes the gentleman has 5 minutes remaining, since he yielded 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to a very valuable colleague, my great friend, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for all of the kind accolades, and for yielding time to me.

I join in support of this legislation, and thank the chairman and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], all the staff, and the Members for this very fine piece of legislation. It does contain, as everyone has said, a lot of valuable programs so important to our country.

However, I do have questions that I raised in full committee about title IV. We heard a lot about the so-called bailout of the savings and loans, and the attempt that we are going to make in the future in the next few years of paying back the depositors, some who put their life savings in certain savings and loans only to see the savings and loans fail. What I am concerned about, as I understand the law in trying to read it, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is the insurance company for commercial bank accounts, for the commercial banks, has been given the responsibility of assisting FSLIC and others in recovering the assets of some of these failed savings and loans.

Now, last year this committee appropriated about \$5 billion to FDIC to carry out that responsibility. This year I note that appropriations have been reduced back to about \$3 billion, a reduction of \$2 billion. Now, we are being criticized for allowing the savings and loans to go under, but now is the opportunity as these savings and loans are failing to recapture some of the assets before they fritter it away. This is, as I understand it, the FDIC's responsibility, to try to recapture these assets before they do get away.

Now, back when I used to work for a living, I was a commercial banker. I know assets can sure get away. I usual-

ly made good loans, but once in a while somebody else made a loan, or maybe I had my head turned the wrong direction and we had some bad loans, and sometimes those assets that we do not get real quick can sure get away. So it seems to me that we as a Congress should do everything we can to make sure we capture these, and we get those assets back in and recovered, so the taxpayers of this country will not have to spend any more money than possible to pay back the depositors who expect to be paid in some way.

Therefore, if this is going to shore up and make the availability of the FDIC to do its job—although I think we should have gone back to the \$5 billion—but in any event, I do see here that we do have about \$11 billion in round figures for the Office of Inspector General, who has the responsibility for prosecuting those who made mistakes intentionally. I am certainly not opposed to prosecuting those who did not carry out their jobs, but prosecution is one thing. I think the American people expect that. However, that does not repay debt. It does not repay the depositors.

As I understand, FDIC has the responsibility, so I hope this committee has done everything possible to make sure that the FDIC is given every tool available to recover all the assets before they get away, so we can save the American taxpayer the responsibility of again repaying depositors. If there are assets there, they should be used properly.

I hope the committee has done that, and I thank Members for that, but I think in Congress, while we have limited oversight in the Committee on Appropriations, I know the legislation has been printed on its oversight, but I do hope the committee and the Congress will watch that very closely and make sure everything is done to recover those assets.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I like many of my colleagues, I have been a strong supporter of space for many years. I have a personal interest in our Nation's space initiative. That is why I rise today. The subcommittee, of which I am not a member, has eliminated the President's space exploration initiative, despite the strong public support in favor of this program.

The rationale for the space exploration initiative are diverse. It means pushing back the frontiers of knowledge. It means new technologies to enhance U.S. competitiveness. It will inspire a new generation of Americans to excel in important fields of math, science, and physics. Space exploration can directly produce new industries,

economic opportunities, and resources here in the United States.

Space exploration is critical to long-term U.S. competitiveness. As international tensions reduce and defense spending is cut, space exploration will provide the impetus to new technologies and industries which national security R&D did in the past.

International competition has eroded the once commanding advantage America enjoyed in technology. At present, the U.S. industry enjoys less than 5 percent of the consumer electronics market. As an example, U.S. industry once held a 90-percent share of the American market for phonographs, while today we only hold a 1-percent share. Our ability to compete in the international marketplace depends on the capacity of our industries to innovate and upgrade. The President's space exploration initiative, will provide a long-term mechanism to enhance America's ability to compete more effectively in a growing global marketplace.

Referring to another part of the bill, when Members read the bill and report, they will find we are spending \$1.5 billion for 8,035 units of section 8 and section 202 housing. If my arithmetic is right, that amounts to roughly \$187,000 per unit. I associate my thoughts with the gentleman from California. It is terrible that this subcommittee has to pit problems with visions of the future, but that is reality, and we have to live with it.

I think we would even save money if we took the gentleman from Indiana's advice and took ROTC assets and gave them to the elderly and handicapped and free up money for the future. I just hope, as this bill moves through the process, that the President will have his vision honored and space exploration funding will be restored, thereby insuring a competitive future for this country.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5158, the VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill. I would also like to thank and congratulate the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the ranking Republican, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for their tremendous work on this bill.

However, I would especially like to thank the chairman. Last year, he promised to give full and proper consideration to my request to fund the Veterans' Nursing Home at Palm Beach, FL. He has kept his promise, a rate attribute in this business these days, and I, along with the veterans of south Florida, thank him as well.

Mr. Chairman, this 120-bed nursing home is a long time in coming to Palm Beach County. It was in the early 1980's that the VA first realized a nursing home must be an integral part of the 400-bed medical center, despite the fact that no person denied to me the nursing home was the first part to be excluded when the Veterans' Administration fought to trim the budget project.

I have always considered it unreasonable and irresponsible to cut out the most important part of the facility by gutting the heart of it. I am grateful that the committee has seen the mistake in this thinking.

□ 1220

Mr. Chairman, as we Floridians know, our veteran population is growing rapidly, and this population is aging. This makes the construction of this nursing home vital if we are to adequately serve those who so valiantly served our Nation, those who secured our freedoms that we enjoy.

It is significant that this bill is considered today and during this period recognizing the forgotten war fought in Korea 40 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, if I still have time, I would like to also mention another project in H.R. 5158 which I consider very important, and this is the National Aerospace Plane.

Again, I would like to congratulate and thank the committee for their support of this project and express my support for making what I believe to be a wise decision in including adequate funding for NASP. In particular, I would like to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], for his long-time support of this project. Without him this project would be in danger.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], my colleague, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am not privileged to serve on the Committee on Appropriations, and I have a question really of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER]. I have a question I would like to ask him, if I may, and I mean this sincerely.

This morning we had a press conference outside the Capitol announcing that we will be having a vote on a constitutional amendment on a balanced budget next month, and there were Members from both sides of the aisle there. It is a bipartisan effort seeking to bring some fiscal restraint into the spending habits of the Congress of the United States.

When I look at this appropriation bill that is now on the floor, I notice that in 1990, the current year, we ap-

propriated \$71.2 billion roughly for this purpose, and this bill, which the committee of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has brought to the floor proposes an increase of 17.3 percent to some \$83.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, my question is: What goes on in the Committee on Appropriations? Do those folks have a policy of striving, when they bring appropriations bills to the floor, to have a freeze on what was spent in 1990 for 1991, or to let spending grow by just the rate of inflation? What is the policy?

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

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

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] for his concern on a matter of keen interest to myself, the subcommittee and, I think, the general membership of this body.

I know the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] will be pleased to know that this bill in real dollars, outlay dollars—that is what counts, is \$700 million under the President's request by \$700 million.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, "I hear you, but that's not my question."

See, we are spending this year for this purpose \$71.2 billion.

Mr. TRAXLER. The gentleman from California is correct.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. And this bill would propose we spend \$83.5 billion, an increase of 17 percent.

How do we justify that kind of increase?

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Again, Mr. Chairman, the President justified it because we needed \$7 billion addition for HUD because subsidy contracts that were entered into, most 15 years ago, are expiring, and unless the people are going to be evicted and thrown on the street, they have to be renewed.

The President wanted a substantial increase in NASA's activities. We could not give him all he wanted, but we did give him a lot of it.

The President wanted to double the National Science Foundation in 5 years. We could not give him all he wanted. We gave him what we could.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is driven very heavily by the President's request for additional funding for the departments and agencies that it covers.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], my colleague, for that answer, and I am being sincere about this. If we are ever going to get a handle on spending, and bear in mind that we are going to add about a quarter of a trillion dollars to the national

debt this year, the only way we are going to do it is to have a policy that we are going to freeze spending, and that is what prompts me to raise this question.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think it deserves an answer. As one member of the Committee on Appropriations, I can say that a lot of us understand that in America it does not stay frozen. The population of America increases annually. Indeed, more and more children are born every year in America than the year before. I think it seems only appropriate that Americans understand that just like inflation. It does not stay static, nor is it frozen.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me stress the issue of deficits and budgets for a moment. It is a troublesome one for each and every one of us. Currently there are negotiations going forward between the President and the leadership of the House and the Senate, and we wish them well in those very serious, and what I consider to be necessary, efforts in order to protect the future credit of this Nation and prohibiting us from going into insolvency, and of course that is the direction we have been heading.

Mr. Chairman, the responsibility for budgeting rests both with the President and with the Congress, and the tenor of what we do in this body and the appropriation process is established by the President when he forwards his budget proposals to us. Everyone knows that at any point in time the President may, if he chooses, send us a balanced budget. We do not have such a request as yet.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which provides funding for programs benefitting some of the Nation's most deserving citizens—America's military veterans, their families, and survivors.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. TRAXLER; ranking Republican member, Mr. GREEN; other members of the subcommittee and the subcommittee staff have worked hard to bring a good bill to the House.

They have recommended appropriation of \$813.9 million more for veterans programs than the President's budget proposed. Every cent of that money is needed to help meet the needs of veterans and their families. These dollars are essential to helping keep the commitments made to the men and women who answered this Nation's call to arms.

In return for risking their lives and health in service to the security needs of all Americans, the Nation agreed to provide aid to our veterans of military service. It is vitally important that the Federal Government fulfill these agreements.

The Department of Veterans Affairs administers the programs supported by this proposal. It manages the benefits programs for 27.1 million veterans, 44 million family members of living veterans and 1.7 million survivors of deceased veterans.

As the Nation's military veteran population ages their needs, particularly in the area of health care, increase. This bill provides \$12.6 billion for veterans health service and health research. That is \$106 million more than the President requested.

The bill recommends \$15.7 billion for veterans compensation and pensions. This is an increase of \$480.1 million more than the President requested.

This money provides payments to service-connected disabled veterans, aid to family members of living veterans and survivors of veterans, and assistance to nonservice connected veterans who have a severe economic need.

I urge that the House support the committee's recommendations for programs benefiting veterans which are included in this bill.

It is true that this bill includes more funding than the President requested. But, that is not the end of the appropriations story this year. I would remind the House that in 39 of the past 45 years, the Congress has appropriated less than Presidential budgets requested.

At this point, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an historic data table maintained by the House Committee on Appropriations. It compares the Presidential budget requests for appropriations, the amounts appropriated by the Congress and shows the differences between the two during the years 1945 through 1989. This table establishes that during that period, the Congress has appropriated \$173.5 billion less than Presidents requested be appropriated.

The table follows:

REGULAR ANNUAL, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILLS COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATION BUDGET REQUESTS AND APPROPRIATIONS ENACTED

Calendar year:	Administration budget requests	Appropriations enacted	Difference (under —) (over +)
1945	\$62,453,310,868	\$61,042,345,331	—\$1,410,965,537
1946	30,051,109,870	28,459,502,172	—1,591,607,698
1947	33,367,507,923	30,130,762,141	—3,236,745,782
1948	35,408,550,523	32,699,846,731	—2,708,703,792
1949	39,545,529,108	37,825,026,214	—1,720,502,894
1950	54,316,658,423	52,477,926,629	—1,838,731,794
1951	96,340,781,110	91,059,713,307	—5,281,067,803
1952	83,964,877,176	75,355,434,201	—8,609,442,975
1953	66,568,694,353	54,539,342,491	—12,029,351,862
1954	50,257,490,985	47,642,131,205	—2,615,359,780
1955	55,044,333,729	53,124,821,215	—1,919,512,514
1956	60,892,420,237	60,647,917,590	—244,502,647
1957	64,138,110,610	59,589,731,631	—4,548,378,979
1958	73,272,859,573	72,653,476,248	—619,383,325
1959	74,859,472,045	72,977,957,952	—1,881,514,093
1960	73,845,974,490	73,634,335,992	—211,638,498
1961	91,597,448,953	86,606,487,273	—4,990,961,680
1962	96,803,292,115	92,260,154,659	—4,543,137,456
1963	98,904,155,136	92,432,923,132	—6,471,232,004
1964	96,297,358,556	94,162,918,996	—2,134,439,560
1965	109,448,074,896	107,037,566,896	—2,410,508,000
1966	131,164,926,586	130,281,568,460	—883,358,126
1967	147,804,557,929	141,872,346,664	—5,932,211,265
1968	147,908,612,996	133,339,868,734	—14,568,744,262
1969	142,701,346,215	134,431,463,135	—8,269,883,080
1970	147,765,358,434	144,273,528,504	—3,491,829,930
1971	167,874,624,937	165,225,661,865	—2,648,963,072
1972	185,431,804,552	178,960,155,864	—6,471,648,688
1973	177,959,504,255	174,901,434,304	—3,058,069,951
1974	213,667,190,007	204,012,311,514	—9,654,878,493
1975	267,224,774,434	259,852,322,212	—7,372,452,222
1976	282,142,432,093	282,536,694,665	+394,262,572
1977	364,867,240,174	354,025,780,783	—10,841,459,391
1978	348,506,124,701	337,859,466,730	—10,646,657,971
1979	388,311,676,432	375,444,855,439	—12,866,820,993

REGULAR ANNUAL, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILLS COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATION BUDGET REQUESTS AND APPROPRIATIONS ENACTED—Continued

	Administration budget requests	Appropriations enacted	Difference (under —) (over +)
1980	446,690,302,845	441,290,587,343	—5,399,715,502
1981	541,827,827,909	544,457,423,541	+2,629,595,632
1982	507,740,133,484	514,832,375,371	+7,092,241,887
1983	542,956,052,209	551,620,505,328	+8,664,453,119
1984	576,343,258,980	559,151,835,986	—17,191,422,994
1985	588,698,503,939	583,446,885,087	—5,251,618,852
1986	590,345,199,494	577,279,102,494	—13,066,097,000
1987	618,268,039,556	614,526,518,150	—3,741,530,806
1988	621,250,663,756	625,967,372,769	+4,716,709,013
1989	652,138,432,359	666,211,680,769	+14,073,248,410
Total	10,249,467,607,455	10,075,912,028,737	—173,555,578,718

Note.—Prepared by House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman TRAXLER, ranking member GREEN and all members of the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee for the new budget priority which they have placed on HUD and housing assistance for our Nation's low-income families.

As Chairman GONZALEZ mentioned, the Banking Committee has reported out H.R. 1180, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1990. While I do not wish to minimize the contributions made by the Appropriations Committee here in H.R. 5158, I feel compelled to express some disappointment over the issue of timing. Unlike the pessimistic outlook expressed in the committee's report on H.R. 5158, my personal feeling is that the passage of housing authorization legislation is very likely during this session. It was my hope that the committee would give recognition to the efforts of the Banking Committee and Secretary Kemp by, at the minimum, including a line item for certain important priorities in H.R. 1180.

In this regard, I am concerned that the funding provided in the loan management account for preservation of low-income housing may be inadequate. As the subcommittee members are well aware, the prepayment of low-income housing stock is one of the most difficult housing issues facing the Congress this year. The Banking Committee has devised a permanent, bipartisan solution to the prepayment problem. It is my hope that, either in conference or in a supplemental appropriation, a permanent solution to low-income housing preservation will be funded.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up the subject of FHA just briefly. I commend the committee's necessary \$10 million increase in FHA staff funding. Given the importance of the FHA's contribution to affordable, multifamily rental housing, it is gratifying to see authorizers and appropriators working together to improve the FHA's multifamily insurance programs. Moreover, the recently completed Price Waterhouse study has forcefully pointed out the existing problems with the Federal Housing Administration's single family insurance fund. One of the key recommendations of that study warned against raising the FHA high cost mortgage limits without first taking certain reform actions. In concert with Chairman GONZALEZ and other members of the Banking Committee, we will include FHA reform in housing authorization legislation this year in order to restore actuarial soundness to

FHA. In the interim, I am pleased to see that H.R. 5158 is consistent with our housing authorization bill and recognized the importance of leaving the FHA high cost mortgage limits at \$124,875.

Finally, I would like to comment on one other issue. The public housing drug elimination program plays a key role in protecting and enhancing the lives of public housing tenants in this country. While the program is funded at \$100 million in H.R. 5158, this level falls short of the President's request for \$150 million. Moreover, together with the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. CONTE, I have authorization pending on an adjunct program, the Public Housing Youth Sports Program. Funded from drug elimination grants, the Public Housing Youth Sports Program will provide the youth in public housing an effective alternative to drug use. It is my hope that the funding for the Drug Elimination Program might be increased some time in the future.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to give great credit to the subcommittee chairman, Mr. TRAXLER, and the ranking member, Mr. GREEN, for their leadership and hard work on H.R. 5158. The competing priorities included within Veterans, HUD, and the independent agencies appropriation make for some difficult choices. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 5158, a measure to appropriate a total of \$83.6 billion in fiscal year 1991 new budget for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development.

I commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TRAXLER] for introducing this important measure, and the distinguished chairman of the Veterans Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and the ranking minority members, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for their unceasing efforts on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

H.R. 5158 authorizes an increase of \$12.3 billion over the fiscal year 1990 budget. This measure not only increases funds for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, but also includes the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Chairman, our support of this measure confirms the support in Congress for our veterans by increasing funding to VA. H.R. 5158 will provide \$31.3 billion to fund the Veterans Health Service and Research Administration. This includes increases in medical care, medical and prosthetic research, as well as increases in compensation and benefits.

In regard to health care programs and personnel, H.R. 5158 will increase funding by \$1.6 billion more than fiscal year 1990. This measure will enable the steps that have been taken to improve the quality of health care for our Nation's veterans to continue, as well as, to enhance the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, funding programs that will help our Nation's veterans has continued to be a major concern. H.R. 5158 will provide \$12.3 billion directly to the Department of Veterans Affairs to make certain that the problem

or a lack of medical care and personnel shortages will remain problems of the past. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in support of this measure.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5158, the fiscal year 1991 appropriations bill for VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies. Many of the programs funded in this \$83.6 billion measure are of great importance to my home State of West Virginia, and I would like to take this opportunity to highlight a few of them.

The bill appropriates \$31.3 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs, including \$12.6 billion for veterans' medical care, which is \$900 million over the fiscal year funding level. These funds will allow VA hospitals to treat more patients, purchase much needed supplies and equipment, and provide for homeless programs for veterans as authorized by the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act.

In addition, \$15.6 billion is appropriated for veterans' service connected compensation payments and pensions. The measure also includes \$575.5 million for major construction projects and \$146.1 million for minor construction projects. The VA will determine how the money appropriated for minor construction projects will be allocated. Veterans' Affairs Medical Center hospitals, such as those in Beckley and Huntington, will be eligible to receive funds.

Also of great importance to West Virginia is the \$400 million contained in the bill for HUD programs to assist the homeless. This funding level is \$56 million more than the fiscal year 1990 level and is money well spent. According to the most recent data, 9,224 homeless individuals received services to meet basic needs in West Virginia, with 2,655 such individuals receiving shelter in fiscal year 1987. While it is difficult to estimate the total number of homeless in this country, or even in West Virginia, it is clear that the number is significant. While it is doubtful that the funds in this bill will solve the homeless problem, they will go far toward alleviating the homeless in the United States. I am confident that West Virginia and other States will use this increased funding to the fullest extent possible.

Directly related to the efforts to solve the homeless problem are the housing programs contained in the bill. The bill provides a total of \$22 billion for various housing programs which is \$10.7 billion more than the fiscal year 1990 appropriations level, and \$4.6 billion more than the level requested by the administration. I think it is very important that we continue to work to see that affordable housing is available for people on low income. This is the best preventive measure the Federal Government can take to stop homelessness before it happens.

The bill also provides a total of \$3 billion in fiscal year for the Community Development Block Grant [CDBG] Program which is \$219 million more than the administration request. This program supplies much needed development assistance to towns and cities throughout West Virginia and the Nation. While I am pleased that this program has not suffered drastic cuts in this bill, it is my hope that we will provide significantly more funding for community development programs in the future. At a time when we should be promoting econom-

ic growth to increase our tax base, increase employment, increase our share of the world market, and ultimately working to decrease the dual deficits, it seems to me we should be more strongly supporting programs like CDBG, which help to accomplish these goals.

Finally, also of great importance to West Virginia is the \$2 billion appropriated for wastewater treatment construction grants to State revolving funds under the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]. While I believe that this program should be augmented by the title II construction grant program which will be phased out at the end of this fiscal year, I believe that these funds are greatly needed to address our serious wastewater treatment needs. Since the EPA has estimated that these needs total \$83.5 billion, it is my hope that greater funds will be provided in the future. Increased funds are important because many communities in West Virginia and States across the country are struggling to comply with the secondary sewage treatment standards mandated by the Clean Water Act. The funding provided by this measure for the sewer grants program is critical for these and other communities throughout the Nation, which simply do not have the financial resources to meet the sewage treatment requirements on their own.

While I generally believe that we should be putting more resources into revitalizing our communities and enhancing our competitiveness, this bill provides reasonable increases in such programs over last year's levels. I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of the bill.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address provisions in the fiscal year 1991 VA, HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill.

It is always reassuring to see that the authorizing subcommittee for the Clean Water Act, and the appropriations subcommittee can work together to produce strong legislation to help clean and maintain our Nation's valuable waters.

I also would like to commend the subcommittee for addressing several needs of EPA that will not only be beneficial to Minnesota, but the country as a whole.

First of all, the Construction Grant/State Revolving Loan Program has proven successful in improving the quality of our lakes, rivers, and oceans through the appropriations of moneys to States and municipalities. I appreciate the committee providing appropriations for State revolving loan funds and thus continuing to support the efforts of our communities in eliminating polluted discharge.

Second, I wish to thank the chairman and members of the committee for an additional \$40 million for nonpoint source pollution. The Construction Grant Program has done an excellent job in cleaning up point source pollution nationwide, and we in Congress must now increase our efforts on eliminating nonpoint source pollution. This will not be an easy task, yet this money is a good step in the right direction.

Third, I am happy to see the Clean Lakes Program receiving additional funding. As many of us in the Great Lakes region know, this program has been extremely successful in tackling some of the pollution problems in the

Great Lakes as well as lakes in other parts of the country. It deserves our continued support in both appropriations and authorizations. That is why I have introduced legislation, the Sustainable Agriculture and Clean Water Act of 1991 (H.R. 4509), which would reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program for another 5 years.

I next would like to thank the committee for their attention to the State of Minnesota's Wastewater Outreach Program. We in Minnesota are extremely grateful for this appropriation and know that it will be put to good use in training wastewater treatment operators and community officials on how to treat wastewater and save dollars.

Last, as both the ranking Republican member on the Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Subcommittee on Cotton, Rice, and Sugar, and as an avid sportsman, I know the importance of wetlands, and what they provide in terms of wildlife habitat, flood control, ground water filtration, and wastewater treatment. I sincerely appreciate the attention that has been given to wetlands research and restoration in this bill.

Again, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you for your efforts and urge my colleagues to support these measures relating to EPA's water quality programs.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5158

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of Article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, and for other benefits as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, 412, 777, and 806, chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 50 U.S.C. App. 540-548; 43 Stat. 122, 123; 45 Stat. 735; 76 Stat. 1198), \$15,684,551,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose first of commending the distinguished chairman of the subcommit-

tee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for the excellent job that they have done with the appropriation bill this year. Obviously it is not completely satisfactory to me or to probably anyone because of the pressures put upon the subcommittee by the budget deficit and other factors which are not controllable, but in general I think the committee has done a good job.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the distinguished subcommittee chairman, just briefly about a small item which is beginning to get a great deal of attention in the press and media of all kinds having to do with the topic of electric and magnetic fields research which has been contained in the past in the EPA budget.

□ 1230

In our Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, we have just passed legislation which increases the authorization for funding of this vital research area which may have effects upon the health of a large number of people in this country that we are not aware of. In the past, the Appropriations Committee has contained language especially appropriating funds for this particular area of research, but no such language is contained in this year's legislation. However, there are adequate funds in the EPA authorized amount which the subcommittee has granted at the full level of the President's budget to cover this, if they were to be given a little encouragement by the Appropriations Committee.

So my question basically, Mr. Chairman, is, could the gentleman see fit to give them a little encouragement, especially through language in the report or in conference or something like that?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for raising this very, very important issue. I know it is one in which he has been involved for a number of years and in which he has a strong, strong personal concern. He is absolutely correct in stating that we have provided funding for electric and magnetic fuel research in prior years.

The Committee supports funding for electric and magnetic fuel programs in the EPA's research and development appropriation account. As for the specific amount, we will do our very best in conference to reach the \$1 million level that is in the authorizing legislation.

I must add as a caveat that we, as a subcommittee, do not know what our final allocation is going to be. You will remember that the Senate has yet to

do its bills, and we do not know what the consequences of the budget summit are going to mean to the appropriations process and, of course, specifically to this subcommittee and indeed even to this account. So with that sort of caveat, I hope the gentleman knows of the priority we attach to this research. We want to do all in our power to achieve the desired result.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, without presuming to guess how the research will turn out, that it does seem to me this is an important field of research. We certainly have seen some studies which indicate there may be some problems here, and I agree with the gentleman that it is a valid place for the EPA to take a look.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support, and I commend the committee for the work it has done under difficult circumstances. I know that it will do its best to focus attention on this area. I appreciate that very much.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise only to engage in a small dialog with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. It has to do with what our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], referred to on page 71 of the report, having to do with the FSLIC resolution fund.

Here the Appropriations Committee has no alternative but to rigidly obey the request of the administration. This year the administration is saying that the exact amount in indefinite sums as shall be necessary will be over \$4 billion. Now, I want the record to show that this goes back to the 1986 fiscal area for FSLIC, based on the issuance of the so-called FICO bonds which really never were marketable to any extent but did enable the Home Loan Bank Board to enter into questionable areas which I have challenged since then, and that is that for 10 years they have given these guarantees to these defunct associations which have drained and continue to drain not only the insurance funds but the Treasury.

So I wanted to just advise this committee that we are very concerned. I have been personally concerned, and last year we were not able to put an end to that and we had to swallow in conference this indefinite language: Such sums as may be necessary to support the FSLIC resolution fund, the so-called FRF.

We intend to do something about it. We want to advise our colleagues on

the Appropriations Committee that we did not want to delay in any manner, shape, or form what really should be the processes in the appropriation bill because of the fact that this should be something that we should address on the authorization level. So I wanted to advise that we intend to do so. This is an open-ended run on the Treasury that I do not think any one of us desires.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his comment, because I think we should all understand that under the legislation which the gentleman successfully piloted through the House and the Congress last year the role of the Appropriations Committee, which had always been a very limited one with respect to FSLIC and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, in essence is considerably reduced. We have only a vestigial role in that, and we are dependent on the gentleman's committee for congressional oversight of this operation.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I might add also to my distinguished colleagues and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I have been very jealous of the prerogatives of the authorization as well as the appropriation, and I would like to call attention to this effort by referring to the article on the first page of the financial section of the Washington Post this morning where I am quoted as stoutly defending the appropriations process.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be kind enough to yield to me?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, we commend the gentleman from Texas. We, of course, have the highest regard for him. He is a very outstanding and distinguished Member.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to visit for just a moment on this subject with respect to health care for veterans which is included in this appropriation bill.

We in North Dakota, a State of some 70,000 square miles, have one veterans' hospital, the VA hospital in Fargo. It serves literally thousands and thousands of square miles, in fact, the entire State of North Dakota and part of western Minnesota.

Access to health care for veterans is critically important, and it is difficult to get in an area as broad as ours is. We have a good VA hospital. The VA

hospital in Fargo, ND, is a good hospital, but it is in desperate trouble.

I want to tell the chairman of the subcommittee just a brief story. A young man who lives west of Minot, ND, had been shot in the head during the Vietnam conflict. He suffered severe brain damage and is incapacitated for life. Because of that wound suffered in Vietnam, he had muscle atrophy, and as a result of that, he had to have some toes removed through surgery. His father loaded him in the car and took him to the nearest community, Minot, ND, and there the toes were removed.

The VA was sent the bill for that, and the VA said,

We can't pay for that. You had a requirement to load him in a car and drive him nearly 300 miles one way to Fargo to the VA center, in which case we would have paid for it.

I got involved in that case, and we eventually got the VA to reimburse in that situation. This is a young man whose life has been drastically changed because of a severe war wound suffered in the Vietnam conflict, being buffeted around by a health care system that seems to know about costs but not about value.

I tell that story simply to point out how critical access to health care is to veterans in rural areas of the country. North Dakota has a high percentage of veterans, and as those veterans from World War II increasingly reach an age when they need access to a VA center, not in Minneapolis, but in the middle part of North Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana, what is happening is that the VA is squeezing like a lemon the financial resources of the VA hospital in our area. I do not know about the rest of the hospitals, but I can speak for ours.

I want to give the Members some examples, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is critically important that we understand we are heading toward a big time problem in this area, and we have to deal with it. The VA and the administration, I am afraid, are not willing to deal with it.

We had 166 beds in the VA hospital in Fargo; we now have 73 that are utilized. This has happened because of staffing and funding problems. That is a 44-percent reduction. As there is a greater need for the beds, we have a reduction of the beds available, with wards closed because they did not have the money.

Radiation therapy is no longer available. Oh, we give radiation therapy, but instead of giving it in Fargo where they used to do it, they now put them on a plane and send them to Minneapolis, which I assume costs more for the same kind of service.

Cataract surgery used to be done there, they put the veterans on planes and send them down to Minneapolis. There is less service and more cost.

What on earth is going on? This is happening at this time, although the World War II veterans, when they served were given a promise of health care through the VA system, but they are now discovering that that promise was not quite the kind of promise they expected and is not being kept the way they expected it to be kept.

□ 1240

I have raised these issues with the VA and they say to me, "You know, look we've got serious funding problems."

I understand that, but if I look at the amount of money allocated to veterans' health care and then I understand that the exponential increase in the cost of health care in the private sector and lay that on top of the VA, I understand as well that the promise is not going to be kept to these veterans, and I think it is a very important promise that we keep.

I would just like to say this, Mr. Chairman. We need to work on this problem because those of us who represent areas like North Dakota where you have got 70,000 square miles and one veterans hospital to serve veterans who show up at the door who do not have money, are suffering from a serious problem and are told either:

We don't do that for you anymore. We have to turn you away, or,

If we do that, we are going to put you on a bus or a plane and you have got to go to Minneapolis somehow to figure out how to get that done at the VA center in Minneapolis.

We have got to fix that. If we can spend \$300 billion a year on defense, then surely we can have a health care system that keeps our promise to veterans who fought for this country.

I simply want to raise that today with respect to the one hospital that I know of that I serve and represent in North Dakota. It is in serious trouble. I fear that ultimately what is going to happen is they are going to come along and say to us,

Well, now the numbers of beds being utilized are down. We are sending all these cases to Minneapolis, so we are going to close the hospital.

That will be the result of what I think is a serious problem in administrative policy here with respect to the VA hospitals around the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement. I wish he did not have

to make it. I want to pledge to him that we will work with him to correct some of the inequities and the wrongs that are clearly present there. It would be my hope that across this town, not just within the confines of this building, but across this town other people who are involved in Federal budgeting could have heard the gentleman's statement and would be more willing to respond with the necessary dollars and personnel.

We are \$83 million over the President's request in terms of personnel funds for medical care. As I said in my opening statement, I am proud of that, but I also know in my heart of hearts they could use more.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Well, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I just say that part of our promise to veterans is part of the defense cost to this country. When we discuss B-2 bombers and MX missiles, let us also discuss elderly, poor veterans, who fought for their country who now cannot get the health care they were promised. There is something wrong with that and something we can correct and something this administration can correct.

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

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of scorekeeping from the Budget Committee, this bill provides \$63.3 billion in discretionary authority and \$59.1 billion in discretionary outlays.

I am pleased to note that it is about \$5 million below the level of discretionary budget authority and equal to the outlays that were set by the resolution that was adopted by the House and the subdivision that was then made by the Appropriations Committee.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I have been informing the House on scorekeeping of all the bills. This is the fourth of 13 appropriation bills. I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for doing a fine job in the bill that they have presented to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5158, Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991, and request permission to revise and extend my remarks. This is the fourth of the 13 annual appropriations bills.

The bill provides \$63.395 billion in discretionary budget authority and \$59.175 billion in discretionary outlays. I am pleased to note that the bill is \$5 million below the level of discretionary budget authority and equal to the outlays as set by the subdivision for this subcommittee.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I plan to inform the House of the status of all spending legislation, and will be issuing a dear

colleague on how each bill compares to the budget resolution.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee on its other bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 27, 1990.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Attached is a fact sheet on H.R. 5158, Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill. This bill is scheduled for consideration on Thursday, June 28, subject to a rule being adopted.

This is the fourth appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991.

I hope this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman.

[Fact sheet]

H.R. 5158, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1991 (H. REPT. 101-556)

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991 on Tuesday, June 26, 1990. This bill is scheduled for floor action on Thursday, June 28, subject to a rule being adopted.

COMPARISON TO THE 302 (b) SUBDIVISION

The bill, as reported, provides \$63.395 million of discretionary budget authority, \$5 million less than the appropriations subdivision for this subcommittee. The Budget Act provides a point of order if the target for discretionary budget authority is breached. Since the bill is \$5 million under the allocation for discretionary budget authority, there is no such point of order against this bill. The bill is equal to the subdivision total for estimated discretionary outlays. A detailed comparison of the bill to the spending and credit subdivisions follows:

COMPARISON TO SPENDING ALLOCATION

(In millions of dollars)

	VA/ HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill		Appropriations committee 302 (b) subdivision		Bill over (+)/ under (-) committee 302 (b), 302 (b) subdivision
	BA	O	BA	O	BA O
Discretionary	63.395	59.175	63.400	59.175	- 5
Mandatory ¹	17.446	20.249	17.446	20.249
Total	80.841	79.424	80.846	79.424	- 5

Note.—BA—New budget authority; O—Estimated outlays.

The bill as reported provides \$871 million in direct loan authority, which is \$24 million less than the appropriations subdivision for this subcommittee. However the bill provides \$58,893 million in loan guarantees, which is \$3,003 million above the subcommittee subdivision and is therefore subject to a 302(f) point of order. Adoption of the rule would waive the point of order.

COMPARISON TO CREDIT ALLOCATION

(In millions of dollars)

	VA/HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 302 (b) subdivision		Bill over (+) / under (-) committee 302 (b) subdivision	
	DL	LG	DL	LG	DL	LG
Discretionary.....	871	58,893	895	55,890	-24	+3,003
Mandatory.....						
Total.....	871	58,893	895	55,890	-24	+3,003

Note.—DL—New direct loan obligations; LG—New loan guarantee commitments.

The House Appropriations reported the committee's subdivision of budget authority, outlays and credit authority in House Report 101-545. Those subdivisions are consistent with the total "allocation of spending and credit responsibilities to committees" as contained in House Report 101-445 to accompany H. Con. Res. 310, concurrent resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1991 which was adopted by the House on May 1, 1990.

The following are the major program highlights for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill for FY 1991, as reported:

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	New outlays
Housing and Urban Development:		
HUD Salary and Expenses (S&E)	426	341
Assisted Housing (excludes \$236 million rescission)	11,695	32
Renewal of Expiring Section 8 Contracts	7,735	190
Public Housing Operating Subsidies	2,000	920
Section 202 Loans for Elderly or Handicapped Housing	437	0
Direct Loans	(492)	
Community Development Block Grants	3,000	120
Primary Loan Guarantee	(140)	
Subsidized Housing (rental)	135	7
Drug Elimination Grants for Low-Income Housing	100	46
Emergency Shelter Grants (Homeless)	75	11
Transitional Housing (Homeless)	150	0
Rental Housing Assistance (Homeless)	15	3
Section 8 SRO MOD-Rehabilitation (Homeless)	100	1
Federal Housing Administration-Guaranteed Loans ¹	(75,000)	
Government National Mortgage Association-Secondary Loan Limit	(80,000)	
Section 312 Rehabilitation Loan Fund: Direct Loans	(75)	
Environmental Protection Agency:		
EPA Research and Development	255	88
EPA Sewer Construction Grants	2,000	70
EPA S&E	1,032	880
EPA Abatement, Control, Compliance	1,007	453
Hazardous Substance Response Trust Fund (Superfund)	1,610	419
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund	75	19
NASA:		
NASA Space Flight	5,321	3,719
NASA R&D	7,034	3,816
NASA Research and Program Management	1,446	1,241
Construction of Facilities	485	49
Veterans Administration:		
Veterans Administration Compensation and Pensions and Burial Benefits (Mandatory)	15,685	14,326
Veterans Medical Care	12,310	10,417
Veterans Readjustment Benefits (Mandatory)	503	503
Veterans General Operating Expenses	903	812
Veterans Construction, Major Projects	575	26
Veterans Construction, Minor Projects	146	69
Veterans Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund	670	486
National Science Foundation (NSF) and other activities	2,337	1,130
FEMA (Salary and Expense and Planning), including defense	423	284
Emergency Food and Shelter (FEMA) (Homeless)	134	134
Disaster Relief	100	40

¹ The limit in the bill exceeds the CBO estimate of market demand for these guarantees, which is estimated \$58,753 million including the effect of the Committee's provision to increase the maximum mortgage amount eligible for FHA insurance in fiscal year 1991 to \$125,875.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 30, 31, 34-36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61), \$502,500,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 19; 70 Stat. 887; 72 Stat. 487), \$15,410,000, to remain available until expended.

LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary to carry out loan guaranty and insurance operations, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 37, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title), \$670,200,000, to remain available until expended.

During 1991, the resources of the loan guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses for operations related to property acquisition, disposition, and other loan guaranty and insurance operations as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 37, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title): *Provided*, That the unobligated balances, including retained earnings of the direct loan revolving fund, shall be available, during 1991, for transfer to the loan guaranty revolving fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the timely payment of obligations of such fund, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall not be required to pay interest on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.

During 1991, within the resources available, gross obligations for direct loans and total commitments to guarantee loans are authorized in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the "Loan guaranty revolving fund".

GUARANTY AND INDEMNITY FUND

For purposes of making the credits to the Guaranty and Indemnity Fund authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 1825 and 1829), such sums as may be necessary to remain available until expended.

DIRECT LOAN REVOLVING FUND

During 1991, within the resources available, not to exceed \$1,000,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans (38 U.S.C. chapter 37).

VETERANS HEALTH SERVICE AND RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries receiving care in Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise pro-

vided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); aid to State homes as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 641); and not to exceed \$2,000,000 to fund cost comparison studies as referred to in 38 U.S.C. 5010(a)(5); \$12,310,490,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That of the sum appropriated, \$7,904,000,000 is available only for expenses in the personnel compensation and benefits object classifications: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$278,000,000 is for the equipment and land and structures object classifications only, which amount shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 1991, and pursuant to section 202(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987, this action is a necessary (but secondary) result of a significant policy change.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by law, to remain available until September 30, 1992, \$216,795,000, 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, \$52,047,000, plus reimbursements.

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 632), for assisting in the replacement and upgrading of equipment and in rehabilitating the physical plant and facilities of the Veterans Memorial Medical Center, \$484,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed \$7,000 for official reception and representation expenses; cemetery expenses as authorized by law; purchase of four passenger motor vehicles, for use in cemetery operations, and 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; \$902,514,000, including \$616,658,000 for the Veterans Benefits Administration: *Provided*, That, during fiscal year 1991, jurisdictional average employment shall not be less than 12,550 for the Veterans Benefits Administration.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$26,859,000.

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 1004, 1006, 5002, 5003, 5006, 5008, 5009, and 5010 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, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is \$3,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, \$575,456,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, except for advance planning of projects 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 1991, for each approved project shall be obligated (1) by the awarding of a working drawings contract by September 30, 1991, and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall promptly report in writing to the Comptroller General and to the Committees on Appropriations any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above; and the Comptroller General shall review the report in accordance with the procedures established by section 1015 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (title X of Public Law 93-344): *Provided further*, That no funds from any other account except the "Parking garage 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 one 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: *Provided further*, That prior to the issuance of a bidding document for any construction contract for a project approved under this heading (excluding completion items), the director of the affected Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility must certify that the design of such project is acceptable from a patient care standpoint: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,300,000 of the funds available shall be used for the settlement of contractor claims arising from the modernization of a hospital at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, New Orleans, LA: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,100,000 of the funds available shall be used for the settlement of contractor claims arising from the construction of outpatient improvements at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA.

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, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1004, 1006, 5002, 5003, 5006, 5008, 5009, and 5010 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than \$3,000,000, \$146,140,000, 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 \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$44,420,000 shall be available for expenses of the Office of Facilities, including research and development in building con-

struction technology: *Provided further*, 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 of Veterans Affairs 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 GARAGE REVOLVING FUND

For the parking garage revolving fund as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5009), \$28,900,000, together with income from fees collected, to remain available until expended. Resources of this fund shall be available for all expenses authorized by 38 U.S.C. 5009 except operations and maintenance costs which will be funded from "Medical care".

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist the several 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 law (38 U.S.C. 5031-5037), \$65,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans cemeteries as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 1008), \$3,946,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Any appropriation for 1991 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", "Veterans insurance and indemnities", and the "Loan guaranty revolving fund" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations.

Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for 1991 for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs (except the appropriations for "Construction, major projects", "Construction, minor projects" and the "Parking garage revolving fund") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1991 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", "Veterans insurance and indemnities", and the "Loan guaranty revolving fund" shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the aforementioned accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 1990.

Mr. TRAXLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I know of no amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I be consid-

ered 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the remainder of title I?

If not, are there any amendments?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING (INCLUDING RESCISSION AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended ("the Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 1437), not otherwise provided for, \$11,625,086,000, to remain available until expended and in addition, to be transferred to and merged under this head, not to exceed \$70,000,000 from the reserve fund authorized by section 236(g), notwithstanding section 236 (f)(3) and (g): *Provided*, That of the new budget authority provided herein, \$194,468,000 shall be for the development or acquisition cost of public housing for Indian families, including amounts for housing under the mutual help homeownership opportunity program under section 202 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437bb); \$550,320,000 shall be for the development or acquisition cost of public housing, including major reconstruction of obsolete public housing projects, other than for Indian families; \$2,700,000,000 shall be for modernization of existing public housing projects pursuant to section 14 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437l), of which \$5,000,000 shall be for technical assistance and training under section 20 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437r); \$890,800,000 shall be for assistance under section 8 of the Act for projects developed for the elderly under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q) and \$186,000,000 for amendments to section 8 contracts for projects developed for the elderly and handicapped under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended; \$1,767,125,000 shall be for the section 8 existing housing certificate program (42 U.S.C. 1437f) including project-based section 8 assistance to help implement plans of action approved under title II of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, of which \$65,150,000 shall be for eligible tenants affected by the demolition or disposition of public housing units (including units occupied by Indian families); \$1,370,225,000 shall be available for the housing voucher program under section 8(o) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)); \$1,883,442,000 for amendments to section 8 contracts other than contracts for projects developed under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, of which \$70,000,000 shall be for rental adjustments resulting from the application of an annual adjustment factor in accordance with section 801 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989; up to \$1,486,850,000 shall be available for section 8 assistance for property disposition and loan management; and, any amounts of budget authority provided herein that are used for loan management activities under section 8(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1437f(b)(1)) shall not be obligated for a con-

tract term that is less than five years: *Provided further*, That of that portion of such budget authority under section 8(o) to be used to achieve a net increase in the number of dwelling units for assisted families, highest priority shall be given to assisting families, who as a result of rental rehabilitation action are involuntarily displaced or who are or would be displaced in consequence of increased rents (wherever the level of such rents exceeds 35 percent of the adjusted income of such families, as defined in regulations promulgated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development): *Provided further*, That those portions of the fees for the costs incurred in administering incremental units assisted in the certificate and housing voucher programs under sections 8(b) and 8(o), respectively, shall be established or increased in accordance with the authorization for such fees in section 8(q) of the Act: *Provided further*, That of the \$11,625,086,000 provided herein, \$321,762,000 shall be used to assist handicapped families in accordance with section 202(h) (2), (3), and (4) of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q) and \$52,000,000 shall be for amendments to contracts under section 202(h) (2), (3), and (4) of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q); and \$25,000,000, shall be for assistance under the Nehemiah housing opportunity program pursuant to section 612 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-242), but such amount shall be obligated under title VI of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, notwithstanding the sunset provision in section 613 thereof: *Provided further*, That amounts equal to all amounts of budget authority (and contract authority) reserved or obligated for the development or acquisition cost of public housing (including public housing for Indian families), for modernization of existing public housing projects (including such projects for Indian families), and except as hereinafter provided, for programs under section 8 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f), which are recaptured during fiscal year 1991, shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That 50 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 not be rescinded, or in the case of cash, shall not be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash shall be used by State housing finance agencies in accordance with such section: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 20 percent limitation under section 5(j)(2) of the Act, any part of the new budget authority for the development or acquisition costs of public housing other than for Indian families may, in the discretion of the Secretary, based on applications submitted by public housing authorities, be used for new construction or major reconstruction of obsolete public housing projects other than for Indian families.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 SUBSIDY CONTRACTS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437) not otherwise provided for, for use in connection with expiring section 8 subsidy contracts, \$7,734,985,400, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds pro-

vided under this paragraph may not be obligated for a contract term that is less than five years: *Provided further*, That to the extent the amount in this paragraph is insufficient, the Secretary may, from the Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing paragraph, transfer to, add to, and merge with the amounts appropriated under this paragraph up to \$300,000,000 to fund such insufficiency, and the \$1,883,442,000 earmarked for amendments to section 8 contracts other than contracts for projects developed under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, in the Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing paragraph, shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount transferred: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may maintain consolidated accounting data for funds disbursed at the Public Housing Agency or Indian Housing Authority or project level for subsidy assistance regardless of the source of the disbursement so as to minimize the administrative burden of multiple accounts.

RENTAL REHABILITATION GRANTS

For the rental rehabilitation grants program, pursuant to section 17(a)(1)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437o), \$135,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) is reduced in fiscal year 1991 by not more than \$2,000,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED FUND

In fiscal year 1991, \$491,570,000 of direct loan obligations may be made under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q), utilizing the resources of the fund authorized by subsection (a)(4) of such section, in accordance with paragraph (C) of such subsection: *Provided*, That such commitments shall be available only to qualified nonprofit sponsors for the purpose of providing 100 per centum loans for the development of housing for the elderly or handicapped, with any cash equity or other financial commitments imposed as a condition of loan approval to be returned to the sponsor if sustaining occupancy is achieved in a reasonable period of time: *Provided further*, That the full amount shall be available for permanent financing (including construction financing) for housing projects for the elderly or handicapped: *Provided further*, That 25 per centum of the direct loan authority provided herein shall be used only for the purpose of providing loans for projects for the handicapped, with the mentally ill homeless handicapped receiving priority: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury in such amounts as are necessary to provide the loans authorized herein: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the aforesaid fund shall be included in the totals of the Budget of the United States Government: *Provided further*, That of the direct loan authority provided under this heading, an amount necessary to provide for 500 dwelling units shall be used only for the purpose of providing dwelling units for persons who have con-

tracted the disease of acquired immune deficiency syndrome: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 202(a)(3) of the Housing Act of 1959, loans made in fiscal year 1991 shall bear an interest rate which does not exceed 9.25 per centum, including the allowance adequate in the judgment of the Secretary to cover administrative costs and probable losses under the program.

Section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) Notwithstanding section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Secretary shall provide assistance under this subsection for housing and related facilities for handicapped families for which occupancy is limited to families and persons having acquired immune deficiency syndrome."

CONGREGATE SERVICES

For contracts with and payments to public housing agencies and nonprofit corporations for congregate services programs in accordance with the provisions of the Congregate Housing Services Act of 1978, \$7,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992.

PAYMENTS FOR OPERATION OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

For payments to public housing agencies and Indian housing authorities for operating subsidies for low-income housing projects as authorized by section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g), \$2,000,000,000.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners—both current and prospective—with respect to property maintenance, financial management, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions and meeting the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership, including provisions for training and for support of voluntary agencies and services as authorized by section 106(a)(1)(iii), and section 106(a)(2), and section 106(c) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, \$5,000,000.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

For assistance to owners of eligible multifamily housing projects insured, or formerly insured, under the National Housing Act, as amended, or which are otherwise eligible for assistance under section 201(c) of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1a), in the program of assistance for troubled multifamily housing projects under the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 1990, and any collections and other amounts in the fund authorized under section 201(j) of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended, during fiscal year 1991, which are in excess of the \$70,000,000 authorized to be transferred to the annual contributions for assisted housing account, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That assistance to an owner of a multifamily housing project assisted, but not insured, under the National Housing Act may be made if the project owner and the mortgagee have provided or agreed to provide assistance to the project in a manner as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION FUND

For payment to cover losses, not otherwise provided for, sustained by the Special Risk Insurance Fund and General Insurance Fund as authorized by the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3(b) and 1735c(f)), \$317,366,000, to remain available until expended.

During fiscal year 1991, within the resources available, gross obligations for direct loans are authorized in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Housing Act, as amended.

During fiscal year 1991, additional commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of \$75,000,000,000.

During fiscal year 1991, gross obligations for direct loans of not to exceed \$151,125,000 are authorized for payments under section 230(a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, from the insurance fund chargeable for benefits on the mortgage covering the property to which the payments made relate, and payments in connection with such obligations are hereby approved.

NONPROFIT SPONSOR ASSISTANCE

During fiscal year 1991, within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amounts of direct loans shall not exceed \$1,100,000.

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

For grants to public housing agencies for use in eliminating drug-related crime in public housing projects authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11901-11908, and for drug information clearinghouse services authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11921-11925, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for grants, contracts, or other assistance for technical assistance and training for or on behalf of public housing agencies and resident organizations (including the costs of necessary travel for participants in such training).

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES

During fiscal year 1991, new commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721g), shall not exceed \$80,000,000,000 of loan principal.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM

For the emergency shelter grants program, as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, \$75,000,000 to remain available until expended.

TRANSITIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

For the transitional and supportive housing demonstration program, as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR FACILITIES TO ASSIST THE HOMELESS

For grants for supplemental assistance for facilities to assist the homeless as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act

(Public Law 100-77), as amended \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SECTION 8 MODERATE REHABILITATION

SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY

For assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437f), for the section 8 moderate rehabilitation program, to be used to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SOLAR ENERGY AND ENERGY CONSERVATION BANK

ASSISTANCE FOR SOLAR AND CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENTS

All funds previously appropriated under this head that are recaptured or that otherwise are or become available for obligation in fiscal year 1991 or thereafter, including all such amounts affected by the order of the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, in *Dabney v. Reagan*, 82 Civ. 2231-CSH, dated March 20, 1985, shall be withdrawn, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1555 et seq.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For grants to States and units of general local government and for related expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out a community development grants program as authorized by title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), \$3,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$14,500,000 shall be available for "special purpose grants" pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301): *Provided further*, That not to exceed 20 per centum of any grant made with funds appropriated herein (other than a grant using funds under section 107(b)(3) of such Act or funds set aside in the following proviso) shall be expended for "Planning and Management Development" and "Administration" as defined in regulations promulgated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 shall be made available from the foregoing \$3,000,000,000 to carry out a child care demonstration under section 222 of the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z-6 note): *Provided further*, That after September 30, 1990, no funds provided or heretofore provided in this or any other appropriations Act shall be used to establish or supplement a revolving fund under section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and pursuant to section 202(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987, this action is a necessary (but secondary) result of a significant policy change.

During fiscal year 1991, total commitments to guarantee loans, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), shall not exceed \$140,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal.

REHABILITATION LOAN FUND

During fiscal year 1991, collections, unexpended balances of prior appropriations (including any recoveries of prior obligations) and any other amounts in the revolving fund established pursuant to section 312 of

the Housing Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452b), after September 30, 1990, are available and may be used for commitments for loans and operating costs and the capitalization of delinquent interest on delinquent or defaulted loans notwithstanding section 312(h) of such Act: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to sell any loan asset that the Secretary holds as evidence of indebtedness under such section 312.

URBAN HOMESTEADING

For reimbursement to the Federal Housing Administration Fund or the Rehabilitation Loan Fund for losses incurred under the urban homesteading program (12 U.S.C. 1706e), and for reimbursement to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Agriculture for properties conveyed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively, for use in connection with an urban homesteading program approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to section 810 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and for reimbursement to the Resolution Trust Corporation for properties conveyed by such Corporation for such use, in accordance with section 810(g)(3) of such Act, \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed \$250,000 shall be available to provide technical assistance as authorized by section 810(c) of such Act.

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, \$30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992.

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, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, \$12,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That not less than \$5,600,000 shall be available to carry out activities pursuant to section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and nonadministrative 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, \$816,466,000, of which \$390,342,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 1991, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall maintain an average employment of at least 1,402 for Public and Indian Housing Programs.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$37,840,000, of which \$8,557,000 shall be transferred from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the City of Lebanon, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is authorized to retain any land disposition proceeds from the financially closed-out Southside Urban Renewal Project (R-635(C)) not paid to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and to use such proceeds in accordance with the requirements of the community development block grant program specified in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The City of Lebanon shall retain such proceeds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use, in accordance with this paragraph, all past and future earnings from such proceeds, including any interest.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the City of Nanticoke, the Borough of Plymouth, and the Borough of Forty Fort, all in the County of Luzerne and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are authorized to retain any categorical settlement grant funds, urban renewal grant funds, and land disposition proceeds that remain after the financial close-out of the Lower Broadway Disaster Urban Renewal Project (No. B-79-UR-42-0001) in the City of Nanticoke, the Plymouth Disaster Urban Renewal Project (No. PA-R-617 and No. B-79-UR-42-0007) in the Borough of Plymouth, and the Forty Fort Disaster Urban Renewal Project (No. PA-R-613 and No. B-79-UR-42-0003) in the Borough of Forty Fort, respectively, and to use such funds in accordance with the requirements of the community development block grant program specified in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The City of Nanticoke, the Borough of Plymouth, and the Borough of Forty Fort shall retain such funds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use, in accordance with this paragraph, all past and future earnings from such funds, including any interest.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the City of Pittsfield in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, is authorized to retain any land disposition proceeds from the financially closed-out Columbus Urban Renewal Project, Parcel 5 (No. Mass. R-90) not paid to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and to use such proceeds in accordance with the requirements of the community development block grant program specified in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The City of Pittsfield shall retain such proceeds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use, in accordance with this paragraph, all past and future earnings from such proceeds, including any interest.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the Borough of East Stroudsburg, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is authorized to retain any land disposition proceeds from the closed-out Courtland Plaza Urban Renewal Project (No. PA-R-352) not paid to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and to use such proceeds in accordance with the re-

quirements of the community development block grant program specified in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The Borough of East Stroudsburg shall retain such proceeds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use all past and future earnings from such proceeds, including any interest.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall cancel the indebtedness of the Town of Fairmount Heights, Maryland, relating to the public facilities loan (project number MD-18-PFL0003) issued July 1, 1969, under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The Town of Fairmount Heights is relieved of all liability to the Government for the outstanding principal balance on such loan, for the amount of accrued interest on such loan, and for any other fees and charges payable in connection with such loan.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall approve the use by the Housing Authority of the City of Seattle of excess residual reserve receipts from the Bay View Tower (No. 127-38044) and Market House Projects (No. WA19-8023-005) for any purpose which inures to the benefit of the low-income tenants of federally or locally financed projects owned by the Authority. Excess residual receipt funds are those receipts in excess of 25 percent of the average annual operating costs during the immediately preceding five-year period.

The \$784,000 in the Housing Development Action Grant (HoDAG) funding previously awarded to the City of Santa Cruz, California by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under Section 17 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437o), as amended, are hereby restored to the City of Santa Cruz from previously appropriated funds for the construction of low-income housing at the site known as the Alborada project.

Section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(b)(2)) is amended by striking "(185 percent during fiscal year 1990)" and inserting the following: "(185 percent during fiscal year 1991)".

During fiscal year 1991, notwithstanding any other provision of law, average employment in the headquarter's offices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall not exceed: (1) 28 staff years for the Immediate Office of the Secretary/Under Secretary, (2) 18 staff years for the Deputy Under Secretary for Field Coordination, (3) 29 staff years for the Office of Public Affairs, (4) 28 staff years for the Office of Legislation and Congressional Relations, (5) 1,117 staff years for the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, (6) 148 staff years for the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, (7) 271 staff years for the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, (8) 147 staff years for the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, (9) 170 staff years for the Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, and (10) 238 staff years for the Office of General Counsel.

Mr. TRAXLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title II?

Are there any amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DREIER of California: Page 33, after line 3, insert the following:

The amounts otherwise provided in this title under the heading "HOUSING PROGRAMS—ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING" for the development of acquisition cost of public housing, including major reconstruction of obsolete public housing projects, other than for Indian families, are decreased by \$50,000,000, and under the heading "HOUSING PROGRAMS—DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS OR LOW-INCOME HOUSING" are increased by \$50,000,000.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to improve the condition of already existing public housing which, as my colleagues all know, face an epidemic of drug-related violence and other forms of criminal activity. This amendment will take the small sum of \$50 million from the public housing new construction account and add it to the \$100 million already earmarked for the Public Housing Drug Elimination Grant Program. Secretary Kemp had proposed, as part of the fiscal year 1991 budget submission, that this grant program be funded at \$150 million.

The grant program was first authorized in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, and it received \$8.2 million in fiscal year 1989. Secretary Kemp received 500 applications for these funds but was only able to fund 37 programs. For fiscal year 1990, he has proposed to increase funding levels for larger public housing agencies and has budgeted \$97.4 million. Assuming that the Secretary receives the same number of applications in fiscal year 1991, \$126.1 million would be needed.

However, Secretary Kemp anticipates receiving even more applications than in the program's first year because of increased antidrug efforts in public housing. He also proposes to expand the grant program to include a demonstration project to address the needs of assisted housing. In addition, the extra \$50 million provided in this antidrug amendment will go toward efforts such as the Drug Information and Strategy Clearinghouse, as well as training and technical assistance.

The \$150 million called for to fund the drug-free public housing initiative will help to make public housing decent, safe, and free from illegal drugs. It is clearly an investment in both the physical property and the

safety of tenants in public housing. We can either spend \$150 million today, or several billions of dollars tomorrow to rehabilitate the physical environment of public housing as a result of the damage being done by drug lords and gang violence.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, this is a modest amendment that emphasizes human needs at the expense of bricks and mortar. It will help to rid our public housing projects of drug-related criminal activity, and I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which I think could be very well received.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who indicated to me he wanted to be recognized at this point.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, this program is not authorized and, therefore, a point of order will lie against it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from California for his initiative and his leadership. I know he has spoken to me on many, many occasions on this program, and I have spoken with Jack Kemp on it.

The program has a tremendous amount of merit. It goes to the source of the problem. Funds go where the drug users are and cleans them out of these neighborhoods. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from California for his leadership in this effort.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say it is very clear that we have to do everything that we possibly can to try and expedite efforts to get these drug dealers out of public housing. It is a goal that we have been discussing.

I see the chairman of the full Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia are here. We have been discussing this in the authorization process, and I hope very much that we will be able to proceed and get the kind of resources to the Department of Housing and Urban Development there so that they will, in fact, be able to get these people out of public housing.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for his recognition of our attempt to do this.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact the gentleman has raised a point of order on the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment at this point.

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

There was no objection.

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; \$15,900,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That where station allowance has been authorized by the Department of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be authorized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Commission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces serving as members or as Secretary of the Commission may be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members of the Commission: *Provided further*, That the Commission shall reimburse other Government agencies, including the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of personnel assigned to it: *Provided further*, That section 509 of the general provisions carried in title V of this Act shall not apply to the funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That not more than \$125,000 of the private contributions to the Korean War Memorial Fund may be used for administrative support of the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board including travel by members of the board authorized by the Commission, travel allowances to conform to those provided by Federal Travel regulations.

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 rate for GS-18, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$37,109,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$365,000 of these funds shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits for the Commissioners of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the U.S. Court of Veterans Appeals as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 4051-4091, \$9,560,000: *Provided*, That such sum shall be available without regard to section 509 of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and im-

provement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$12,236,000, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project; and not to exceed \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$995,000,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be expended for purposes of Resource Conservation and Recovery Panels established under section 2003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6913).

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, \$37,000,000, of which \$13,107,000 shall be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund trust fund and \$575,000 shall be derived from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For research and development activities, \$254,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That not more than \$11,600,000 of these funds shall be available for procurement of laboratory equipment.

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

For abatement, control, and compliance activities, \$1,006,525,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That up to \$2,800,000 shall be available for grants and cooperative agreements to develop and implement asbestos training and accreditation programs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this head shall be available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration pursuant to section 118(h)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be expended for purposes of Resource Conservation and Recovery Panels established under section 2003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6913), or for support to State, regional, local, and interstate agencies in accordance with subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, other than section 4008(a)(2) or 4009 (42 U.S.C. 6948, 6949).

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment for facilities of, or use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$34,000,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended (CERCLA), including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), \$1,610,200,000, to be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund, plus sums recovered on behalf of the Hazardous Substance Superfund in excess of \$135,000,000 during fiscal year 1991, with all of such funds to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 111(m) of CERCLA or any other provision of law, not to exceed \$47,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to carry out activities described in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of CERCLA and section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986: *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 fiscal year 1991: *Provided further*, That no more than \$233,000,000 of these funds shall be available for administrative expenses.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than \$6,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Water Quality Act of 1987, \$2,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,964,300,000 shall be for title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; and \$35,700,000 shall be for title V of the Water Quality Act of 1987, consisting of \$15,700,000 for section 510 and \$20,000,000 for section 513: *Provided*, That the \$15,700,000 for section 510 shall be for the United States share of an international wastewater treatment plant in San Diego to treat Tijuana wastewater and these amounts shall only become available upon approval of a Minute of the International Boundary and Water Commission by Mexico and the United States in which Mexico agrees to finance: (1) all operating and maintenance costs of treating Tijuana wastewater at the plant; and (2) all construction, operations, and maintenance costs for any future capacity needed to treat Tijuana wastewater in excess of the 25 million gallon per day capacity to be provided at the international plant: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding sections 602(b)(6) or 201(g)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, amounts awarded in a capitalization grant to an agency of any State, including funds transferred pursuant to section 205(m), shall be available for providing assistance in that State for the construction of publicly owned treatment works as defined in section 212 of that Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, to the fullest extent possible, ensure that at least 8 per centum of Federal funding for prime and subcontracts awarded in support of authorized programs, including the contracts for wastewater treatment and leaking underground storage tanks grants be made available to business concerns or other organizations owned or controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a)(5) and (6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(5) and (6)), including historically black colleges and universities. For purposes of this section, economically and socially disadvantaged individuals shall be deemed to include women.

Notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Delavan Lake Sanitary District shall be entitled to retain all funds received under EPA construction grants c550549-01 and c550549-02.

During fiscal year 1991, notwithstanding any other provision of law, average employment in the headquarter's offices of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not exceed: (1) 44 workyears for the Immediate Office of the Administrator, (2) 50 workyears for the Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs, (3) 64 workyears for the Office of Communications and Public Affairs, (4) 146 workyears for the Office of General Counsel, (5) 52 workyears for the Office of International Activities, (6) 35 workyears for the Office of Federal Activities, (7) 257 workyears for the Office of Policy, Planning, and Evaluation, and (8) 1,095 workyears for the Office of Administration and Resources Management.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality, in carrying out their functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-224), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, including not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$2,780,000.

NATIONAL SPACE COUNCIL

For necessary expenses of the National Space Council, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That the National Space Council shall reimburse other agencies for not less than one-half of the personnel compensation costs of individuals detailed to it.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed \$1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$3,300,000: *Provided*, That the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall reimburse other agencies for not less than one-half of the personnel compensation costs of individuals detailed to it.

**FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
DISASTER RELIEF**

For necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire and purchase of motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343); uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency preparedness; transportation in connection with the continuity of Government program to the same extent and in the same manner as permitted the Secretary of a Military Department under 10 U.S.C. 2632; and not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$143,459,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$3,905,000.

**EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND
ASSISTANCE**

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as amended (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), section 103 of the National Security Act (50 U.S.C. 404), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, \$275,423,000.

**NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND
(TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)**

Of the funds available from the National Flood Insurance Fund for activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, \$11,078,000 shall, upon enactment of this Act, be transferred to the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for administrative costs of the insurance and flood plain management programs and \$46,023,000 shall, upon enactment of the Act, be transferred to the "Emergency management planning and assistance" appropriation for flood plain management activities, including \$4,720,000 for expenses under section 1362 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4103, 4127), which amount shall be available until September 30, 1992. In fiscal year 1991, no funds in excess of (1) \$32,000,000 for operating expenses, (2) \$183,500,000 for agents' commissions and taxes, and (3) \$3,500,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

There is hereby appropriated \$134,000,000 to the Federal Emergency Management

Agency to carry out an emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of Public Law 100-77, as amended: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed three and one-half per centum of the total appropriation.

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER**

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Information Center, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,540,000, to be deposited into the Consumer Information Center Fund: *Provided*, That the appropriations, revenues and collections deposited into the fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Consumer Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of \$5,500,000. Administrative expenses of the Consumer Information Center in fiscal year 1991 shall not exceed \$2,172,000. Appropriations, revenues, and collections accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1991 in excess of \$5,500,000 shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

For necessary expenses of the Office of Consumer Affairs, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,889,000.

**INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON THE HOMELESS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses of the Interagency Council on the Homeless, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title II of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11311-11319), as amended, \$1,214,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Council shall carry out its duties in the 10 standard Federal regions under section 203(a)(4) of such Act only through detail, on a non-reimbursable basis, of employees of the departments and agencies represented on the Council pursuant to section 202(a) of such Act.

**NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation and modification of real and personal property, and not in excess of \$100,000 per project for construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, repairs, and rehabilitation and modification of facilities; purchase, lease, hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration: \$7,034,094,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$35,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for scientific consultations or extraordinary expense to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

Mr. TRAXLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III through page 47, line 5, 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against that portion of title III?

If not, are there any amendments to that portion of title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MACHTLEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACHTLEY: Page 46, line 25, strike "\$7,034,094,000" and insert "\$7,027,994,000".

Mr. MACHTLEY (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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is quite simple. On page 61 of the report accompanying this bill, the Committee on Appropriations calls for spending \$6.1 million on a program called SETI [search for extraterrestrial intelligence].

My amendment reduces the appropriations for NASA research and development by \$6.1 million, and it is intended to eliminate in this fiscal 1991 budget such funding.

Mr. Chairman, no one in this body can doubt that we are in the middle of a financial crisis. The budget summit negotiations have been working to come up with an agreement to reduce the Federal deficit which, we are told, may be as high as \$200 billion.

In this strapped fiscal environment, NASA has asked Congress for \$12 million this year and \$100 million over the next decade to search for extraterrestrial intelligence and to see, in fact, whether it is in existence.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, I would rather see a special terrestrial intelligence program in our schools and colleges in this country. We do not have to go into outer space to find minds and intelligence that need to be developed. In every State, in every city in this country there is intelligence, there are minds that need to be developed. Ask any parent who is trying to pay a tuition bill for their kids to go to college today.

We are just beginning to realize the costs associated with the S&L bailout. Might we spend some of this NASA money to find where the absence of intelligence was that led to this failure?

Does any Congressperson think that for a second he or she can explain to their constituents how important it is to spend \$6.1 million to find out if ET really exists? And then we are going to have to raise their taxes to pay for it.

Indeed, former Senator William Proxmire gave this program in 1978 the Golden Fleece Award. If SETI does proceed as planned, I might suggest that we adopt the SCOTI Pro-

gram. The SCOTI is the search for congressional intelligence.

This may be an oversimplification, but, frankly, when I was a kid, I wanted to go to the west coast from the east coast. It might have been exciting. I might have learned something, and I may have found another form of life. But my family could not afford it. I did not go, and, frankly, I survived.

It is frankly the same with our Nation. A search into outer space for extraterrestrial life might be exciting. We might learn something. We may even discover another form of life. But today our country just cannot afford the trip. If we do not do it, I would suggest that since we have survived for 15 billion years without knowing whether there is extraterrestrial life, we may just survive a few billion more.

There is no doubt that there is some scientific curiosity and perhaps even public curiosity as to whether ET is real. One has to only see the popularity of the movie ET and Close Encounters of the Third Kind to appreciate this fact.

As an engineer myself in undergraduate studies, I certainly appreciate and applaud scientific research and exploration. However, the question, the difficult question, that we in this body must ask is: Can we, in fact, today afford this type of expenditure?

We have no, and I repeat no, scientific evidence that there is anything beyond our galaxy except we do have some curiosity. The answer that I would suggest is that we cannot spend money on curiosity today when we have a deficit.

I would suggest that our constituents would agree that money ought not to be spent on curiosity. If there is a scientific justification for SETI, in fact, I think there is justification scientifically to not proceed.

Scientists have argued that, in fact, there is an evolutionary cycle on this Earth that if we have a 15-billion-year galaxy that probably there is an alien form of life beyond. Some of our constituents might suggest that there is an alien form of life which has already arrived here in Washington.

I might suggest that, in fact, if there is such a superintelligent form of life out there, might it be easier just to listen and let them call us?

As frivolous as part of this might have been, I think we are talking about serious dollars, and I believe that, in fact, we owe it to our constituents to cut out some of this that we just, frankly, cannot afford.

I would suggest that this is the answer to those who would argue that we should have a line-item veto. This is a specific amendment to delete a specific program that we cannot afford.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHTLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have to tell the gentleman that I think there is little likelihood that a line-item veto would be exercised on this item since the administration sent us a request for \$12.1 million, and we cut it to \$6.1 million in the subcommittee.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we in Congress can, in fact, cut it down to zero, and that is my hope today.

I would ask my colleagues respectfully to recognize the seriousness of this issue and, in fact, support my amendment.

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

Mr. MACHTLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, of course, we did not give the President his \$12 million for this research, but we did yield \$6 million to him. Do I understand what the gentleman wants us to do now is take away the last penny that the President has requested for this program?

Mr. MACHTLEY. I would suggest it is NASA's, and I would say that we should take away everything.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Chairman, the honorable gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] has offered an amendment to terminate funding for the SETI program of NASA. SETI [search for extraterrestrial intelligence] is, quite simply, an effort to locate space aliens.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when good people of America can't find affordable housing, we shouldn't be spending precious dollars to look for little green men with misshapen heads.

I commend the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies for cutting NASA's request for this program. The fiscal year 1991 budget request for this \$100.5 million rip off was \$12.1 million. The subcommittee, however, reduced this amount by \$6 million, leaving \$6.1 million in the bill currently under consideration. But it's time to put this crippled dog out of its misery and kill it with a forceful blow.

Mr. Chairman, of course, there are space aliens.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, it has just been on the AP wire, they have located some extraterrestrial beams, and they are wearing striped coats.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, of course there are flying saucers and advanced civilizations in outer space. But we don't need to

spend \$6 million this year to find evidence of these rascally creatures. We only need 75 cents to buy a tabloid at the local supermarket. Conclusive evidence of these crafty critters can be found at checkout counters from coast to coast.

This article—Exhibit 1—from the Weekly World News, for example, describes how UFO's were poised to land at Chicago's Soldier Field during halftime of last year's Bears-Eagles game. They were scared off, though, by gridlock traffic of blimps, helicopters, and airplanes over the stadium.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the article for the RECORD.

[Exhibit 1]

BLIMP SCARED UFOs AWAY FROM STADIUM (By Beatrice Dexter)

UFOs were poised to land during Monday Night Football at Chicago's Soldier Field—but they shied away because of the gridlock traffic of blimps, helicopters and airplanes over the stadium!

That's the contention of Ufologist Andy Reiss, whose headline-making attempt to attract aliens to the October 2 game resulted in a no-show.

The Los Angeles space specialist had orchestrated an incredible national effort—featured in a recent issue of *The NEWS*—to invite aliens to Earth by sending a psychic message to them in outer space. Millions of Americans across the country are believed to have cooperated in the psychic experiment.

"I have heard from a number of Ufologists around the country that sightings in the Midwest were way up," he told *The NEWS*. "I think the aliens responded to our invitation and buzzed the planet more than once—but decided against landing during the Eagles-Bears game at halftime."

"The stadium was swarming with air traffic, including the Goodyear blimp. There's no way you could land a giant starship without causing a tragic accident. I think our space friends are going to wait for us to find a better place."

Reiss says he's trying to keep communication open with the aliens by concentrating on a friendly message to them 20 minutes each day. He plans to organize another landing effort within the next few months, he said.

"We achieved a great deal with our first effort, and even though we didn't see a landing, we did see signs of an alien response," Reiss said.

"Now that we've had so much publicity and mass cooperation, we don't need to have them land in a public place. For our next effort we're going to select a quiet, isolated place."

We also know that Noah's Ark was built by space aliens. I submit exhibit 2 that I have here in my file.

[Exhibit 2]

NOAH'S ARK WAS BUILT BY SPACE ALIENS (By Mickey McGuire)

Pictures on an ancient stone tablet found near Mount Ararat prove beyond a doubt that Noah didn't build the ark that survived the great flood—it was brought to Earth by space aliens!

The crude pictures, which probably were carved in the tablets by Noah himself, clearly show the ark being beamed to Earth from

an enormous space ship that appears to stretch from horizon to horizon.

The tablet also shows eight human figures standing beneath the ark. They are believed to represent Noah and his sons, Shem, Ham and Japhet, and their wives.

Using the human figures as a comparison scale, the ark would have been about 550 feet long, 91 feet wide and 55 feet high. "Those measurements are almost an exact match of those in the Holy Bible," declared Dr. Sabah Ozdikir, a Turkish archaeologist and Bible expert who has searched for the ark's remains for almost a half-century.

"In Genesis 6:15, the ark is described as 300 cubits long, 50 cubits wide and 30 cubits high," Dr. Ozdikir explained.

"In modern measurements, the ark shown on the stone tablet is more or less a perfect match of the one described in the Bible," Dr. Ozdikir said, compared to the size of the figures on the tablet, the spaceship would have been three miles long by one mile high.

That's roughly the same size as a UFO seen by millions of people in skies over China in the early 1980s.

"According to the Bible, God warned Noah that a great flood would cover the Earth and destroy all living creatures on the land," Dr. Ozdikir said. "He told Noah to build the ark and take aboard a male and female of every animal so they could replenish the Earth with their kind after the flood."

"But we're certain Noah couldn't finish the ark in time. You see, one of the pictures on the tablet clearly shows an obviously uncompleted ark being overturned by a large wave."

"More than a dozen experts in hieroglyphics have studied the picture and all reached the same conclusion: Creatures from another world brought a completed ark to Earth and saved Noah and the animals just in the nick of time."

"However, we also believe that God, seeing Noah's plight, told the space beings to deliver the ark to Earth."

Why spend \$5 million to search radio waves, when we already know that space aliens are stealing our frogs. I submit for the RECORD exhibit 3.

[Exhibit 3]

WEBBED CREATURES VANISHING FROM EARTH BY LEAPS AND BOUNDS—SPACE ALIENS STEALING OUR FROGS!

(By John Stern)

A UFO researcher says space aliens are wiping out the world's frog population because they eat tadpoles and use the mature creatures for research!

The decline of frogs is a worldwide phenomenon that has repeatedly been blamed on pollution and the destruction of natural habitat.

Walter Caine contends that the environmental explanation is all hogwash.

He further claims to have the evidence to prove that extraterrestrial hunters alone are wiping frogs out. In some areas populations have declined as much as 90 percent, scientists report.

"It's the only explanation that makes any sense," said Caine, who founded the California-based research group. Extraterrestrial Today.

"I have hundreds of reports from eyewitnesses who have seen extraterrestrials gathering frogs and tadpoles all over the world."

"I can't vouch for the character and credibility of all these witnesses but I know for a fact that most of them are rock solid."

"Their independent descriptions of saucer-shaped UFOs and slender, large-headed space aliens are uncannily similar. And these people swear they saw the extraterrestrials stealing frogs and eating tadpoles."

Washington sources refused to comment on Caine's theory and report but conceded that American and other governments are investigating UFO activity in regions where frogs grow and breed.

Caine says that's evidence enough to show that world authorities are aware of alien interference in earth ecology.

And he has called on them to take "immediate steps to end the interference before the only frogs we see are in books."

"There isn't a doubt in my mind that space aliens are eating our tadpoles as a delicacy and experimenting with our frogs," said Caine.

"This is a very serious situation."

The intergalactic frog and tadpole theft, reported by hundreds of eye witnesses, has become a serious global problem. Perhaps the \$6 million could be better spent by the Attorney General in bringing these orbiting scofflaws to justice.

We know that a UFO blasted out of the ocean and hovered for 15 terrifying minutes over a frightened Sri Lankan tanker crew, and we also know that this UFO cured 22 sick, blind, and lame people in Turkey. I submit those exhibits for the RECORD.

[Exhibit 4]

UFO FLIES OUT OF THE OCEAN!

(By Ann Hughey)

A saucer-shaped UFO stunned the crew of a tanker when it blasted out of the ocean and circled their ship for 15 terrifying minutes before vanishing without a trace back into the sea!

According to Sri Lankan newspaper reports, the incident took place in broad daylight in late March, 210 miles south of Matara, Sri Lanka, in the Indian Ocean.

No one was injured but the 175-foot-long tanker *Kim Seng* suffered severe structural damage from the towering waves that were kicked up when the UFO rose out of and later returned to the water, the press said.

"It was enormous—at least five times the size of our ship," Rasika Mawatha, the 47-year-old captain of the *Kim Seng*, told reporters.

"I'd just come up on deck when the huge silver orb flew out of the sea and hovered just off the starboard bow of the ship. We almost sank from the waves it made as it left the water."

"At first, I was so shocked I nearly fainted from fright. My crew was terrified, too."

"They fell to the deck in shock—covering their eyes and cowering like small children."

"All the ship's instruments went haywire and the needle on the compass kept spinning around and around. I couldn't even use the radio to call for help," he said.

"The spacecraft glowed and pulsed with a silvery light and another eerie beam of light shone from the bottom of the ship. It seemed as if whoever was in the craft was scanning our ship, but for what purpose, I don't know."

After about 15 minutes, the UFO disappeared as suddenly as it had appeared.

"One minute it was there and the next it had vanished back into the sea in a blinding flash of light," said Capt. Mawatha.

"And it kicked up such huge waves that it almost capsized the ship again."

Immediately after the UFO disappeared, all the ship's instruments began working again as if nothing had happened.

"I radioed authorities about what had happened and they sent planes and ships to scan the area but they came up with nothing," said Capt. Mawatha.

Officials searched for days but not a trace of the UFO could be found anywhere.

"We spent days searching for signs of the alleged spaceship but couldn't find anything," says Adi Chandrakar, a spokesman for the coastal authority in Matara.

"Even though we couldn't find any concrete evidence of the UFO, we know that something highly unusual did happen out there because of the damage to the ship."

"Only extremely rough water like you'd experience in a severe storm could cause that kind of damage and there wasn't a cloud in the sky."

"We're calling this incident an official UFO sighting because there's no other explanation for what happened."

[Exhibit 5]

MAGIC RAY FROM THIS UFO CURES 22 PEOPLE!

(By Mickey McGuire)

At least 22 sick and crippled people were miraculously cured when they were bathed in eerie greenish light—that pulsed from a gigantic UFO hovering over their city!

Official reports from western Turkey said the incredible cures began moments after the silvery, saucer-shaped spaceship streaked silently down from the heavens to hover for more than an hour just over the rooftops.

And what is being hailed as the most sensational photograph ever made of a flying saucer was taken by a Turkish soldier home on leave.

"There is no doubt the photograph is real," declared a Turkish official in the city of Manisa. "Hundreds of people here saw the UFO. They saw it arrive and they watched it depart."

"But even more amazing than the photograph is the overwhelming evidence that something from the ship healed at least 22 sick and crippled people."

A physician, Dr. Mehmet Nadi, said he talked to a woman named Inisa Tokap, whose 46-year-old husband Alaattin was miraculously cured of crippling arthritis that had kept him bedridden for years.

"With tears streaming from her eyes she told me how his twisted limbs slowly straightened as the UFO's greenish light washed over his frail body," Dr. Nadi recalled.

"She said when the light from the UFO touched him the pain vanished from his body and his gnarled, twisted fingers slowly began to become relaxed and began to straighten."

"His feet and toes became straight and he was able to stand and walk for the first time in years."

Dr. Nadi said he has examined several other patients and found them completely cured of their ailments, including Kamal Yilmaz, a middle-aged man who had been in a stroke-induced coma for months.

"I couldn't believe my eyes when Kamal came walking into my office as healthy as an ox," he said. "I've known him for years,

but I made him show me some identification. I just couldn't believe it was true. But it was."

Medical officials from Ankara are now in the area to examine dozens of other people who also have reported being cured by the strange light.

"So far, we know of several people who were dying of cancer who now appear to be completely cured," one doctor confirmed. "But only time will tell us if the cures are permanent or merely some kind of coincidental mass remission."

Another doctor confirmed that a 9-year-old boy, identified as Hasan Koru, comatose and near death with total kidney failure, awoke and got out of bed after the mysterious light filtered through a window and swept over his still body. Other doctors verified that a woman blinded by cataracts regained her sight, a man deaf since birth had his hearing restored and a day-old infant girl dying of some undiagnosed malady now appears to be normal and healthy because of the miracle light.

The UFO, which hovered over the village for about 70 minutes, before it suddenly streaked off into space, is believed to be the same spaceship that landed in a Soviet city about 1,300 miles to the north on September 27.

The NEWS revealed in its November 7 issue that the captain of the spaceship was captured by KGB agents when the aliens left their craft after landing in a park in the city of Veronezh.

"It would be too much of a coincidence for two UFOs to be making such dramatic visits within weeks of each other," one Turkish official declared.

If we are willing to spend just a few dollars more than the 75 cents I have proposed, we could take out an advertisement in the personals to locate some of these devilish foreigners. It could read:

Single blue planet seeks out alien life forms for fun, adventure and possible romance. I am middle-aged, well-built and relatively attractive, despite premature ozone loss. I'm looking for an energetic green biped who likes to dance, cuddle and take long, romantic spacewalks—someone who will help to ease my global tension. Call 976-SETI.

This amendment gives us a chance to prove that there is still intelligent life on Earth. Let us save our hard-earned money and let the space aliens spend their currency to find us.

If we continue to fund this dog—a Golden Fleece award winner in 1978—then we should seriously consider funding of an even more ambitious program—SCI: Search for Congressional Intelligence.

Support the amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the logic of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and the maker of the amendment is irrefutable. I think we had better exercise a congressional veto on this Presidential request. We accept the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTELEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 47, line 5, after "conclusive" insert the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$266,900,000 shall be made available under this heading for the Space Exploration Initiative, to be derived from transfers of funds appropriated under this title for other accounts and activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration."

Mr. WALKER (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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. In my judgment it provides for an unauthorized transfer of funds between NASA appropriations, and, therefore, the amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI. I would ask for a ruling from the Chair.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order, and move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEILENSEN). The point of order is conceded and sustained.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that a nation that lacks vision is doomed. I had hoped that this amendment would be considered today, and I am disappointed, of course, that the point of order was offered against it. Because what it sought to do was to put at least a portion of the money back in, that the President had requested for his Moon-Mars initiative. It is money that was authorized by the House last year in the House-passed authorization bill, which never got through the Senate, but which the authorizing committee felt was an important initiative for this Nation's future.

We were somewhat stunned when the Committee on Appropriations decided to completely eliminate all funding for this program. I sat here a moment ago and listened to the Committee on Appropriations decide to eliminate another program, one that has been a scientific effort that has been around for many years on the NASA agenda, and one which I realize is nice to make fun of, and I appreciated the good humor of the Members who came to the floor.

The fact is though that this is another program that was looking out beyond our galaxy, looking out to try to find out what it is that human

beings should know about this final frontier on which we are engaged.

My concern about the bill that we have before us, and I do not doubt the good work of the committee, the committee has struggled hard to look at a number of things. I might say to the subcommittee, I am particularly grateful for a policy judgment that was made in the housing section that I think was particularly meritorious, and I appreciate the good humor with which that was dealt in the full committee.

But I am concerned about the priorities reflected in this particular appropriations measure, because it seems to me that where your priorities lie, as defined in this bill, is simply on funding what is and maybe even looking back.

Oh, yes, there are new initiatives in the program. You have funded things like the Earth observation system and so on, which I happen to support. But you have given it far more than the administration requested, money that many of us who have looked at it feel will be money wasted in the program because the community that has to do the work cannot absorb the money at the present time. The President's increase in funding was more than enough to take care of the program. But instead, you decided to go that route, which is essentially a program that is good science, but looks back, not forward; that looks inward, not outward.

You decided to go that direction. That is your judgment. But I have got to say that that does not reflect the judgment of the authorizing committee, and I thought maybe we had some role to play in this whole process.

Sure, we have obligations that have to be met. We have priorities to make. But I would suggest that a nation that fails to look outward, fails to show vision, is in fact a nation that is in decadency, rather than ascendancy.

I would like to think as we head toward the next century, we are going to have a space program to be proud of somewhere there, and it ought to be one we plan for at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, when President Kennedy stood in this Chamber nearly 30 years ago to deliver in those now famous words the challenge to the Nation to land a man on the Moon by the end of the 1960's, I do not believe that he meant for us to stop our exploration when that goal was reached.

□ 1310

Although world circumstances have changed significantly since those days of the space race with the Soviet Union, President Kennedy's words still have relevance in today's climate. He said, in part:

For while we cannot guarantee that we shall one day be first, we can guarantee that

any failure to make this effort will make us last * * * space is open to us now; and our eagerness to share its meaning is not governed by the efforts of others. We go into space because whatever mankind must undertake, free men must fully share.

After 20 years of proceeding without a firm vision for our space program, President Bush has finally articulated a very specific goal, returning to the Moon and going to Mars.

As exciting as the prospect of that voyage is, the space exploration initiative will be much more than that. SEI will spur the development of new technologies to enhance U.S. competitiveness. SEI will inspire young people to pursue educations in math, science and engineering.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

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

Mr. WALKER. SEI will create new industries and new economic opportunities, including new sources of energy and information that will help make the Earth more environmentally sound.

Recent public opinion polls have demonstrated that Americans strongly support the space program. Nearly 69 percent of Americans surveyed indicated they supported the President's proposal to undertake a vigorous program of manned exploration. Sixty-seven percent agreed that NASA's funding should be boosted from 1 to 2 percent of the Federal budget to help pay for these new initiatives, and 87 percent stated they believe it is vitally important to them, that the space program is something which keeps America competitive.

The Appropriations Committee has determined we cannot afford the space exploration initiative. I understand that, and they did their work as best they knew how. But I say that we cannot afford not to undertake that commitment to expanding our frontiers in space, and I am sorry that the lack of vision prevailed on this other program and we instead will not move aggressively forward.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for a very thoughtful statement. I think he does right to raise the issue he raises, because it is an important issue and one about which the House should hear.

I take this opportunity to try to explain, at least from my perspective, why we did not accept the administration request for the additional funding for the Moon-Mars Program. I think it is essentially a question of priorities within funds that we have, and that is

spelled out in some detail on page 62 of the committee report.

From my point of view, mission to Planet Earth is the No. 1 priority of NASA. That is an effort to use NASA's look-down capability to tell us what is going on in terms of the Earth's climate.

It is extraordinary to me that scientists think they can tell us what happened in the first second of the universe, they think they can tell us what is going on in the inside of the Sun, but they really can tell us very little about how the world works as a system, and particularly about how the world's climate works.

That gap in knowledge might not have been very important some decades ago. But as the evidence is becoming very clear that with the vast explosion of human population, and the vast explosion of technology, we are having a significant impact on that system and on the Earth's climate, I think it is very important that we start to know how the world's climate functions and what we are doing to it. Mission to Planet Earth, which is a Presidential initiative, is our means of finding that out.

Yes, we did put in some extra money compared with what the President requested, but I think that is fully justified by the situation. We put in \$10 million to make a start on the synthetic aperture radar, an instrument which most of the scientists in the field tell me ought to be flying at the same time as the polar orbiting platform, and which has to be a different orbit, at a different level, from the polar orbiting platform, and it is necessary in order to give us information on biomass and moisture.

We put in \$10 million for a new total ozone mapping spectrometer because our capacity at the present time is rapidly deteriorating to measure the decline in the ozone, and we know that is a very important issue.

Most significantly, we put in \$8 million toward trying to be able to handle the vast amount of data that this whole program is going to generate. Just by way of comparison, the entire data base of the Internal Revenue Service is said to be 30 trillion bits of information. According to what we are told by the advisory committee on this program, the polar orbiting platform will generate every day 10 trillion bits of information. In 3 days it will generate as much information as the entire data base of the Internal Revenue Service.

We have no capacity to process that information at the present time, and if Members want to talk about NASA programs that can drive technology and keep us competitive internationally, it seems to me that learning how to receive, manage, and make accessible that vast quantity of data is going to be an extraordinary challenge with ex-

traordinary opportunities for payoffs not just in terms of science but in terms of our world competitiveness in the data processing and data management fields.

The second area of priorities is of course the shuttle itself, and I regret that we were not able to do the full amount that the President requested there. But plainly a lot remains to be done with respect to the shuttle program. We have not done everything that those who reviewed the shuttle program following the *Challenger* tragedy thought out to be done. It is our only means of getting human beings into space at the present time, so that those who are interested in the Moon-Mars Program must surely want the shuttle put in first-class reliable condition, and we know from the recent *Columbia* pullback that it is far from a reliable instrument at the present time.

Then, of course, we have the space station. There are those who have more enthusiasm for the space station than I do. But certainly if we are going to find out what happens to human beings who spend long times in space, essential for any Moon-Mars Program, we do have to move ahead with the station, and again I regret that we could not do the full amount that the administration required. But there are limits.

Have we been fair to NASA? I think we have. It is already on an upward curve. In fiscal 1988 the appropriations for NASA were \$8.8 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. GREEN of New York was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREEN of New York. In fiscal year 1989 funding for NASA was \$10.7 billion. In fiscal year 1990 it was \$12.2 billion, and in fiscal year 1991 it is \$14.3 billion. No other agency in this bill is growing at that rate.

But we simply do not have the money to do all of the missions that NASA wants to do if we have to go ahead and do the Moon-Mars mission.

The National Academy of Sciences in its report cites "leadership imperatives 'and' revitalizing the national research and development effort" as the cardinal goals of the mission; \$500 billion is a huge price for these goals.

Although the administration requested only a \$300 million increase for Moon-Mars that is a very thin edge of a very wide wedge. When we were briefed at the White House a year ago on the dimensions of the program we were told that within short order the program would require an expenditure of \$15 billion a year. For our subcommittee, that would be a 25-percent increase in our discretionary account over what we currently have.

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, because the statement of the Academy of Sciences, as the gentleman knows, was referencing the \$400 or \$500 billion cost that this program is supposedly going to cost. Those are NASA figures, and no one knows whether they are true. There are some people who now think that we can do the whole Moon-Mars effort for around \$30 billion spent over a period of 10 years.

Mr. GREEN of New York. If I may reclaim my time, I can only tell the gentleman in my 10 years on this subcommittee I have never seen NASA estimates be too high, and certainly not too high by an order of tenfold. These programs only grow, as happened with the shuttle, as happened with the space station. So I have to say to the gentleman I think the \$15 million will turn out to be an underestimate, not an overestimate.

□ 1320

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because the point here is one of the things we wanted to look at in the SEI was whether or not we ought to look toward a more research/development program outside of NASA's bounds; maybe there are some people out there with ideas NASA has not thought about.

But you have zeroed it out. You have not even given us a chance to explore some of the minor issues let alone some of the major ones. So by zeroing out, you have given us no chance to resolve some of the questions that the gentleman raises about it. I find that extremely disappointing.

Mr. GREEN of New York. If I may reclaim my time, it is a mistake to say we zeroed it out. The fact of the matter is the program encompasses a number of areas of research which NASA has conducted in the past and which we shall continue to fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREEN of New York was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GREEN of New York. We continue to fund those items so that they can move forward. The only ones that I know of who are proposing radically different approaches to Moon-Mars are in another agency, in another appropriation bill, the Subcommittee on Energy and Water bill. If those who

manage that bill want to undertake the work at Lawrence Livermore that some suggest, that is within their jurisdiction to recommend to us.

But I think, given the priorities we have within NASA, and given the vast expansion of the NASA program we have supported over these last several years, there is no way that we can see under present circumstances that our subcommittee is going to be able to get a 25-percent increase in our 302(b) allowance in order to be able to fund this program.

So we have stuck with what we think are sensible priorities for the Congress and for NASA, and I hope that my colleagues will support us in that.

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

Mr. Chairman, the administration is not happy with the committee's recommendation to cut the Moon-Mars increase. We gave NASA the biggest increase in the past 15 years—17.5 percent—or about \$2 billion—the very best we could under the circumstances.

But—yes—we did have to cut NASA by about \$800 million below the President's request.

We had to cut the shuttle program by \$100 million—and that program has just about the highest priority in the agency. In fact, I'm not sure we should have cut it at all. Anybody who has been reading the newspapers lately—including the President—should be aware of the fact that the shuttle program is having a number of problems and probably needs every dime it can get.

And we had to cut the space station program by \$195 million. Now on a percentage basis that was less of a cut than we took last year but the program does enjoy a higher priority than Moon-Mars.

And—above all—we have honored the Administrator's priorities by providing every dollar for NASA's salaries account—the account that he pays for staff and maintenance. Its very vital.

I can't tell you how many center directors have come to us from Kennedy—from Johnson—from Marshall—and told us that we had to provide full funding for the NASA infrastructure because there are serious problems. So those were our priorities: First, agency infrastructure—full funding; second, shuttle; and third, space station.

And by the way, one other priority we didn't forget about was science—things like the earth observing system [EOS] which we funded and which this President has suggested is so important. We can't find out how bad global warming will be unless we have an earth observing system—so we funded that program at about the President's request.

But when we had to make cuts—yes—we were picked on the Moon-Mars Program. The President ought to know that common sense would suggest that we would do that.

Why,

Because on any scale the Moon-Mars initiatives is not as vital as ongoing NASA programs.

The fact is that the space station program is in deep trouble. And unless we fund this pro-

gram and get it moving and insist that the problems are solved—we are going to continue to spend billions and never build a single piece of hardware. I suppose we could have cut the space station program another \$100–\$200 million to fund the President's Moon-Mars initiative program. But, does that make any sense? Of course, it doesn't.

I think it violates what is a commonsense approach to funding this agency in tough budget times.

Who are we kidding around here? Do you really believe that NASA's going to end up at \$14.3 billion? The committee's recommendation is easily the high water mark this budget year—with the Federal Government running a \$200 billion deficit—more than \$100 billion above what the President told us it would be 6 months ago.

Frankly, the fact is that we have probably tilted too much in favor of NASA. What we should have done is to add some extra money over and above what we provided for veterans medical care. But we stuck every last dollar into NASA that we could find—and we did it on the basis of simple straightforward priorities.

And if anyone is not happy with that—stay tuned—because it's going to get a lot worse in the budget wars ahead.

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

Mr. Chairman, first let me say as a member of the Committee on Appropriations that I value the hard work of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] in preparing this important appropriation for consideration by the House of Representatives.

I support it, and I look forward to working with the House and the members of the committee as this measure moves through the conference committee.

But, ladies and gentlemen of the House, let me say that I have asked for a few moments to speak this afternoon to address what I consider to be a watershed issue for this Congress. We have been engaged in the last year in a debate as to what we will do when America faces new spending priorities. We have been elated by the news coming from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union that the military conflict of past decades is finally abating and gives us an opportunity to declare what has been called a peace dividend; to bring back some of the money and some of the troops and spend it on priorities in America.

That is why I think it is absolutely critical that we take a look at this Space Program at this moment and consider what we are being asked to do. Let me say at the outset that I have served on what was then the Committee on Science and Technology. I supported the Space Program and I still do. I think it is important that we as a leading Nation in the

world invest in space, invest in the future, and invest in research as well.

But there are some troubling signs on the horizon when we consider the drift of the debate on our Space Program.

Let me first call the attention of the Members to something they all received this week, a copy of a local newspaper here on Capitol Hill, given to us twice a week, and I think it is very widely read.

You may have noted an insert in this week's newspaper, coincidentally the same week we are considering this appropriation bill, which addresses America's new role in space.

I read most of the articles in this paper. The thing I found interesting to note, though, is who paid for the advertising in this newspaper.

As you page through, you are going to find four or five major corporations; not surprisingly all of these corporations are defense contractors today. They are defense contractors looking for new opportunities for Federal spending in the future. They see the new opportunities in terms of our Space Program.

Some of us can remember those days in the Pentagon no too many years ago when, week after week and month after month, we were told of cost overruns, overspending by some of these very same companies.

Now we are being told today that these same companies want to be involved in the effort to push forward in space. I do not think they should be disqualified, but I do believe this House and the taxpayers of this Nation should be sensitive to the fact that many of the companies that brought us the horror stories from the Pentagon are the same companies that now want to take us on missions into space.

The second point I would like to make is the fact that we have greatly increased this budget for NASA. It is a substantial increase, perhaps not to the level the President asked for, but I think realistic in terms of the deficit we are facing.

When you look at the size of some of the projects we are being asked to invest in, I can tell you that the youngest child seated in the gallery today may still be paying taxes late in life, waiting to see the end of some of these programs.

Let me give you a couple of examples: the space station. The original estimate for the space station was \$8 billion; then it went up to \$16 billion and now it is up to \$40 billion, and another \$80 billion to operate.

What is the net impact of that kind of major expenditure? It does several things. First, when you put limited Federal resources into that type of massive program, you necessarily crowd out other scientific research.

There just is not enough money to go around.

When you focus on the big-ticket items, you do it at the expense of other important research. Let me give you one example.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make the point that I share some of the gentleman's concerns about this space station. I think the reason why it is important to note this is that a lot of distinguished experts, including, I am told, Mr. Keyworth, former science adviser to the President, now looks at this with a great amount of skepticism.

My only concern here, to the gentleman from Illinois, is that he is aware of what I am trying to do on armed services and budget to get things under control. I only wish that we had all been able to spend more time looking at the policy decisions that had been made by the authorizing committee in the area of space, whether it is the telescope that right now is not working properly or whether it is the space station, whose mission could be—in some quarters is labeled as dubious because of problems with space junk and other difficulties associated with it. I think we have carved out a direction in space.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has expired.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, I am just very concerned that we as a Congress should have been more involved in these early policy decisions. I am not sure it is too late now for us to get ourselves involved in these decisions. But I really want to compliment the gentleman on raising the issue about these big-ticket items and what they mean.

We are not just doing it for the sake of saying we are doing it for science. We all support science and our activities in space. But just because somebody says this means science, there is a lot of defense contractors who say they need X, Y, and Z weapons. I want to make sure that what we do in space really makes sense and that we play a full role. I hope to work with the gentleman in the future in becoming more and more involved in analyzing these programs.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, lest anyone in the audience believe that I have an aversion

to science, let me give you a practical example of a priority decision which is being made by this Congress as it relates to a choice between sciences.

Shall we take this money, \$14 billion, and put it in the Space Program? Or shall we take several billion dollars and put it into health research?

At this very moment, the National Institutes of Health, right outside the District of Columbia, are considering applications from health researchers around the United States of America. These are applications for research on things as basic as treatment and cures for cancer, treatment of heart disease. I will tell you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, what is happening: Of all of the research grants which are being approved by the National Institutes of Health, three out of four are not presently funded because they do not have enough money.

When you speak to the future of science and the quality of life in America, I for one believe that a greater investment in the health of Americans and a greater investment in the health of other people around the world really is going to seal our fate in the future as much as whether we should discover at some future point some alien in outer space.

It makes as much sense for me, from my point of view, to put money into medical science as it does space science and perhaps even more sense.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman made an excellent point about spending priorities. I have always found it interesting that as we discuss these bills, the appropriations that we want to make as a body, there are some who have continued to come to the floor always to point fingers and say, "Well, this side of the aisle, that group, they are the big spenders."

I observe that if you take a close look at what we spend around here, there is not a plugged nickel's worth of difference between an appetite to spend a dollar. Some have priorities in space, others have priorities in research in health care.

□ 1330

All Members around here have their agenda. This is a good example today.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania comes to the floor on space. He does it often. Nothing wrong with that. It is just that I tend to share the gentleman's priorities. It is interesting to watch people want to run off to Mars when we have so much left to do on Earth, especially at home. I was on the floor briefly about those who are now

turning—are veterans who are turning at an age when they need increasing house care at the VA hospitals, and the hospitals are squeezed like a lemon with no resources.

Is it more important to find aliens in outer space, or rush to Mars, when we cannot get health care to a poor veteran who fought for the country? The point the gentleman in the well makes is critical, and a point we will have to deal with increasingly on the floor. It will be difficult for all Members, not just for this side of the aisle, but for all Members in this House of Representatives. I appreciate the gentleman raising the point today.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude my remarks by saying the following: There is another element that has to be mentioned. What is being invested in the space program is being invested in a very specific region of the United States of America. The Sunbelt States which have profited so much from defense spending in the past, will continue to profit by the space program. Ironically, some of the same States that are soaking up so many American tax dollars because of the savings and loan crisis will be benefactors of additional expenditures in the Space Program.

I live in the Midwest. I believe we need balanced growth across this country and across our economy. As we concentrate on investments in the Sunbelt States, and as we concentrate our investments in those particular companies, we do it at the expense of many other worthy endeavors which must go begging. I support the work of the subcommittee. I think they have done a fine job. I hope this Congress will at least pause and reflect as to whether or not we will make a major long-term space investment at the expense of medical research, at the expense of education, at the expense of some of the basics that we value in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I really want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the VA, HUD, and independent agencies, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], my close friend and very able ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], certainly for their support as far as the veterans are concerned in this legislation.

The veterans' programs come under the subcommittee that also handles other agencies of the Government. I would say, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased with the appropriation levels contained in this bill for the Department of Veterans Affairs. The bill generally tracks the President's budget. The President did make a recommendation over OMB that a billion dollars be added to veterans' health care. It

has been mentioned by speakers before this body that we do have a problem in medical health care for our veterans. We think we have the best system, we have the cheapest system, cheaper than Medicaid, Medicare, with which to treat the veterans. Certainly, we want to keep this medical care for our veterans, to keep it strong and viable and doing the job. Therefore, I support this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, Mr. TRAXLER, and the very able ranking minority member, Mr. GREEN of New York, for the work they have done on this bill and their efforts on behalf of our Nation's veterans. I am generally pleased with the appropriation levels contained in this bill for the Department of Veterans Affairs. The bill generally tracks the President's budget.

The two areas of concern that I have relate to medical care and general operating expenses. For health care, the bill contains a level of funding of \$12.3 billion for fiscal year 1991—about the same as proposed by the President. The funds allow for a staffing level of 194,638.

I am disappointed that the committee has reduced the level of funding for equipment, supplies, and materials by almost \$29 million. Our committee has documented the fact that the equipment account over the last 5 years has eroded by almost one-half billion dollars. Therefore, the reduction in this bill is only going to add to the problem. Language has been included in the bill to delay the \$278 million for equipment until August 1, 1991. I understand the delay was necessary so that the total outlays in the bill could be reduced for fiscal year 1991.

In the area of health care, I must question the action of the committee to spend \$87 million over the next 10 years to install private computers in two additional hospitals. In my view, this is an absolute waste of medical care funds and I am at a loss to understand why, while there is a shortage of medical funds, the committee feels it is necessary to dismantle computer systems that are now operational at two hospitals in order to install two private systems. I have questioned this from the very beginning but to no avail.

Mr. Chairman, I am not pleased with the amount of funds contained in this bill for general operating expenses, which are at the level recommended by the President. We all know the administration's GOE request was short in the first place. The bill would supposedly add 216 FTEE to increase the number of staff in the field processing veterans' claims, but in order to provide funds for the 216 FTEE increase, the bill would require reductions in other areas, including the General Counsel's Office, and the National Cemetery System.

Our committee documented the need to increase the level of funding in the National Cemetery System. If we can't keep our National Cemetery System to the standards we all expect, how can we afford to spend at the levels we have been for other new programs?

Notwithstanding my feelings in these areas, Mr. Chairman, I know my good friends, BILL

TRAXLER of Michigan, and BILL GREEN of New York, have done the best they possibly can with this bill. The chairman and I have discussed the budget at length on a number of occasions and I don't want my criticism in the areas I have outlined to suggest in any way that on balance this is not a good bill for veterans. I guess my problem is that, if we can afford to spend money on some domestic programs at the levels contained in this bill, I wonder why we can't afford to do a little better for veterans. It's a question of priorities. If we can increase the President's budget by over \$4 billion for subsidized housing, I believe we can spend a few extra million to help veterans who are in need.

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

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

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Every veteran in this Nation owes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] a deep sense of gratitude for the careful way that he has looked after those programs which are so vital to the American veterans and their families. They are all indebted to the gentleman. On their behalf, I want to extend our thanks.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, and also to the other subcommittee members, as well as the staff. Everybody has been very cooperative. Sometimes we do not get what we came for. No person does. However, at least they listen to our requests. They talk to the Members. That is very important.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his kind words about my role on this bill, and also want to compliment him for his leadership in the field of veterans' affairs.

Obviously, we do listen to his advice very conscientiously. We also appreciate it, and we try to do as much as we can within the dollar limits we are faced with to accommodate the very, very real needs that he is always pointing out to Members.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York. Really, the best friend the veterans have is this Congress. They do the best job for the veteran right here in the Halls of this Congress. I certainly want to express my appreciation.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, although the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY]

was not on the floor, I believe when I made a statement earlier today about the VA health care system, I want to reiterate just in 30 seconds that I think we face extraordinarily serious problems with some of the VA hospitals, especially the one in North Dakota. However, it is symptomatic of what is going on around the country.

I know of the work the gentleman has done. I, too, served with the gentleman on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for a term, and I hope and I know that the gentleman will join with the rest of the Members who are concerned about that, to try to figure out a way to solve this problem, with the Secretary and others, because we cannot allow veterans who are reaching retirement age, who fought for the country, to show up at the VA hospitals and be told that America will not keep its promises. We cannot allow that to happen.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is right. We have been getting 4- or 5-percent cost-of-living increases the last 10 years in running the hospitals, and it takes a 10-percent cost-of-living increase. We actually ran out of money. We are turning away veterans. We closed wards, we closed beds.

However, this budget gives Members a chance to open wards again, to buy new equipment, and maybe get better service to the veteran. The gentleman is right, and I appreciate him pointing it out.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in your remarks about progress we have made in this bill in restoring needed support for our veterans' health system.

We did lose ground during the decade of the eighties. We were at a point where beds were not filled, while veterans were waiting in line. That is an unconscionable development. It necessitated a reinvestment in veterans' health care.

I am pleased that the new administrator at the Department, the new Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Mr. Derwinski, has been an outspoken advocate on behalf of veterans' health care needs and was successful in obtaining some needed relief in this area as part of the President's budget. We have done somewhat better here in the Congress in allocating additional resources beyond that for these needs, and while I will be addressing these budget programs with an amendment later today, in deference to the importance of these VA health care systems, they are exempt from the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to comment on the conference report on the report

here before Members, the Committee on HUD, on the HUD appropriations bill, HUD and Independent Agencies.

I have several comments on some issues that have come up on the House floor in prior appropriations bills that do not arise from this bill. With that, I would seek to commend the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations for resisting putting into the appropriation bill those special interest obligations which would appropriate money for particular projects to particular recipients of projects, in particular locations, for no other reason than there was a sponsor on the Committee on Appropriations.

As I read the Committee on Appropriations' legislation before Members, the bill that is before Members, I note that the committee has resisted that in virtually every case. In fact, brings to Members what we can all call a clean appropriations bill that appropriates money on the basis of public policy and of prioritizing.

I would note that in the last session, the last appropriations bill that did come to Members in the same form in the House, but then when the other body passed their appropriation bill and the two bills were sent to conference, the other body apparently began adding special interest items that were individually earmarked for particular projects and a particular recipient that had not been completed.

I would note that the conferees did not resist that, and in fact, in our body, we added our own. That led to the regrettable series of motions and floor fights and amendments that only got resolved in this last supplemental appropriation. Therefore, I would suggest, and I want to say publicly on the floor that first I commend the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies and the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the ranking Republican from New York [Mr. GREEN], for resisting those special interest projects in this appropriation bill. Second, I would commend them for doing that, and I would urge them to continue to resist those special interest projects when we do get conference from the other body.

It would be my intention to offer a motion to instruct our conferees to resist those special interest projects and, as a way of helping our own conferees in understanding that this body does not want to start down that road again.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

□ 1340

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to say regretfully that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his under-

standing of the realities of both the budget and the need to appropriate based on public policy purposes only.

I would also note that there is a long process left to go, and when the conference report comes back, it would be my hope, and, I believe, the hope of this body that it would come back in as clean a form as it was when we sent it over, if not cleaner, because I think it does not do this body good service to be debating on the House floor special interest projects that only go to a particular project or a particular recipient because of whom they know.

I would note on two other matters that I would also hope we would take a harder look at some of the prioritizing in this committee report or in this legislation, and specifically I refer to a home ownership program called Urban Homestead, in which low-income families are given the opportunity to purchase a single-family home. The HUD appropriation bill before us erroneously reduces the program to \$15 million while increasing other programs that I think do a lot less good for low-income families. I would bring to the attention of the Members the fact that I think it would do a lot more benefit to low-income families to increase the amount of urban homestead money in this bill from \$15 million to a minimum of \$50 to \$75 million.

Second, I would note that the preservation section that is appropriated for \$450 million to attempt to preserve a subsidized unit appears to be the appropriate amount of money, that is, the total of \$450 million. I say that as a member of the authorizing committee. But I would also note that the authorizing committee is completely re-doing the authorization for preservation. We would expect to have that on the House floor sometime during the month of July, and I would very much hope that the appropriators would pay careful attention to our new authorization and take the same amount of money approximately and to make the appropriations fit the new authorizations. The authorization may not be completed by both bodies and signed into law by the time the appropriations bill is finally passed.

I would just urge the appropriators, though, to take into account the changing authorization and to make the appropriate amount apply to whatever we end up with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] has expired.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the committee to take that into account and to appropriate the amount of money, allowing either the current authorizing language or

the new authorizing language after October 1 to take precedence.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes a valid point in terms of the authorizing legislation. We are not sure when it will be completed.

Let me alert the gentleman to this problem. Of course, we fully expect to follow the authorizing legislation with this caveat, and that is has that our experience is that it has taken about one year for the Department to implement new legislation. So if the gentleman will allow us some leeway in that regard, we do not want to leave a gap between the new and the old authorization. We will work with the Department and with the gentleman to make sure that things dovetail nicely.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. I think the amount of money is approximately correct. We want to make sure that the money is appropriated in a way that is authorized either under the old program or the new program, and that there is a transition. I commend the sponsors, the subcommittee chairman, and the ranking member for their courtesies and for the cleanliness of H.R. 5168.

The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including support of space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including operations, production, services, minor construction, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and modification of real and personal property, and not in excess of \$100,000 per project for construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, repairs, and rehabilitation and modification of facilities; tracking and data relay satellite services as authorized by law; purchase, lease, hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$6,530,351,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That funds provided under this paragraph, with sums provided for "Research and development", may be utilized for the purchase of one mission management aircraft for replacement only (for which partial payment may be made by exchange of at least one existing mission management aircraft and such other existing aircraft as may be considered appropriate).

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For construction, repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and for facility planning and design not otherwise provided, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$485,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated under this heading by

this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations therefor, the amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended, except that this provision shall not apply to the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization for repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and facility planning and design: *Provided further*, That no amount appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be used for the lease or construction of a new contractor-funded facility for exclusive use in support of a contract or contracts with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under which the Administration would be required to substantially amortize through payment or reimbursement such contractor investment, unless an appropriations Act specifies the lease or contract pursuant to which such facilities are to be constructed or leased or such facility is otherwise identified in such Act: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may authorize such facility lease or construction, if he determines, in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next appropriations Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and for travel expenses, \$1,446,212,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$10,500,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The NASA Administrator shall, to the fullest extent possible, ensure that at least 8 per centum of Federal funding for prime and subcontracts awarded in support of authorized programs, including the space station by the time operational status is obtained, be made available to business concerns or other organizations owned or controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a) (5) and (6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a) (5) and (6)), including historically black colleges and universities. For purposes of this section, economically and socially disadvantaged individuals shall be deemed to include women.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

During fiscal year 1991, gross obligations of the Central Liquidity Facility for the principal amount of new direct loans to member credit unions as authorized by the National Credit Union Central Liquidity Facility Act (12 U.S.C. 1795) shall not exceed \$600,000,000: *Provided*, That administrative expenses of the Central Liquidity Facility in fiscal year 1991 shall not exceed \$893,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

PAYMENT TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

For payment to the National Institute of Building Sciences, \$250,000.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), and the Act to establish a Na-

tional Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$1,854,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this Act, or from funds appropriated previously to the Foundation, not more than \$100,000,000 shall be available for program development and management in fiscal year 1991: *Provided further*, That contracts may be entered into under the program development and management limitation in fiscal year 1991 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year: *Provided further*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the amount appropriated is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

ACADEMIC RESEARCH FACILITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out an academic research facilities program pursuant to the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$20,000,000, to remain available until September 20, 1992.

UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the research and operational support for the United States Antarctic Program pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875); maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research and operations support; improvement of environmental practices and enhancements of safety; maintenance and operation of research ships and charter or lease of ships for research and operations support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That receipts for support services and materials provided for non-Federal activities may be credited to this appropriation.

UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC LOGISTICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in reimbursing Federal agencies for logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic Program pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875); maintenance, and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research and operations support; improvement of environmental practices and enhancements of safety; maintenance and operation of research ships and charter or lease of ships for research and

operations support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That receipts for support services and materials provided for non-Federal activities may be credited to this appropriation.

SCIENCE EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education programs and activities pursuant to the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$285,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That to the extent that the amount of this appropriation is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101-8107), \$24,500,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 4101-4118) for civilian employees; and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$26,635,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of 50 U.S.C. App. 460(g), none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated in connection with the preparation of more than one report each year to the Congress covering the operation of the Selective Service System.

TITLE IV CORPORATIONS

Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 1991 for such corpo-

ration or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FSLIC RESOLUTION FUND

For payment of expenditures, in fiscal year 1991, of the FSLIC Resolution Fund, for which other funds available to the FSLIC Resolution Fund as authorized by Public Law 101-73 are insufficient, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations beginning November 15, 1989, on the receipts, disbursements, cash balance, estimated Treasury payments required by fiscal year, and total estimated costs to the FSLIC Resolution Fund.

RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$10,785,000.

TITLE V GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 501. Where appropriations in titles I, II, and III of this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System; to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to travel performed in connection with major disasters or emergencies declared or determined by the President under the provisions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to site-related travel performed in connection with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; to site-related travel under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended; to travel performed by the Offices of Inspector General in connection with audits and investigations; or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules: *Provided further*, That if appropriations in titles I, II, and III exceed the amounts set forth in budget estimates initially submitted for such appropriations, the expenditures for travel may correspondingly exceed the amounts therefor set forth in the estimates in the same proportion.

SEC. 502. Appropriations and funds available for the administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Selective Service System shall be available in the current fiscal year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 503. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Resolution Trust Corporation, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 505. No funds appropriated by this Act may be expended—

(1) pursuant to a certification of an officer or employee of the United States unless—

(A) such certification is accompanied by, or is part of, a voucher or abstract which describes the payee or payees and the items or services for which such expenditure is being made, or

(B) The expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law; and

(2) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office or is specifically exempt by law from such audit.

SEC. 506. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between his domicile and his place of employment, with the exception of any officer or employee authorized such transportation under title 31, United States Code, section 1344.

SEC. 507. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for payment, through grants or contracts, to recipients that do not share in the cost of conducting research resulting from proposals not specifically solicited by the Government: *Provided*, That the extent of cost sharing by the recipient shall reflect the mutuality of interest of the grantee or contractor and the Government in the research.

SEC. 508. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used, directly or through grants, to pay or to provide reimbursement for payment of the salary of a consultant (whether retained by the Federal Government or a grantee) at more than the daily equivalent of the maximum rate paid for GS-18, unless specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 509. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for personnel compensation and benefits shall be available for other object classifications set forth in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any part of the appropriations contained in this Act for Offices of Inspector General personnel compensation and benefits.

SEC. 510. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Nothing herein affects the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission pursuant to section 7 of the Con-

sumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 et seq.).

SEC. 511. Except as otherwise provided under existing law or under an existing Executive order issued pursuant to an existing law, the obligation or expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for contracts for any consulting service shall be limited to contracts which are (1) a matter of public record and available for public inspection, and (2) thereafter included in a publicly available list of all contracts entered into within twenty-four months prior to the date on which the list is made available to the public and of all contracts on which performance has not been completed by such date. The list required by the preceding sentence shall be updated quarterly and shall include a narrative description of the work to be performed under each such contract.

SEC. 512. Except as otherwise provided by law, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be obligated or expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) for a contract for services unless such executive agency (1) has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder, and (2) requires any report prepared pursuant to such contract, including plans, evaluations, studies, analyses and manuals, and any report prepared by the agency which is substantially derived from or substantially includes any report prepared pursuant to such contract, to contain information concerning (A) the contract pursuant to which the report was prepared, and (B) the contractor who prepared the report pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 513. Except as otherwise provided in section 506, none of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency.

SEC. 514. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in 15 U.S.C. 2001 with an EPA estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon.

Mr. TRAXLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, through line 7, page 62, 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be made on any portions of the bill?

Are there any amendments?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 515. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1991 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 516. None of the funds appropriated under title II of this Act under the heading entitled Community Planning and Development, Community Development Grants, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States may be obligated or expended to any municipality that fails to adopt and enforce a policy prohibiting the

use of excessive force by law enforcement agencies within the jurisdiction of said municipality against any individual engaged in nonviolent civil rights demonstrations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENZEL: Page 62, insert after line 19 the following new section:

SEC. 517. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is reduced by 14.5 percent, except that this reduction shall not apply with respect to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by title I for "MEDICAL CARE" under "VETERANS HEALTH SERVICE AND RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION".

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, this is an across-the-board cut of 14.5 percent, excluding the VA medical account, which by itself amounts to about \$12.3 billion of the total.

The reason for the number, 14.5 percent, was that I wanted to take the bill back to last year's appropriated level after letting the committee add in some \$6.8 billion in expired housing authority. I regret that I have to bring a cut as large as 14.5 percent, but, of course, I also had to exclude \$12.3 billion of VA medical, which I think no Member of this House seeks to decrease. The reason that the numbers are so large is because the subcommittee has been so egregious in its openhandedness.

Last year's bill amounted to \$48.5 billion. This year's bill, including the expired housing program, runs to \$63.5 billion, an increase of more than 30 percent. Now, I do not believe that any Member of this House is going to be able to go home and defend a 30-percent increase in anything, regardless of expiring contracts or regardless of the needs at hand. And I am sure all of the needs are here.

Not too long ago the House was treated to a little presentation indicating it was about time we began to pick out the proper priorities. This bill is a perfect example of determining that everything the subcommittee does is a priority. The way we got into our fiscal trouble around here was deciding that if each Member had a proposition, the proper compromise was to suggest them all and to fund them all as richly as we could. That has given us a \$3 trillion-plus national debt, and it is going to provide for us this year, absent a miracle at the summit, another deficit of somewhere between \$150 billion and \$200 billion.

I do not expect a lot of Members will vote for a cut as severe as 1.4 percent. On the other hand, I do not expect a lot of Members to ever vote for any cuts, because if we look at the record around here, we see that nobody votes for anything like that; they only vote

for more spending. And if one looks at our debt, they can see the result of our continuous voting for more and more and more, and saying that "my program must be wonderful, and to get everybody to vote for it, I will vote for their programs." Then when we get all done, we find we have a \$3 trillion deficit and a \$6 trillion unfunded liability in our credit budget.

□ 1350

So, Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer this amendment as a pious hope, knowing that it is not going to succeed and knowing that the Members are going to continue spewing out money that the taxpayers have not contributed that will only have to be paid in terms of interest charges and of a huge debt laid upon our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to prolong this no longer.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As the Republican manager of this bill, I find myself in a very curious situation at the moment. On the one hand, our ranking Republican on the Committee on the Budget is pillorying me for the profligacy of this bill. On the other hand, I have a message from the Executive Office of the President in which six paragraphs are devoted to criticizing us for cutting the President's request, and only two are devoted to the fact that we have proposed some appropriations above what the President wanted.

So, our Republican President is saying we are spending too little, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] is saying we are spending too much. That might indicate to our colleagues that we probably have a pretty reasonable balance in this bill.

I again point out that we are more than half a billion below the President's request in terms of the outlays in this bill. The President requested very substantial increases for HUD for the expiring subsidies, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] noted. He requested very large increases for the space program. He requested substantial increases for the National Science Foundation, a small one for EPA, and the bill reflects the increases the President requested. Our 302(b) allocation reflected the respect that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the full Committee on Appropriations shows for the President's budget requests, and I think we got a more generous 302(b) allocation than we otherwise would have because of the fact that the President made a very substantial request for increases for the departments and agencies involved in this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I particularly urge my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle who may want to support the President's request for additional spending for those agencies to vote against this amendment, which in many cases would cut the bill well below the President's request.

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's bill is right, may we assume in the future that about a 30-percent increase is going to be the subcommittee's target?

I say the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] describes the bill as being just right in its spending. May we then assume that the subcommittee's target for the future is going to be a 30-percent increase each year?

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should be surprised if the subcommittee would be able to sustain a 30-percent increase each year, and that of course is the reason why earlier in the day I rose in opposition to the suggestion that we ought to fund the Moon Mars program. We know we are not going to get that kind of increase, and that is why we did not make a start on that program.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for his help.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking minority member, has made the case in opposition to the amendment and has made an eloquent defense of the President's request.

I would say though to the sponsor that he enjoys the love and affection of this body. He has been, I think, a watchdog on matters affecting the budget. He has been on the Committee on the Budget; I cannot remember when he was not there, in fact, and of course this is his last term. In a sense we all ought to honor him by supporting his amendment.

However, Mr. Chairman, we cannot be that generous. He knows that our hearts are with him though.

I will be careful what I say because we do not know the outcome of the deliberations which the gentleman is an active participant in. We are not certain as to what package, if any package, will come out of these negotiations that are going forward with the President and important Members of the Congress' bipartisan group. Certainly what we see in this bill today in my judgment is the high point for this bill, and before it goes to the President the bill will be reduced in some fashion.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say that to my colleagues to encourage them to

vote against this amendment. I say it to them as a point of information and what I believe to be fact.

I would oppose the amendment and wish the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] well in the negotiations and discussions. I hope it is a product that every Member of this body can support when it finally comes before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently, a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 206]

Ackerman	Carper	Edwards (OK)	McMillen (MD)	Schroeder
Alexander	Carr	Emerson	McNulty	Schuette
Anderson	Chandler	Engel	Meyers	Schumer
Andrews	Chapman	English	Mfume	Sensenbrenner
Annunzio	Clarke	Erdreich	Michel	Serrano
Anthony	Clay	Espy	Miller (CA)	Sharp
Applegate	Clement	Evans	Miller (OH)	Shaw
Archer	Clinger	Fascell	Miller (WA)	Shays
Armey	Coble	Fawell	Mineta	Shumway
Aspin	Coleman (MO)	Fazio	Molinari	Shuster
Atkins	Coleman (TX)	Feighan	Mollohan	Sikorski
AuCoin	Collins	Fields	Montgomery	Sisisky
Baker	Combest	Fish	Moody	Skaggs
Ballenger	Condit	Flake	Moorhead	Skeen
Barnard	Conte	Flippo	Morella	Skelton
Bartlett	Cooper	Foglietta	Morrison (WA)	Slattery
Bateman	Costello	Ford (MI)	Mrazek	Slaughter (NY)
Bates	Coughlin	Ford (TN)	Murphy	Slaughter (VA)
Beilenson	Courter	Frenzel	Murtha	Smith (FL)
Bennett	Cox	Frost	Myers	Smith (IA)
Bentley	Coyne	Galleghy	Nagle	Smith (NE)
Bereuter	Craig	Gallo	Natcher	Smith (NJ)
Berman	Crane	Gaydos	Neal (MA)	Smith (TX)
Bevill	Crockett	Gejdenson	Neal (NC)	Smith (VT)
Bilbray	Dannemeyer	Gekas	Nowak	Smith, Denny
Bilirakis	Darden	Gephardt	Oakar	(OR)
Billiey	Davis	Geren	Oberstar	Smith, Robert
Boehlert	DeFazio	Gibbons	Obey	(NH)
Boggs	DeLay	Gillmor	Olin	Smith, Robert
Bonior	Dellums	Gilman	Ortiz	(OR)
Borski	Derrick	Gingrich	Owens (UT)	Snowe
Bosco	DeWine	Glickman	Oxley	Solarz
Boucher	Dickinson	Gonzalez	Packard	Solomon
Boxer	Dicks	Goodling	Pallone	Spence
Brennan	Dingell	Gordon	Panetta	Spratt
Brooks	Dixon	Goss	Parker	Staggers
Broomfield	Dorgan (ND)	Gradison	Parris	Stallings
Browder	Dornan (CA)	Grandy	Pashayan	Stangeland
Brown (CA)	Douglas	Grant	Patterson	Stearns
Brown (CO)	Downey	Gray	Paxon	Stenholm
Bruce	Dreier	Green	Payne (NJ)	Stokes
Buechner	Duncan	Guarini	Payne (VA)	Studds
Bunning	Durbin	Gunderson	Pease	Stump
Burton	Dwyer	Hall (OH)	Pelosi	Sundquist
Byron	Dymally	Hamilton	Penny	Swift
Callahan	Dyson	Hammerschmidt	Perkins	Synar
Campbell (CA)	Campbell (CO)	Hancock	Petri	Tallon
Campbell (CO)	Cardin	Hansen	Pickett	Tanner
		Harris	Pickle	Tauke
			Porter	Tauzin
			Poshard	Taylor
			Price	Thomas (CA)
			Pursell	Thomas (GA)
			Quillen	Thomas (WY)
			Rahall	Torres
			Rangel	Torricelli
			Ravenel	Trafficant
			Ray	Traxler
			Regula	Udall
			Rhodes	Unsoeld
			Richardson	Upton
			Ridge	Valentine
			Rinaldo	Vander Jagt
			Ritter	Visclosky
			Roberts	Volkmer
			Robinson	Vucanovich
			Roe	Walgren
			Rogers	Walker
			Rohrabacher	Walsh
			Ros-Lehtinen	Watkins
			Rose	Waxman
			Rostenkowski	Weber
			Roth	Weiss
			Roukema	Weldon
			Rowland (CT)	Wheat
			Rowland (GA)	Whittaker
			Roybal	Whitten
			Russo	Williams
			Sabo	Wise
			Saiki	Wolf
			Sangmeister	Wolpe
			Sarpalius	Wyden
			Sawyer	Wyllie
			Saxton	Yates
			Schaefer	Yatron
			Scheuer	Young (AK)
			Schiff	Young (FL)
			Schneider	

□ 1415

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred and nine Members have answered to their

name, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] for a recorded vote. The Chair would remind members that 5 minutes will be allowed for the vote.

Without objection, a recorded vote is ordered.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 72, noes 337, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

AYES—72

Archer	Gunderson	Porter
Armey	Hamilton	Roberts
Ballenger	Hancock	Robinson
Bartlett	Hansen	Roth
Bennett	Hastert	Schaefer
Billey	Hefley	Sensenbrenner
Bunning	Henry	Sharp
Campbell (CA)	Herger	Shumway
Clinger	Houghton	Shuster
Coble	Ireland	Slaughter (VA)
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Smith, Denny
Cooper	Kasich	(OR)
Courter	Lighthoot	Smith, Robert
Cox	Marlenee	(NH)
Crane	McCandless	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	McEwen	(OR)
Dornan (CA)	McMillan (NC)	Stangeland
Douglas	Michel	Stenholm
Dreier	Miller (OH)	Tauzin
Duncan	Moorhead	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	Olin	Thomas (WY)
Fields	Oxley	Upton
Frenzel	Packard	Vander Jagt
Gingrich	Pashayan	Walker
Gradison	Petri	Whittaker

NOES—337

Ackerman	Clay	Ford (MI)
Alexander	Clement	Ford (TN)
Anderson	Coleman (MO)	Frank
Andrews	Coleman (TX)	Frost
Annuzio	Collins	Gallegly
Anthony	Condit	Gallo
Applegate	Conte	Gaydos
Aspin	Costello	Gejdenson
Atkins	Coughlin	Gekas
AuCoin	Coyne	Gephardt
Baker	Craig	Geren
Barnard	Crockett	Gibbons
Bateman	Darden	Gillmor
Bates	Davis	Gilman
Beilenson	DeFazio	Glickman
Bentley	DeLay	Gonzalez
Bereuter	Dellums	Goodling
Berman	Derrick	Gordon
Bevill	DeWine	Goss
Bilbray	Dickinson	Grandy
Billrakis	Dicks	Grant
Boehlert	Dingell	Gray
Boggs	Dixon	Green
Bonior	Dorgan (ND)	Hall (OH)
Borski	Downey	Hammerschmidt
Bosco	Durbin	Harris
Boucher	Dwyer	Hatcher
Boxer	Dymally	Hawkins
Brennan	Dyson	Hayes (IL)
Brooks	Early	Hayes (LA)
Broomfield	Eckart	Hefner
Browder	Edwards (CA)	Hertel
Brown (CA)	Edwards (OK)	Hiler
Brown (CO)	Emerson	Hoagland
Bruce	Engel	Hochbrueckner
Buechner	English	Holloway
Burton	Erdreich	Hopkins
Byron	Espy	Horton
Callahan	Evans	Hoyer
Campbell (CO)	Fascell	Hubbard
Cardin	Fazio	Huckaby
Carper	Feighan	Hughes
Carr	Fish	Hunter
Chandler	Flake	Hutto
Chapman	Flippo	Hyde
Clarke	Foglietta	Inhofe

Jacobs	Morrison (WA)	Shaw
James	Mrazek	Shays
Johnson (SD)	Murphy	Sikorski
Johnston	Murtha	Siskisky
Jones (GA)	Myers	Skaggs
Jones (NC)	Nagle	Skeen
Jontz	Natcher	Skelton
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Slatery
Kaptur	Neal (NC)	Slaughter (NY)
Kastenmeier	Nowak	Smith (FL)
Kennedy	Oakar	Smith (IA)
Kennelly	Oberstar	Smith (NE)
Kildee	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Klecza	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Kolbe	Owens (NY)	Smith (VT)
Kolter	Owens (UT)	Snowe
Kostmayer	Pallone	Solarz
Kyl	Panetta	Solomon
LaFalce	Parker	Spence
Lagomarsino	Parris	Spratt
Lancaster	Patterson	Staggers
Lantos	Paxon	Stallings
Laughlin	Payne (NJ)	Stearns
Leach (IA)	Payne (VA)	Stokes
Leath (TX)	Pease	Studds
Lehman (CA)	Pelosi	Stump
Lehman (FL)	Penny	Sundquist
Lent	Perkins	Swift
Levin (MI)	Pickett	Synar
Levine (CA)	Pickle	Tallon
Lewis (CA)	Poshard	Tanner
Lewis (FL)	Price	Tauke
Lewis (GA)	Pursell	Taylor
Lipinski	Quillen	Thomas (GA)
Livingston	Rahall	Torres
Lloyd	Rangel	Torricelli
Long	Ravenel	Towns
Lowey (NY)	Ray	Tracifant
Lukens, Donald	Regula	Traxler
Machtley	Rhodes	Udall
Madigan	Richardson	Unsoeld
Markey	Ridge	Valentine
Martin (NY)	Rinaldo	Vento
Martinez	Roe	Visclosky
Matsui	Rogers	Volkmer
Mavroules	Rohrabacher	Vucanovich
Mazzoli	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
McCloskey	Rostenkowski	Washington
McCollum	Roukema	Watkins
McCrery	Rowland (CT)	Waxman
McCurdy	Rowland (GA)	Weber
McDade	Roybal	Weiss
McDermott	Russo	Weldon
McGrath	Sabo	Wheat
McHugh	Saiki	Whitten
McMillen (MD)	Sangmeister	Williams
McNulty	Sarpalius	Wise
Meyers	Savage	Wolf
Mfume	Sawyer	Wolpe
Miller (CA)	Saxton	Wyden
Miller (WA)	Scheuer	Wyllie
Mineta	Schiff	Yates
Molinari	Schneider	Yatron
Mollohan	Schroeder	Young (AK)
Montgomery	Schuette	Young (FL)
Moody	Schumer	
Morella	Serrano	

NOT VOTING—23

Barton	Jenkins	Nielson
Bryant	Lowery (CA)	Ritter
Bustamante	Luken, Thomas	Rose
Conyers	Manton	Schulze
de la Garza	Martin (IL)	Stark
Donnelly	Moakley	Walgren
Guarini	Morrison (CT)	Wilson
Hall (TX)	Nelson	

□ 1423

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANNEMEYER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DANNEMEYER: Page 62 insert after line 19 the following new section:

Sec. 517. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act

that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is reduced by 5 percent.

Mr. DANNEMEYER (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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, in this fiscal year for the HUD, VA, independent agency appropriations we are spending about \$71.2 billion. The bill before us for fiscal year 1991 would raise that by 17.3 percent to \$83.5 billion, approximately.

Mr. Chairman, I just do not believe that we are in an era when we should be approving increases in appropriations bills for 1991 over 1990 by 17.3 percent, or anything close to it.

My amendment would reduce what is proposed to be spent in 1991 over 1990 in this bill by 5 percent. That would result in a reduction of \$4.1 billion, but still let spending be in the total amount of \$79.4 billion, which represents an 11.4 percent increase over what we are spending this year.

I would hope that most Members would be able to say that an increase of 11.4 percent over what is spent this year is a decent reduction, a reasonable deduction. This across-the-board reduction is to me the only fair way that we can go at getting a handle on runaway spending, because the moment we begin to exempt certain programs from the reduction, we are then I think helping to defeat the very thing we seek to achieve, a sense of fairness and equity in the appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take all of my 5 minutes on behalf of the amendment because I think many Members have heard the arguments that we could address.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, this amendment would cut 5 percent from what is contained in the bill, some \$83.5 billion, and that would still permit an increase of some 11.4 percent over what we are spending for this year. I ask for your aye vote.

□ 1430

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

Mr. Chairman, I again want to remind my colleagues that it is the increases requested by the President that have largely led to the very large increases in the bill. The bill is \$590 million plus under the President's request. It is fully within the 302(b) budget authority and outlay allocations.

The White House has expressed concern in its communication to us at the

cuts that have already been made. This amendment would make still deeper cuts in accounts in which the White House is vitally interested.

It would make a cut of \$714 million in the NASA accounts, which would bring them to \$1.5 billion below the President's request. It would make a \$116 million cut in the National Science Foundation appropriation, which would leave it \$160 million below the President's request.

So I remind colleagues on both sides of the aisle that if they want to support the President on his request for funding for NASA and the National Science Foundation and the other accounts they should vote against the Dannemeyer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 53, noes 343, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—53

Archer	Duncan	Meyers
Armey	Fields	Moorhead
Bartlett	Frenzel	Packard
Bellenson	Gallegly	Petri
Bennett	Gekas	Porter
Brown (CO)	Gradison	Robinson
Bunning	Hamilton	Rohrabacher
Campbell (CA)	Hancock	Roth
Clinger	Hastert	Russo
Courter	Hefley	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Hopkins	Shumway
Craig	Houghton	Shuster
Crane	Hunter	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Hyde	(NH)
DeLay	Ireland	Stenholm
Dickinson	Johnson (CT)	Thomas (CA)
Douglas	Lagomarsino	Thomas (WY)
Dreier	Lightfoot	Walker

NOES—343

Ackerman	Broomfield	Davis
Alexander	Browder	DeFazio
Anderson	Brown (CA)	Dellums
Andrews	Bruce	Derrick
Annuzio	Buechner	DeWine
Anthony	Burton	Dicks
Applegate	Byron	Dingell
Aspin	Callahan	Dixon
Atkins	Campbell (CO)	Dorgan (ND)
AuCoin	Cardin	Dornan (CA)
Baker	Carper	Downey
Barnard	Carr	Durbin
Bateman	Chandler	Dwyer
Bates	Chapman	Dymally
Bentley	Clarke	Dyson
Bereuter	Clay	Early
Berman	Clement	Eckart
Bevill	Coble	Edwards (CA)
Billbray	Coleman (MO)	Edwards (OK)
Bilirakis	Coleman (TX)	Emerson
Boehlert	Collins	Engel
Boggs	Condit	English
Bonior	Conte	Erdreich
Borski	Cooper	Espy
Bosco	Costello	Evans
Boucher	Coughlin	Fascell
Boxer	Coyne	Fazio
Brennan	Crockett	Fish
Brooks	Darden	Flake

Flippo	Markey	Sarpalius
Foglietta	Marlenee	Savage
Ford (MI)	Martin (NY)	Sawyer
Ford (TN)	Martinez	Saxton
Frank	Matsui	Schaefer
Frost	Mavroules	Scheuer
Gallo	Mazzoli	Schiff
Gaydos	McCloskey	Schneider
Gejdenson	McCollum	Schroeder
Gephardt	McCurdy	Schuetz
Geren	McDade	Schumer
Gibbons	McDermott	Serrano
Gilman	McGrath	Sharp
Gingrich	McHugh	Shaw
Glickman	McMillan (NC)	Shays
Gonzalez	McMillen (MD)	Sikorski
Goodling	McNulty	Sisisky
Gordon	Mfume	Skaggs
Goss	Michel	Skeen
Grandy	Miller (CA)	Skelton
Grant	Miller (OH)	Slattery
Gray	Miller (WA)	Slaughter (NY)
Green	Mineta	Slaughter (VA)
Guarini	Molinari	Smith (FL)
Gunderson	Mollohan	Smith (IA)
Hall (OH)	Montgomery	Smith (NE)
Hammerschmidt	Moody	Smith (NJ)
Harris	Morella	Smith (TX)
Hatcher	Morrison (WA)	Smith (VT)
Hawkins	Mrazek	Smith, Robert
Hayes (IL)	Murphy	(OR)
Hayes (LA)	Murtha	Snowe
Hefner	Myers	Solarz
Henry	Nagle	Solomon
Hertel	Natcher	Spence
Hoagland	Neal (MA)	Spratt
Hochbrueckner	Neal (NC)	Staggers
Holloway	Nowak	Stallings
Horton	Oakar	Stangeland
Hoyer	Oberstar	Stearns
Hubbard	Obey	Stokes
Huckaby	Olin	Studds
Hughes	Ortiz	Stump
Hutto	Owens (NY)	Sundquist
Inhofe	Owens (UT)	Swift
Jacobs	Pallone	Synar
James	Panetta	Tallon
Johnson (SD)	Parker	Tanner
Johnston	Pashayan	Tauke
Jones (GA)	Patterson	Tauzin
Jones (NC)	Paxon	Taylor
Jontz	Payne (NJ)	Thomas (GA)
Kanjorski	Payne (VA)	Torres
Kaptur	Pease	Torricelli
Kasich	Pelosi	Towns
Kastenmeier	Penny	Traficant
Kennelly	Perkins	Traxler
Kildee	Pickett	Udall
Klecicka	Pickle	Unsoeld
Kolbe	Poshard	Upton
Kolter	Price	Valentine
Kostmayer	Pursell	Vento
Kyl	Quillen	Visclosky
LaFalce	Rahall	Volkmer
Lancaster	Rangel	Walgren
Lantos	Ravenel	Walsh
Laughlin	Ray	Washington
Leach (IA)	Regula	Watkins
Leath (TX)	Rhodes	Waxman
Lehman (CA)	Richardson	Weber
Lehman (FL)	Ridge	Weiss
Lent	Rinaldo	Weldon
Levin (MI)	Ritter	Wheat
Levine (CA)	Roberts	Whittaker
Lewis (CA)	Roe	Whitten
Lewis (FL)	Rogers	Williams
Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wise
Lipinski	Rose	Wolf
Livingston	Rostenkowski	Wolpe
Lloyd	Roukema	Wyden
Long	Rowland (CT)	Wylie
Lowery (CA)	Rowland (GA)	Yates
Lowey (NY)	Roybal	Yatron
Lukens, Donald	Sabo	Young (AK)
Machtley	Saiki	Young (FL)
Madigan	Sangmeister	

NOT VOTING—36

Ballenger	de la Garza	Herger
Barton	Donnelly	Hiler
Billiey	Fawell	Jenkins
Bryant	Feighan	Kennedy
Bustamante	Gillmor	Lukens, Thomas
Combest	Hall (TX)	Manton
Conyers	Hansen	Martin (IL)

McCandless	Nielson	Stark
McCrery	Oxley	Vander Jagt
McEwen	Parris	Vucanovich
Moakley	Schulze	Wilson
Morrison (CT)	Smith, Denny	
Nelson	(OR)	

□ 1450

Mr. WHITTAKER and Mr. GINGRICH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained at the White House when the Dannemeyer amendment to H.R. 5158 was voted upon.

I ask that the RECORD reflect that fact, and if I were present, I would have voted "aye" on the Dannemeyer amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Page 62, insert after line 19 the following new section:

SEC. 517. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is reduced by 2 percent, except that this reduction shall not apply with respect to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by title I for "MEDICAL CARE" under "VETERANS HEALTH SERVICE AND RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION" or by title II for "ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 SUBSIDY CONTRACTS" under "HOUSING PROGRAMS".

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, this represents a 2-percent cut across the board in the accounts under which legislation authorizing appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.

We make two exceptions to this across-the-board cut. One exception is VA health care. In the last number of years we have seen support for VA health care deteriorate. In this year's budget, both the White House and the Congress have attempted to restore needed moneys for health care for America's veterans. My amendment exempts health care programs within the Department of Veterans Affairs from the 2-percent cut.

We also exempt section 8 subsidy contract under housing program. The purpose for exempting section 8 housing program from the cuts is, these are contractual obligations and must be honored. It did not seem prudent to subject that account to the same cuts of 2 percent that all other accounts will receive.

However, with these two exceptions, VA health care and section 8 housing, this 2-percent cut would apply across the board to all programs within this legislation.

Let me stress for Members that this is a relatively painless cut. In fact, the word "cut" does not really apply. Perhaps "scratch" or "sliver" would be a far better term to use in describing this amendment. These are modest reductions. As was explained by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] in offering his amendment earlier, if we were to take the spending levels in this bill back down to the levels appropriated in fiscal year 1990, we would have to apply somewhere in the neighborhood of a 14-percent cut to all the accounts. So clearly, there is significant growth in the programs included in this bill, and a 2-percent cut will still allow for significant growth.

For example, even with the adoption of this amendment we will allow a 37-percent increase in VA major construction programs. There will be a 54-percent increase in State veterans' home programs. In addition to that, housing programs will receive sizable increases. NASA will receive a 24-percent increase in its R&D account, and in space flight control and data communication, a 38-percent increase. Sizable upward adjustments are evidenced in this bill, even with a modest 2-percent adjustment.

I would urge Members to give serious consideration to this amendment. It will cut close to \$1 billion from the appropriated levels in this bill, and it will send a signal to our budget negotiators that we understand in the final analysis, spending levels for these programs will be far less than anything being contemplated here today, at the very least we ought to cast a symbolic vote for some restraint by adopting this 2-percent cut.

Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENNY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are like a drowning man in 40 feet of water who does not have the will to come up for air and sinks further with each passing moment.

The latest CBO numbers estimate a deficit of \$159 billion in fiscal year 1990 without including the numbers from the RTC bailout of the savings and loans. That is \$49 billion over the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target of \$110 billion.

The baseline deficit estimate for the fiscal year 1991 deficit is \$162 billion before looking at the RTC numbers. That is \$88 billion over the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target for that year.

CBO projects total baseline outlays plus inflation of \$1,287 billion for 1991. That would require a reduction of 6.9 percent or \$90 billion to achieve the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target even before RTC funding. If you aren't willing to cut projected outlays by 6.9 percent, not much more than a freeze at last year's level, when you apparently are willing to in-

crease taxes by close to 7.8 percent which is \$90 billion to bring revenues up to \$1,211 trillion. The amendment offered by my colleague from Minnesota is a bare minimum this House should do as a stroke toward rising up to the fresh air of a balanced budget. This amendment may save only peanuts when you are talking about what really needs to be done which is closer to \$100 billion in deficit reduction.

I would suggest that if you are really serious about reducing the deficit according to Gramm-Rudman targets without a full tax increase of 7.8 percent, then you are compelled to support this amendment to reduce Federal outlays. If you don't, you should be ready to support higher taxes.

The American people have already started to blame Congress for being asleep at the wheel during the savings and loan crisis. The President showed his willingness to take politically difficult steps yesterday whether some of us on this side like it or not. Let's give him and the American people some hope that there is still some semblance of leadership left in Congress. Vote for this amendment.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Again, I would point out to my colleagues that the increase in this bill are substantial, though they are largely the increases requested by the President. We are \$500 million plus, below, in outlays what the President requested. We are within our 302(b) allocations, both as to budget authority and as to outlays. The 2-percent cut is said to be nominal cut, but it will have the effect of reducing the NASA budget by \$285 million, which I would suggest is more than a nominal cut in NASA. The 2-percent cut is said to be a nominal cut, will have the effect of cutting the National Science Foundation appropriation by \$46 million, which I have to tell the gentleman in that account is more than a nominal cut. It will leave NASA \$1.1 million below the President's request. It will leave the National Science Foundation \$92 million below the President's request.

The President, in his statement of administration policy on this bill, has criticized the cuts that we have already made in his request, and I particularly urge those of my colleagues on the Republican side who want to support the Presidential request of the National Science Foundation, NASA, and other agencies, to vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I have two quick questions. My first question, with the 2 percent in either of the instances the gentleman cited, National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation, will we be spending less in fiscal year 1991 than in 1990?

Mr. GREEN of New York. I know we will not in the space program. I will do the calculations for the National Science Foundation program, although I would rather doubt it there.

Again, as the gentleman knows, the President wants to double the funding for the National Science Foundation over a 5-year period. Again, we have undertaken a lot of things which are now wrapping us up as we knew when we voted for them last year in the NASA program, most notably the space station. It seems to me the cuts the gentleman will want to make will be very destructive. We have already gone well under what the President requested on both of these items. I hope my colleagues will not cut requests further.

Mr. PENNY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the second question I have, given the fact my amendment could reduce in total somewhat less than \$1 million in appropriations from this bill, could the gentleman share with the membership the dollar amount, the difference between the appropriated level in fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1991?

□ 1500

Mr. GREEN of New York. The dollar difference in this bill?

Mr. PENNY. As compared to fiscal year 1990.

Mr. GREEN of New York. There are a lot of different items, as the gentleman knows, as between outlays.

Mr. PENNY. Is it true the increase is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$12 billion, and my amendment would cut maybe \$1 billion?

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in that. I think the gentleman ought to understand that of that \$12 billion, to use his number, \$7 billion in budget authority simply deals with the fact that section 8 existing housing contracts and other similar contracts are expiring.

Mr. PENNY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of New York. They have to be replaced or those families will get evicted because they cannot afford the rent. The President requested that, Secretary Kemp has requested that, and if the gentleman is requesting that we ought to cut 2 percent out of that, then he is simply saying that we are going to be throwing some families out of the street because we are not going to provide the full amount of money the President requested and that Secretary Kemp said is necessary.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that observation, and it is for that reason that I exempted those section 8 housing programs from my cut.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of

words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members know that if we cut these programs, we are cutting the homeless program. We have had hearings, for example, relative to HUD on community development, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors has been telling us we are not doing our share in terms of attacking urban problems. They say we not only cut section 8 but we are going to cut all the other housing programs and we are going to cut community development.

We already eliminated revenue sharing. How can we expect these urban problems to be allayed if we do not at least meet the request of the committee? I think the committee has done a very fine job. Yet I am disappointed that the space station, for example, is not fully funded. However, I go along with the subcommittee chairman in trying to work it out. He has decreased the funds, I understand, by millions of dollars from the original request by the administration for NASA.

We cannot afford to cut Veterans Affairs, the Environment Protection Agency, and the areas of HUD that attack our urban problems any further.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the Members not to be tempted to cut this budget any further, and I hope we will defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my views on the fiscal year 1991 appropriations bill for VA/HUD/IA, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In today's budget climate, it is more difficult than ever before to find adequate funding for major scientific initiatives. We must commit ourselves to do all that is necessary to ensure that Space Station *Freedom* is developed. I plan to work with my colleagues to ensure that full funding for the Space Station Program is obtained if our current budget summit discussions make additional moneys available.

I know what a difficult job the House Appropriations Committee faced when deciding on the cuts to the VA/HUD/IA bill. It is unfortunate they were unable to fully fund the Space Station *Freedom*; however, I support their efforts.

After 20 years of declining budgets, America has renewed its commitment to space. President Bush proposed an increase in the fiscal year 1991 NASA budget. Today it is our turn to express to the citizens across this country our commitment to space exploration and development. One of the foundations of assuring U.S. leadership in space is to provide the funds needed to allow NASA to continue development of the Space Station *Freedom*.

The Lewis Research Center located in Cleveland, OH, was once threatened with closure due to cuts in the NASA budget during 1980-81. Today it plays a major role in many important NASA programs, most notably Space Station *Freedom*. Lewis is developing the electrical power system for the station, which will allow important experiments to be conducted; sensor observations to be pow-

ered; and astronaut habitats to be supported. Without power the Space Station *Freedom* could not be used. In fact, the House Appropriations Committee took particular note of the importance of power in the report accompanying this bill.

I am very proud of the work being conducted at the Lewis Center, where significant progress has been made on the development and testing of power hardware. I am particularly impressed with the newly constructed space power lab and the recent solar dynamic hardware test. An outgrowth of the Department of Energy's terrestrial solar energy program, solar dynamic power is key to our Nation's energy security in the next century. I believe continued investment in this technology is prudent. The United States is the only country to have developed this new power technology and I believe it will keep America competitive.

Solar dynamic power will also provide a space station with a more efficient source of power and one which offers life cycle cost savings over the 30-year life of the station of \$4.8 billion. Recent studies have also shown that solar dynamic power is a cheaper way to grow beyond 75 kw than photovoltaic power.

Space Station *Freedom* is absolutely essential to the U.S. future in space because it is central to our plans for Earth observation, space research, applications, technology development, and exploration in the coming decades. Moreover, it is a key investment in the technological and economic future of the United States. Technology derived from *Freedom*'s development and operation will enable continued U.S. leadership in new products and processes. This, in turn, will lead to increased employment, an improved balance of trade, and sustained economic growth.

I strongly believe that Space Station *Freedom* will sharpen our national competitiveness and economic strength. The U.S. technology base must constantly be reinvigorated with new research and development efforts. We need the space station if we are to stay competitive in the coming decades.

In addition, Space Station *Freedom* will revitalize and capture the imaginations of our young people in math and science. Our children will enter demanding fields like science and engineering only if we nurture their interest while they are young and sustain it as they grow older. Space Station *Freedom* has already started to do this and I believe it will grow in its influence over our children as the program matures.

The National Science Foundation estimates a shortage of some 67,500 scientists and engineers by the year 2000. This phenomenon is driven by the following factors: the increase in the need for specialized workers as contrasted with decreases in the number of college students opting to prepare for science and engineering careers; a stalemate in the science proficiency of the Nation's young people; and the continued underrepresentation of science and mathematics education training programs of minorities and women who will constitute the bulk of the work force by the year 2000.

In the year 2000, 85 percent of the new entrants to the Nation's work force will be members of minority groups and women. Studies prove that children start to become engineers,

scientists, or science literate before grade three. I work closely with the aerospace industry and NASA to increase the number of programs which reach out to teachers and minority students in the kindergarten through eighth grade educational pipeline.

Investment in the NASA budget does not just result in major accomplishments in space—the benefits here on planet Earth are just as great, if not greater.

Again, I hope that working with our Senate colleagues, we will be able to fully fund Space Station *Freedom*.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. TRAXLER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the National Science Foundation, it would reduce NASA, and it would reduce HUD. It is unacceptable. Already this bill is some \$700 million below the President in outlays.

This is the third bill on which this amendment has been offered. It has failed on each and every one of them.

Mr. Chairman, this is a vital bill. The Members all know the importance of it to their constituencies. I encourage a no vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I may just take a few minutes, I would like to ask the sponsor of the amendment a question with regard to the veterans programs.

Will any of the entitlement programs be affected?

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, no entitlement programs are affected by the amendment; it is only discretionary accounts.

Mr. APPLEGATE. How many full-time employees will be lost by this 2-percent cut?

Mr. PENNY. Within the Department of Veterans Affairs?

Mr. APPLEGATE. Yes.

Mr. PENNY. I do not have that number for the gentleman, but since this would apply to the bureaucratic structure of the Department, if this bill provided, let us say, a 5-percent increase in appropriations for that staffing level, it would be a 3-percent increase after the effect of my amendment were felt.

Mr. APPLEGATE. But the amendment will cause some loss of full-time employees?

Mr. PENNY. It does not necessarily cause a loss in staffing. It depends on what the funding level is for the bureaucracy at the Department. Off-

hand, I do not have that number for the gentleman.

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Chairman, the reason I mentioned that is the fact that we have been fighting to increase the number of full-time employees because they have been decreasing over the years, thereby extending the amount of time veterans have in order to get their benefits, and it has been entirely too long.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were ayes 172, noes 235, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—172

Andrews	Grandy	Payne (VA)
Archer	Guarini	Penny
Armey	Gunderson	Petri
Baker	Hall (OH)	Pickle
Ballenger	Hamilton	Porter
Barnard	Hammerschmidt	Ray
Bartlett	Hancock	Rhodes
Bateman	Hansen	Ridge
Beilenson	Hastert	Roberts
Bennett	Hefley	Robinson
Bereuter	Henry	Rogers
Bliley	Henger	Rohrabacher
Broomfield	Hiler	Roth
Brown (CO)	Hoagland	Roukema
Bunning	Hopkins	Rowland (CT)
Burton	Houghton	Russo
Byron	Huckaby	Saxton
Callahan	Hughes	Schaefer
Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Schroeder
Campbell (CO)	Hyde	Sensenbrenner
Chandler	Inhofe	Shaw
Clement	Ireland	Shays
Clinger	Jacobs	Shumway
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Shuster
Coleman (MO)	Jones (NC)	Slatery
Condit	Jontz	Slaughter (NY)
Cooper	Kaptur	Slaughter (VA)
Courter	Kasich	Smith (NE)
Cox	Kolbe	Smith, Denny
Craig	Kyl	(OR)
Crane	Lagamarsino	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Lancaster	(NH)
Darden	Leach (IA)	Smith, Robert
DeLay	Lehman (CA)	(OR)
DeWine	Lightfoot	Snowe
Dickinson	Livingston	Stallings
Dorgan (ND)	Long	Stangeland
Dornan (CA)	Lukens, Donald	Stearns
Douglas	McCandless	Stenholm
Dreier	McCollum	Stump
Duncan	McCrery	Sundquist
Dyson	McCurdy	Tauke
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Tauzin
English	McMillan (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	Meyers	Thomas (WY)
Fields	Michel	Udall
Fish	Miller (OH)	Upton
Frenzel	Miller (WA)	Vander Jagt
Gallely	Moody	Vucanovich
Gallo	Moorhead	Walgren
Gekas	Morrison (WA)	Walker
Geren	Murphy	Walsh
Gibbons	Neal (NC)	Weber
Gillmor	Olin	Weldon
Gingrich	Oxley	Whittaker
Glickman	Packard	Wolf
Goodling	Parris	Wylie
Goss	Pashayan	
Gradison	Patterson	

NOES—235

Ackerman	Hawkins	Perkins
Alexander	Hayes (IL)	Pickett
Anderson	Hayes (LA)	Poshard
Annunzio	Hefner	Price
Anthony	Hertel	Pursell
Applegate	Hochbrueckner	Quillen
Aspin	Holloway	Rahall
Atkins	Horton	Rangel
AuCoin	Hoyer	Ravenel
Bates	Hubbard	Regula
Bentley	Hutto	Richardson
Berman	James	Rinaldo
Bevill	Johnson (SD)	Ritter
Bilbray	Johnston	Roe
Bilirakis	Jones (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehlert	Kanjorski	Rose
Boggs	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Bonior	Kennedy	Rowland (GA)
Borski	Kennelly	Roybal
Bosco	Kildee	Sabo
Boucher	Kleczka	Saiki
Boxer	Kolter	Sangmeister
Brennan	Kostmayer	Sarpalius
Brooks	LaFalce	Savage
Browder	Lantos	Sawyer
Brown (CA)	Laughlin	Scheuer
Bruce	Leath (TX)	Schiff
Bryant	Lehman (FL)	Schneider
Buechner	Lent	Schuetz
Cardin	Levin (MI)	Schumer
Carper	Levine (CA)	Serrano
Carr	Lewis (CA)	Sharp
Chapman	Lewis (FL)	Sikorski
Clarke	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Clay	Lipinski	Skaggs
Coleman (TX)	Lloyd	Skeen
Collins	Lowery (CA)	Skelton
Conte	Lowey (NY)	Smith (IA)
Costello	Machtley	Smith (NJ)
Coughlin	Madigan	Smith (TX)
Coyne	Markey	Smith (VT)
Davis	Marlenee	Solarz
DeFazio	Matsui	Solomon
Dellums	Mavroules	Spence
Derrick	Mazzoli	Spratt
Dicks	McCloskey	Staggers
Dingell	McDade	Stokes
Dixon	McDermott	Studds
Downey	McGrath	Swift
Durbin	McHugh	Synar
Dwyer	McMillen (MD)	Tallon
Dymally	McNulty	Tanner
Early	Mfume	Taylor
Eckart	Miller (CA)	Thomas (GA)
Edwards (CA)	Mineta	Torres
Emerson	Molinari	Torricelli
Engel	Mollohan	Towns
Erdreich	Montgomery	Trafcant
Espy	Morella	Traxler
Evans	Mrazek	Unsoeld
Fascell	Murtha	Valentine
Fazio	Myers	Vento
Flake	Nagle	Visclosky
Flippo	Natcher	Volkmer
Foglietta	Neal (MA)	Washington
Ford (MI)	Nowak	Watkins
Ford (TN)	Oakar	Waxman
Frank	Oberstar	Weiss
Gaydos	Obey	Wheat
Gejdenson	Ortiz	Whitten
Gephardt	Owens (NY)	Wise
Gilman	Owens (UT)	Wolpe
Gonzalez	Pallone	Wyden
Gordon	Panetta	Yates
Grant	Parker	Yatron
Gray	Paxon	Young (AK)
Green	Payne (NJ)	Young (FL)
Harris	Pease	
Hatcher	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—25

Barton	Hall (TX)	Nelson
Bustamante	Jenkins	Nielson
Combest	Luken, Thomas	Schulze
Conyers	Manton	Smith (FL)
Crockett	Martin (IL)	Stark
de la Garza	Martin (NY)	Williams
Donnelly	Martinez	Wilson
Feighan	Moakley	
Frost	Morrison (CT)	

□ 1524

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Martin of Illinois for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. Schulze for, with Mr. Bustamante against.

Messrs. LOWERY of California, HUTTO, PAXON, and OWENS of Utah changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. KAPTUR changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Chairman TRAXLER and the other members of the subcommittee for restoring needed support for our veterans' health care system. H.R. 5158 raises spending levels above this year's level for veterans' care, compensation and pensions, health facilities, and mortgage loans.

As we adopt this important piece of legislation, however, I want to note that we have still not addressed one very serious problem many Vietnam veterans face; our failure to provide benefits for veterans who have certain diseases connected to their exposure to agent orange—the toxic herbicide used in Vietnam.

Our Government sent millions of young Americans to fight an unpopular war under the most difficult conditions. While serving their country, many of them were exposed to toxic chemicals sprayed by U.S. forces. When they began to contract illnesses and when they began to give birth to infants with birth defects as a result of their exposure to agent orange, Vietnam veterans sought compensation for their suffering. They asked for justice, but instead, had their claims rejected and had scientific studies of their illnesses fraudulently manipulated by White House officials on a mission to reduce Government spending.

The Federal Government continues to insist that agent orange exposure cannot be assessed, despite evidence to the contrary. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, which I have the privilege of chairing, has repeatedly provided such evidence, most recently this past Tuesday by retired Adm. Elmo Zumwalt. The Department of Veterans Affairs continues to deny the vast majority of more than 30,000 claims by veterans with diseases associated with dioxin, the chemical contaminant in agent orange.

Our colleague, LANE EVANS, has introduced a bill to provide benefits for Vietnam veterans who have contracted diseases related to agent orange expo-

sure. After hearings were held, however, the Department of Veterans Affairs asked that the bill be stalled until further studies are completed. That tune has become stale and is wasting lives.

Our deserving veterans have waited long enough. The way the Government has treated these veterans is the ultimate affront to brave men and women who fought and died in combat on foreign soil, and who die yet today from their exposure to toxic chemicals two decades ago.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991".

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, before the House concludes with this bill, I just want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. As I said at the outset, this is a very complicated bill. It involves agencies with very complicated financing mechanisms, and the mastery which in just 1½ years the chairman has developed with all of these programs and all of these agencies is really extraordinary, and I commend him for bringing us thus far so well.

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, it could not be possible without the gentleman's help and the help of the members of the subcommittee. For that I am very grateful.

Mr. GREEN of New York. My chairman is very kind.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. KILDEE] having assumed the chair, Mr. BEILENSEN, 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. 5158) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions,

corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 355, nays 48, answered "present" 3, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—355

Ackerman	Clinger	Gallo
Alexander	Coble	Gaydos
Anderson	Coleman (MO)	Gedjenson
Andrews	Coleman (TX)	Gephardt
Annunzio	Collins	Geren
Anthony	Conte	Gibbons
Applegate	Cooper	Gillmor
Aspin	Costello	Gilman
Atkins	Coughlin	Gringrich
AuCoin	Courter	Glickman
Baker	Coyne	Gonzalez
Ballenger	Craig	Goodling
Barnard	Darden	Gordon
Bateman	Davis	Goss
Bates	DeFazio	Grandy
Bennett	Dellums	Grant
Bentley	Derrick	Gray
Bereuter	DeWine	Green
Berman	Dickinson	Guarini
Bevill	Dicks	Gunderson
Billbray	Dingell	Hall (OH)
Billrakis	Dixon	Hamilton
Bliley	Dorgan (ND)	Hammerschmidt
Boehlert	Dornan (CA)	Hansen
Boggs	Downey	Harris
Bonior	Dreier	Hastert
Borski	Durbin	Hatcher
Bosco	Dwyer	Hawkins
Boucher	Dymally	Hayes (IL)
Boxer	Early	Hayes (LA)
Brennan	Eckart	Hefley
Brooks	Edwards (CA)	Hefner
Broomfield	Edwards (OK)	Hertel
Browder	Emerson	Hiler
Brown (CA)	Engel	Hoagland
Brown (CO)	English	Hochbrueckner
Bruce	Erdreich	Holloway
Bryant	Espy	Horton
Buechner	Evans	Houghton
Burton	Fascell	Hoyer
Callahan	Fazio	Hubbard
Campbell (CO)	Feighan	Huckaby
Cardin	Fish	Hughes
Carper	Flake	Hunter
Carr	Flippo	Hutto
Chandler	Foglietta	Hyde
Chapman	Ford (MI)	Inhofe
Clarke	Ford (TN)	Ireland
Clay	Frank	James
Clement	Galleghy	Johnson (SD)

Johnston	Murtha	Skaggs
Jones (GA)	Myers	Skeen
Jones (NC)	Nagle	Skelton
Jontz	Natcher	Slattery
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Slaughter (NY)
Kasich	Neal (NC)	Slaughter (VA)
Kastenmeier	Nowak	Smith (IA)
Kennedy	Oakar	Smith (NE)
Kennelly	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Obey	Smith (TX)
Kleczka	Ortiz	Smith (VT)
Kolbe	Owens (NY)	Smith, Denny
Kolter	Owens (UT)	(OR)
Kostmayer	Oxley	Smith, Robert
LaFalce	Pallone	(OR)
Lagomarsino	Panetta	Snowe
Lancaster	Parker	Solarz
Lantos	Parris	Solomon
Laughlin	Pashayan	Spence
Leach (IA)	Patterson	Spratt
Leath (TX)	Paxon	Staggers
Lehman (CA)	Payne (NJ)	Stallings
Lehman (FL)	Payne (VA)	Stangeland
Lent	Pelosi	Stearns
Levin (MI)	Perkins	Stenholm
Levine (CA)	Porter	Stokes
Lewis (FL)	Poshard	Studds
Lewis (GA)	Price	Sundquist
Lightfoot	Pursell	Swift
Lipinski	Quillen	Synar
Livingston	Rahall	Tallon
Lloyd	Rangel	Tanner
Long	Ravenel	Tauzin
Lowery (CA)	Ray	Taylor
Lowe (NY)	Regula	Thomas (CA)
Machtley	Rhodes	Thomas (GA)
Madigan	Richardson	Torres
Markey	Ridge	Torricelli
Marlenee	Rinaldo	Towns
Martin (NY)	Ritter	Trafficant
Matsui	Roe	Traxler
Mavroules	Rogers	Udall
Mazzoli	Ros-Lehtinen	Unsoeld
McCandless	Rose	Valentine
McCloskey	Rostenkowski	Vander Jagt
McCollum	Roth	Vento
McCrery	Roukema	Visclosky
McCurdy	Rowland (CT)	Volkmer
McDade	Rowland (GA)	Vucanovich
McDermott	Roybal	Walgren
McGrath	Sabo	Walsh
McHugh	Saiki	Washington
McMillen (MD)	Sangmeister	Watkins
McNulty	Sarpalius	Waxman
Meyers	Savage	Weber
Mfume	Sawyer	Weiss
Miller (CA)	Saxton	Weldon
Miller (OH)	Schaefer	Wheat
Miller (WA)	Scheuer	Whittaker
Mineta	Schiff	Whitten
Moakley	Schneider	Wise
Mollinari	Schroeder	Wolf
Mollohan	Schumer	Wolpe
Montgomery	Serrano	Wyden
Moody	Sharp	Wyllie
Morella	Shaw	Yates
Morrison (WA)	Shays	Yatron
Mrazek	Sikorski	Young (AK)
Murphy	Sisisky	Young (FL)

NAYS—48

Archer	Gradison	Pickett
Armey	Hancock	Roberts
Bartlett	Henry	Rohrabacher
Beilenson	Herger	Russo
Bunning	Hopkins	Sensenbrenner
Byron	Jacobs	Shumway
Campbell (CA)	Johnson (CT)	Shuster
Cox	Kyl	Smith, Robert
Crane	McEwen	(NH)
Dannemeyer	McMillan (NC)	Stump
DeLay	Michel	Tauke
Douglas	Moorhead	Thomas (WY)
Duncan	Olin	Upton
Fawell	Packard	Walker
Fields	Pease	Williams
Frenzel	Penny	
Gekas	Petri	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Condit	Dyson	Kaptur
--------	-------	--------

NOT VOTING—26

Barton	Combest	Crockett
Bustamante	Conyers	de la Garza

Donnelly	Manton	Robinson
Frost	Martin (IL)	Schuetz
Hall (TX)	Martinez	Schulze
Jenkins	Morrison (CT)	Smith (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Nelson	Stark
Lukens, Thomas	Nielson	Wilson
Lukens, Donald	Pickle	

□ 1551

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nelson for, with Mrs. Martin of Illinois against.

Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Nielson of Utah against.

Mr. PEASE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was delayed off the Hill on the previous vote, rollcall 210, the final passage of the HUD appropriations. Mr. Speaker, if I had been here, I would have voted in the affirmative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably absent from the House today and missed a total of five rollcall votes on H.R. 5158, the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies. I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 205, which occurred on House Resolution 426, the rule for H.R. 5158. I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes 207, 208, and 209, which occurred on the amendments to H.R. 5158 offered by Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. PENNY, respectively. Finally, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 210, which occurred on passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 205 and "nay" on rollcalls Nos. 207, 208, and 209.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during House consideration of the Dannemeyer amendment to H.R. 5158, the VA, HUD, appropriations bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 208.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO HAVE UNTIL THE WEEK OF JULY 2, 1990, TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 2647 AND H.R. 2926

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Commit-

tee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be granted permission to have until the week of July 2, 1990 to file its report on H.R. 2647, the Coastal Defense Initiative, and H.R. 2926, the Dolphin Protection Act, during the week of July 2, 1990.

I am advised there is no objection to this request by the minority.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Kalbaugh, one of his secretaries.

CHILD NUTRITION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5149) to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture may not consider, in allocating amounts to a State agency under the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children for the fiscal year 1991, any amounts returned by such agency for reallocation during the fiscal year 1990 and to allow amounts allocated to a State for such program for the fiscal year 1991 to be expended for expenses incurred in the fiscal year 1990, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] so that he can explain his request.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would say to the Members of the House this is legislation introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], that will allow the State WIC directors to borrow up to 3 percent of their next year's appropriation for the purpose of continuing the WIC program throughout the rest of this fiscal year, and be able to provide a full program for women and children that are on this critical program, to improve healthy pregnancies and healthy children and to make sure that we do not have to continue to knock people off, and that some of the people that have been knocked off of this program because of increased costs due to food price increases can be restored to this program.

This has been cleared with the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. HAWKINS, with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. WHITTEN, with the members of the minority, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GOODLING, and my understanding is that the White House has also signed off on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I will have an amendment that will address some of the concerns that were raised by OMB, by the Senate and others to make sure that we have tight fiscal controls on this program, and that this program will not be used to expand the program, that these monies would not be used to expand the program, but simply to maintain the caseload that we have experienced throughout 1990.

Mr. GOODLING. Further reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] so that he might further indicate the necessity for this move.

I rise in strong support of this bill. I want to thank Chairman HAWKINS for bringing this emergency legislation to the floor.

This bill is about children. It's about protecting children from anemia and malnutrition. In some cases, it's about saving their lives.

Mr. Speaker, the Special Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants, and Children, known as the WIC program, is our first line of defense against infant mortality, low birthweight, malnutrition, and anemia in American children. Studies have shown that every dollar spent on WIC saves \$3 in future health care costs.

Back in April, the Select Committee on Hunger conducted a State-by-State survey of WIC administrators, which revealed a nationwide shortfall, affecting 34 States, and totalling \$67 million. Worst of all, we found that more than half the States were beginning to actually drop eligible women and children from their programs.

A new survey by the National Association of WIC Directors shows that more than a quarter of a million women and children are currently being forced off the program.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5149 provides a short-term solution to this problem, by allowing States to borrow up to 5 percent of next year's appropriation for use during this fiscal year to address the shortfall problem. Current law allows States to borrow up to 1 percent. My bill simply raises the ceiling from 1 percent to 5 percent. I want to emphasize that this legislation is not designed to fund caseload expansion during this year. It's designed to allow States to put women and children who had been eliminated from the program back on the program rolls, or to prevent caseload reduction.

This bill won't solve all of WIC's problems. I realize that we're going to have to adjust the fiscal year 1991 appropriation for WIC to reflect the fact that we're spending it in 1990. I hope to work with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee on that in the next few weeks.

But we'll never be able to really solve the problem until we recognize this fact: WIC ought to be available to everybody who needs it.

I don't understand how we can have a program that is as beneficial as WIC is, as effective as WIC is, as cost efficient as WIC is, and deny it to the people who need it. I don't understand how we can bail out the S&L administrators—at a cost of \$300 billion—and we can't find a fraction of that money to feed hungry children. I know money's tight, but, as the saying goes, it's hard to tighten your belt when you're wearing diapers.

We don't send only half our children to school, we don't give only half our children clothing or shelter. There's no reason that only half of the children eligible for WIC should get a nutritious diet.

I supported an increase of \$150 million in the budget for WIC for next year because I believe WIC should be expanded. But it's pretty clear to me now that expanding WIC is going to cost more than \$150 million. I think it's worth it. I think it's high time we made the health of our most vulnerable children a national priority.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported out of the Education and Labor Committee with bipartisan support. It's been endorsed by groups as diverse as the Children's Defense Fund and the National Right to Life, Bread for the World, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Food Research and Action Center, the Coalition on Human Needs. It deserves the support of the House of Representatives.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues who helped move this emergency bill through so quickly. You know, the Hunger Committee is not a legislative committee, so we have to depend on our friends in the authorizing and appropriating committees to help us with our issues. I'm very grateful to Chairman HAWKINS of the Education and Labor Committee for moving this bill through the Education and Labor Committee so quickly, and Mr. GOODLING, whose advice and modifications helped expedite the process. I'm extremely grateful to my good friend GEORGE MILLER, chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families for carrying this bill through the committee process. Congresswoman BOXER held a crucial public hearing on this issue in the Budget Committee today that helped to move this legislation along.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I've been a Member of the House for nearly 12 years, and it's very rare that you see legislation move so quickly. I think that's a testament to the effectiveness of the WIC Program. I'm proud of this House for reacting to this crisis so promptly. If we pass this bill today, and get quick action in the Senate and by the administration, we'll be able to put these kids back on the program before any permanent damage is done. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me, and I sincerely say that because he has played a major role in helping move this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Further reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I do want to point out in the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from California, I want to specifically make sure that everyone understands particularly on my side section (F) which says,

Each State agency which intends to use the authority provided in (E) shall request approval from the Secretary in advance and shall submit a plan showing how the State's caseload will be managed to meet funding limitations. The Secretary shall review and make determinations on such plans on an expedited basis.

Then (G) says, "No State can use the authority provided under (E) to increase the caseload level above the highest level to date in fiscal year 1990."

We are not asking for permanent changes. We are saying that we have an emergency for many reasons, the freeze in relationship to oranges or orange juice, the lack of available milk because of surpluses not being available, all these things which have caused the cost of the package to increase dramatically and, therefore, this is necessary.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5149, the WIC Services Restoration Act and I commend three of my colleagues for their outstanding leadership on this issue. Congressman TONY HALL, chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger, and Congressman GEORGE MILLER, chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, have worked tirelessly on behalf of this legislation and the WIC Program. Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the panel's Agriculture Subcommittee, and his subcommittee staff, deserve our sincere thanks for their efforts to work out a solution to this crisis in the WIC Program. Chairman WHITTEN's assistance with this legislation was vital to its prompt consideration.

Over the years, the Special Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants, and Children, or WIC, has helped to safeguard the health of pregnant and nursing women, infants, and children who are nutritionally at risk

because of inadequate nutrition and income. Numerous studies have shown that WIC is both a worthwhile and cost-effective program. For example, an extensive medical evaluation of WIC by USDA demonstrated that WIC contributed to a reduction of 20 to 33½ percent in late fetal death rate. Furthermore, women who participate in WIC were shown to have longer pregnancies leading to fewer premature births. Another study conducted by the Harvard School of Public Health found that WIC reduced the incidence of low birthweight and that each dollar spent on the prenatal component of WIC averts \$3 spent in hospitalization costs.

Unfortunately, unexpected increases in consumer prices of key foods in the WIC package, such as milk, cereal, and juice, have resulted in budgetary shortfalls in more than half of State WIC programs. According to a survey conducted by the National Association of WIC Directors, WIC participation in 25 States would have to be cut by almost 250,000 by the end of September unless some type of action is taken. In my own State of California, 36,000 individuals will be dropped from participation in the program.

H.R. 5149 seeks to address this shortfall by allowing States to borrow against future funding in order to bring caseloads to their pre-crisis levels. Under current law, States have the ability to borrow up to 1 percent of future appropriations during a current fiscal year. H.R. 5149 simply raises that ceiling from 1 percent to 5 percent for the current year.

WIC represents an extremely worthwhile Federal investment in our Nation's future. I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation as well as increased funding when we consider the fiscal year 1991 agriculture appropriations legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 5149

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966.

Section 17(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: "In the fiscal year 1991, the Secretary may not adjust the allocation to any State agency under this subsection solely on the basis of the return by such agency during the fiscal year 1990 of any amounts allocated to such agency under this subsection for such fiscal year."; and

(2) in clause (i) of paragraph (3)(A), by inserting before the semicolon the following: "and a State agency may expend, from the amount of funds allocated to such agency for supplemental foods for the fiscal year 1991, the amount necessary to cover expenses incurred in the fiscal year 1990 for purposes of continuing to provide services under the program during the fiscal year 1990 at the level at which such services were being provided on March 1, 1990".

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MILLER of California: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO THE CHILD NUTRITION
ACT OF 1966.

Section 17(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(i)) is amended at the end thereof by adding new subparagraphs (3) (E), (F) and (G) which read:

"(E) Notwithstanding any other provision in this paragraph and paragraph (2) a State agency may, subject to the approval of the Secretary under (F), expend not more than 3 percent of the amount of funds allocated to such agency for supplemental foods for the fiscal year 1991 for expenses incurred under this section for supplemental foods during the fiscal year 1990.

"(F) Each State agency which intends to use the authority provided in (E) shall request approval from the Secretary in advance and shall submit a plan showing how the State's caseload will be managed to meet funding limitations. The Secretary shall review and make determinations on such plans on an expedited basis.

"(G) No State can use the authority provided under (E) to increase the caseload level above the highest level to date in fiscal year 1990."

□ 1600

Mr. MILLER of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5149, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter today from Douglas Vollmer, associate executive director for government relations of the Paralyzed Veterans of America. It said in the second paragraph, "To delay and possibly even thwart passage of this much-needed legislation," referring to the Americans With Disabilities Act, "due to an amendment that is predicated upon ignorance and bias and fosters continued discrimination would be unconscionable." He was referring, of course, to the delay in the consideration of the Americans With Disabilities Act today.

I regret to inform the Members that it does not appear that the U.S. Senate is prepared to transfer the papers back to the House of Representatives this afternoon. As a result, I regret to inform the Members that we will not be considering the Americans With Disabilities Act this afternoon and, therefore, will not be considering it until after we return.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman, my friend from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the announcement that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] made. That is, there will not be a vote on the ADA this afternoon, that the ADA will be held off until after the recess.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for that decision, on two bases. First of all, on process: It seems to me that the rules of the House which say that the other body needs to act first, in fact, rule No. 555, states rather explicitly that in all cases of conference asked after votes of disagreement the conferees of the House making it are to leave the papers with the conferees of the other.

We have had disputes informally during the course of the day as to whether those papers could somehow be transferred back to this House even though the other body is required under the House rules to act first.

It seems to me that had that happened, it would have been disruptive to the process and Members would not have had sufficient, adequate notification as to which body was going to act first.

Second, I would note that 79 out of 81 of the items in disagreement between the House and the Senate have been resolved by the conferees. The conference report has been signed by a majority of the conferees, all but two.

I have signed the conference report; I believe it is a good conference report.

In fact, all of the items except two have been resolved and they have all been resolved in favor of the bill that the House wrote, by and large. I think that is to the credit of the four committees that acted.

I would say to the gentleman from Maryland there is still an item in dispute that is an item of substance. It does not affect most people who are affected by the ADA, it is not an issue that I believe should be involved in a disabilities act in any event, but others think it should be.

It is an item in dispute in substance regarding food handling, those with contagious diseases who handle food. It was the Chapman amendment. I want to note that the Chapman amendment passed this body on a roll-call vote. The other body instructed its conferees to accept the conference report, the Chapman amendment, in conference, on a rollcall vote.

The conferees, when they met, chose to disregard the will of the majority of both bodies and took it out.

I want to suggest to the gentleman that when we come back from recess when tempers have cooled a little bit, it seems to me that we could find a middle ground on the Chapman amendment, that we could find a middle ground that will in fact allow us to move forward as needs to happen on the Americans With Disabilities Act.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Americans With Disabilities Act. I believe it is long overdue, that we ought to pass it, that we will pass it this session.

I regret, as much as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] that the Chapman amendment has not yet been resolved. But I would suggest that items of substance ought to be resolved substantively by votes of both bodies and that what ought to happen is that we bring the Chapman amendment back to the conferees, perhaps back to the other body for a vote and debate so that we could resolve it on the substance and not based on procedure.

I would hope that right after the recess we would be able to resolve the Chapman amendment, bring it back, pass the ADA and declare independence for those with disabilities in this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would observe only that the gentleman is, of course, reading from Jefferson's Manual, not from the Rules of the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOYER. As I understand it, either House can take up the conference committee report, which of course was suggested to be done to

move this very important legislation forward before Independence Day.

I think both the gentleman from Texas and I perceive this to be one of the major pieces of legislation that we will pass in this Congress on the independence for 43 million Americans. It is a shame that we have gotten mired in one amendment which the conference pretty handily rejected. But I understand the gentleman's position.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I may, to ask a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, if the Senate, when it takes up the conference report, would consider a motion to recommit the bill to conference because of the failure of the conferees to adopt the provision of both Houses on the Chapman amendment and that motion to recommit would be successful, would it then be in order, since the conferees are still in existence and in business, for the House to then consider a motion to instruct conferees on the Chapman amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's conclusion is correct.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the discussion, and I understand now that we will not have the ADA bill up today.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. It is my understanding that the only business left for the House is a motion to instruct conferees on clean air, and my understanding is that there is probably not going to be a vote on that. If the gentleman could tell us whether or not there is going to be any other business—I am not aware of any—we could let the Members go on home.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this gentleman from Maryland is looking for somebody who knows the answer to that question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would interrupt, perhaps, to say that it is the Chair's intention to appoint conferees on the clean air bill immediately.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will continue to yield so that I may pursue the question: If the motion to instruct is not going to a vote, that will be the final business of the day; is that my understanding?

The SPEAKER. That is my understanding.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Speaker, and I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. That is a much better answer with much more clarity than I would be able to give.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would note, in addition to what was said earlier, it would be possible, but I think erroneous, for anyone to accuse the "other side" on the Chapman amendment of delaying the ADA. The fact is the Chapman amendment has not yet reached an agreement with a majority of both bodies. So while I could—but would not, it would be wrong—accuse the other side of delaying the ADA over the Chapman amendment and the other side could accuse me of delaying it, I think either of those conclusions would be incorrect. The fact is a legislative body has to reach some kind of a majority agreement on items of substance.

The Chapman amendment, with all of the unpleasant debate that goes on with it, is still in dispute. I believe firmly, before the month of July is out, we will reach an agreement on the substance of the Chapman amendment and at that point we will have an Americans With Disabilities Act that we will be proud of and, therefore, make a declaration of independence.

So for those who are concerned about delay, a delay at this time is not the fault of any one side or the other; it is just simply that there is an item remaining in dispute, but the ADA will be passed this session.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for the tremendous time and effort he has put in here. I am sure the gentleman feels very, very discouraged at this moment because we had so desperately wanted the Fourth of July to include independence for every American for the first time. That was a wonderful goal. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] should not feel bad. He has done everything he could to get it here.

My understanding is we could have even solved the Chapman amendment, at least on the House side, if we had gotten the papers, and the other body has not sent them.

So I thank the gentleman from Maryland. I know he has been scram-

bling all afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed he is looking so calm and cool, because he has tried everything he knows how to do except blast them out of the other body to get them over here.

I certainly think every American should salute the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the effort he put in. How tragic it is that one more Fourth of July goes by where not everybody has full independence.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Colorado and yield back the balance of my time.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT HOUSE CONFEREES ON S. 1630, CLEAN AIR RESTORATION AND STANDARDS ATTAINMENT ACT OF 1989

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LENT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate bill, S. 1630, be instructed to maintain the environmental protections in the House amendment, achieve such protections in the most cost-effective way, and minimize the aggregate costs on the economy of such protections.

□ 1610

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I understand that House conferees for the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 will shortly be appointed today. I am pleased to hear that this step—which is obviously essential to getting the conference underway—will soon be taken. I appreciate the Speaker's action in this regard.

Given the importance of this legislation, I have been concerned over the length of time it has taken to designate our conferees. It has been a month since the House passed H.R. 3030. We were under intense pressure to deliver this bill to the floor before Memorial Day. And we did it! We congratulated each other and slapped each other on the back. But now I am concerned that our momentum has been stalled.

Even under the best of circumstances, this conference promises to be long and difficult. Losing a month serves to reduce, not increase, our chances of completing action on the President's clean air initiative before the 101st Congress adjourns. And yet, I believe that after 13 long years of stalemate and after all the hard work over the past year which has produced remarkable compromises, the only acceptable outcome this year is to send

the President a bill that he can sign. Regrettably, the delay makes this task more difficult.

My motion to instruct, however, should assist conferees in their efforts to fashion a bill that the House and the President will find acceptable. The motion instructs the conferees to: First, maintain the environmental protections in the House bill; second, achieve the environmental protections in the most cost-effective way; and third, minimize the aggregate costs on the economy of the environmental protections.

Mr. Speaker, in letters to the leadership of both the House and Senate, the President has indicated that these considerations are among the most important factors that he will use to decide whether he signs our final product. The President has stated that he will only sign a bill that is balanced and reasonable. The instructions in my motion will help ensure that result.

Mr. Speaker, this motion was shown to our majority on the committee; and some changes were made to accommodate concerns expressed. As far as we know, there are no objections.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, almost a year has passed since the President presented Congress with the challenge of passing his comprehensive clean air amendments. We have responded by pushing a fair and effective bill through the House. But, more work remains. The principles contained in my motion will help ensure that we send the President a bill he can sign. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is recognized, if he so chooses, for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity to review the proposal to instruct. I think it is consistent with the bill that was passed by the House of Representatives with regard to the Clean Air Act. We have no objections to those instructions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1630

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees, and without objection, reserves the authority to make additional appointments of conferees and to specify particular portions of the Senate bill and House amendment as the subject of the various appointments.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of the

Senate bill—except that portion of section 702 adding a new section 512(a) to the Clean Air Act—and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. DINGELL, SCHEUER, WAXMAN, SHARP, THOMAS A. LUKE, SWIFT, SYNAR, TAUZIN, WYDEN, HALL of Texas, ECKART, SLATTERY, SIKORSKI, BOUCHER, ROWLAND of Georgia, MANTON, LENT, MADIGAN, MOORHEAD, DANNEMEYER, WHITTAKER, BLILEY, FIELDS, OXLEY, NIELSON of Utah, and BILIRAKIS.

From the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, for consideration of section 106 (g) and (h) of the Senate bill, and that portion of section 101(c) adding a new section 110(m) to the Clean Air Act, sections 101(f) and 102(g) of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ANDERSON, ROE, MINETA, OBERSTAR, NOWAK, RAHALL, APPELGATE, SAVAGE, BOSCO, BORSKI, KOLTER, VALENTINE, LIPINSKI, VISCLOSKEY, TRAFICANT, LEWIS of Georgia, HAMMERSCHMIDT, SHUSTER, STANGELAND, CLINGER, McEWEN, PETRI, PACKARD, BOEHLERT, LIGHTFOOT, and HASTERT.

From the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, for consideration of sections 103, 106(f), those portions of section 106(g) adding new sections 108(f) (3) and (4) to the Clean Air Act, those portions of section 107 adding new sections 183 (b)(4)(B) and (c)(1) to the Clean Air Act, that portion of section 108 adding a new section 189(a) to the Clean Air Act, 222, 226, and that portion of section 301 adding a new section 112(n) to the Clean Air Act of the Senate bill, and for sections 102 (d), those portions of section 103 adding new sections 182 (c)(5), (d)(1), and (e)(4) to the Clean Air Act, that portion of section 104 adding new section 187(a)(2) to the Clean Air Act, 108(a) and that portion of section 301 adding a new section 112(n)(1) to the Clean Air Act of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ANDERSON, ROE, MINETA, HAMMERSCHMIDT, and SHUSTER.

Except that, for consideration of that portion of section 301 adding a new section 112(n) to the Clean Air Act, of the Senate bill, and for consideration of that portion of section 301 adding a new section 112(n)(1) to the Clean Air Act, of the House amendment, Mr. NOWAK is appointed in lieu of Mr. MINETA, and Mr. STANGELAND is appointed in lieu of Mr. SHUSTER.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of that portion of section 702 adding a new section 512(a) to the Clean Air Act of the Senate bill, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ROSTENKOWSKI, GIBBONS, and ARCHER.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of section 111

of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ROSTENKOWSKI, FORD of Tennessee, DOWNEY, PEASE, and MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Messrs. ANDREWS, COYNE, GIBBONS, PICKLE, RANGEL, STARK, JACOBS, JENKINS, GUARINI, RUSSO, ARCHER, VANDER JAGT, CRANE, FRENZEL, SCHULZE, GRADISON, THOMAS of California, McGRATH, CHANDLER, and SHAW.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of those portions of section 103 adding new sections 183 (e)(4), (e)(5), and 185 to the Clean Air Act, that portion of section 108 adding a new section 302(y) to the Clean Air Act, and that portion of section 401 adding a new section 401(b)(3) to the Clean Air Act, and section 802 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. ROSTENKOWSKI, PICKLE, RANGEL, ARCHER, and VANDER JAGT.

Except that, for consideration of section 802 of the House amendment, Mr. GIBBONS is appointed in lieu of Mr. RANGEL.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of section 303 of the Senate bill, and sections 112-114, and 302 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HAWKINS, FORD of Michigan, GAYDOS, CLAY, MILLER of California, MURPHY, KILDEE, WILLIAMS, MARTINEZ, OWENS of New York, HAYES of Illinois, PERKINS, SAWYER, PAYNE of New Jersey, and POSHARD, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Messrs. GOODLING, GUNDERSON, HENRY, and SMITH of Vermont, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Messrs. FAWELL, BAL-LENGER, PETRI, GRANDY, and ROBINSON.

From the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for consideration of section 112 of the Senate bill, and section 712 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. UDALL, MILLER of California, LEVINE of California, YOUNG of Alaska, and CRAIG.

From the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for consideration of section 112, that portion of section 301 adding a new section 112(n) to the Clean Air Act, 411 and 412 of the Senate bill, and that portion of section 103 adding a new section 183(f) to the Clean Air Act, that portion of section 301 adding a new section 112(n)(1) to the Clean Air Act, sections 712, 805, and 901(e) of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. JONES of North Carolina, STUDDS, TAUZIN, DAVIS, and SHUMWAY.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of that portion of section 304 adding a new section 129(e)(7) to the Clean Air Act, sections 310, 408 and 1103 of the Senate bill, and titles IX

and X of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. ROE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. LLOYD, Messrs. GLICKMAN, VOLKMER, McCURDY, MINETA, VALENTINE, TORRICELLI, STALLINGS, NOWAK, NAGLE, HAYES of Louisiana, COSTELLO, TANNER, BROWDER, WALKER, and SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Messrs. BOEHLERT, LEWIS of Florida, MORRISON of Washington, PACKARD, and HENRY, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of those portions of section 301 adding new sections 112 (n) and (r) to the Clean Air Act of the Senate bill, and those portions of section 301 adding new sections 112 (i) and (n)(1) to the Clean Air Act of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. ROE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. WALKER, and Ms. SCHNEIDER.

As an additional conferee, for consideration of subtitle B of title I of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. WISE.
As an additional conferee, for consideration of section 709 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. COOPER.
There was no objection.

□ 1620

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4462

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 4462. The gentleman's name was added in error.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for the balance of this week and then as we reconvene after the Fourth of July recess.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, the business of the House will soon be finished today. There will not be further votes. There

will not be votes on tomorrow or on Monday, July 9, and the House will not be in session. We will have the Independence Day recess, and, of course, all of next week will be during the Independence Day recess.

On Tuesday, July 10, the House will meet at noon to consider 13 bills under suspension of the rules. Recorded votes on those suspensions will be postponed until after debate on all suspensions. The bills under suspension are as follows:

H.R. 4087, Veterans' Employment and Training Amendments of 1990;

H.R. 4089, Veterans' Educational and Vocational Counseling Amendments of 1990;

H.R. 4111, Strategic and Critical Minerals Act;

H.R. 4053, Coalfield Environment Enhancement Act;

S. 666, Regarding Alaskan Settlement Act;

H.R. 3888, Pertaining to the use of property in Rockingham County, VA;

H.R. 4834, Providing for a visitor center at Salem Maritime National Historic Site;

H.R. 988, Camp W.G. Williams Land Exchange Act;

H.R. 4982, Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Amendments of 1990;

H.R. 5064, Drug Abuse Resistance Education Act of 1990;

H.R. 5124, Anti-Drug Education Act of 1990;

H.R. 5140, School Drop-Out Prevention and Basic Skill Improvement Act of 1990; and

H. Con. Res. 291, Regarding POW's and MIA's.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 11, the House will meet at noon and will consider H.R. 4329, the American Technology Preeminence Act, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate. Then if the bill is ready and the problems surrounding it have been dealt with, we will take up H.R. 1180, the omnibus housing authorization, subject to a rule.

On Thursday, July 12, and Friday, July 13, the House will meet at noon on Thursday and at 10 a.m. on Friday. First we will take up H.R. 5115, the Equity and Excellence in Education Act of 1990, and then we will consider the transportation appropriations for 1991, subject to a rule.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Sometime soon we hope to have a calendar for July in front of Members. I would only say to Members that there is a good deal of legislation that has to be dealt with in July, and it would be likely that we would have votes on most Mondays and Fridays during that month. We have the remaining appropriations bills and a housing bill which I mentioned. We also have the Balanced Budget

Amendment, the defense authorization bill, and the agriculture bill, and we have to deal with the debt limit. There are other matters of importance also that have to be dealt with during this period.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I would certainly concur with him that there is going to be a full platter if we intend to have our normal August recess that would begin, as I recall, on August 3 or August 4.

Because of the distinguished majority leader and the gentleman from Illinois being tied up in the summit negotiations, I have not had an opportunity to counsel with the Speaker on some of the other items that the gentleman did not mention. For example, there is campaign reform. Will the majority leader give me any indication as to whether or not he has had any conversation with the Speaker to indicate when that might come up on the floor? The last time I talked with the Speaker, he said it would be sometime after we returned from our Fourth of July recess, but no time certain had been set. Does the gentleman have any idea about that? Would that be on the agenda sometime in that period?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I believe our goal is to try to deal with it in July.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman, of course, then mentioned the balanced budget amendment. Since we have had a discharge petition on that bill, there will be an opportunity for Members to vote on that. And the farm bill will be very significant for all of us from agricultural areas. Then there is the debt limit.

Incidentally, I will include with my remarks a letter which I have just had handed to me from the summit by the Secretary of the Treasury addressed to me on the need for our action on the debt limit. I will not take the time of the Members to read that at this juncture.

Conceivably, there will be a budget conference report sometime during July, and then the crime bill, is that a possibility?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The chairman will report, we think by the middle of July, and we may have that up in July. It is not yet clear, but we expect the committees to report by about that time.

Mr. MICHEL. And what about civil rights?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is still in the Judiciary Committee. It may come in July. I have my doubts that we can get all of these things done in this month.

I think in listing these bills, Members can get a sense of how much business there is to finish. This is the last clump of time before the September-October period when we have to finish up before the election.

Mr. MICHEL. The Ethics Committee has had under consideration now for some time several matters, and there has been conjecture as to whether or not there is going to be a recommendation from the committee this week or next week or sometime soon. Does the gentleman have any idea on that? Will we be confronted with those recommendations?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that these matters have to be concluded. I do not have a sense of when exactly they will be finished.

Mr. MICHEL. I have been asked by one of the coauthors and movers of the balanced budget amendment, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], whether or not that balanced budget amendment would be scheduled specifically for July 17.

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is the date we have been looking at. I do not think we have locked down specifically the fact that that is the date. That week and that date is what we have been looking at as the time to do it.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the majority leader a question.

We have had quite a bit of concern on our side about the fact that when these restrictive rules are being written and the time for amendments to be filed is announced, Members are out of town and have not had time to respond to that. Can the gentleman tell me, with regard to the schedule for the week that we come back, whether or not it is anticipated we will have any such restrictive rules where time will be of essence to the Members who want to file amendments?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I do not know enough about it to know that there will be a restrictive rule. I take it the gentleman is referring probably to the Omnibus Housing Authorization Act in particular?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that is the one that at least was a suspicious candidate there, because it is a fairly broad bill, and to have it considered in 1 day, it certainly appears as though it might be a candidate for a restrictive rule, and it is one where I think a number of Members would want to have advance notice if they have to have amendments filed.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I understand the gentleman's concern. I have real doubts, though, whether that bill will actually be able to be considered on Wednesday, but we will keep the gentleman's concerns in mind.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I think that covers it, I will say to the majori-

ty leader, and I appreciate receiving the schedule.

Mr. Speaker, under my leave to include extraneous material, as we close our exchange here, I will include with my remarks the letter from Nicholas Brady, the Secretary of the Treasury, with regard to the debt ceiling to which I referred earlier. The text of the letter is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, DC, June 28, 1990.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Republican Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I am writing to advise you of the need for action by Congress on legislation to increase the limit on the public debt in early August before the schedule Congressional recess.

As you know, the Resolution Trust Corporation's (RTC) borrowing from the Federal Financing Bank is funded through the normal Treasury debt management process, and, therefore, affects the debt subject to limit. As a result, our debt and cash estimates for the rest of Fiscal Year 1990 are subject to a greater-than-usual degree of uncertainty because of the RTC's difficulty in predicting the timing and level of its need for funds.

Based on our current estimate, it appears likely that, without an increase in the debt limit, the Treasury will run out of cash and borrowing authority and default on the Government's obligations in Mid-August. However, a significant increase in the level of RTC spending above the current estimate could accelerate the need for an increase in the debt limit to early August. In any case, it is highly likely that default would occur before Congress returns in September.

As you are aware, the limit is ordinarily raised to a new permanent level sufficient to fund the Government's needs for the upcoming Fiscal Year. Treasury will request a permanent debt limit increase as soon as the mid-session review of the budget is available from OMB. At that time, we will also advise you of our best estimate of the date that default would occur absent action to increase the debt limit.

I urge the Congress to act in a timely manner on a debt limit increase in order to avert a default with its adverse consequences on domestic and international confidence and trust in the United States.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS F. BRADY.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1990

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 11, 1990.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1990, AND ON THURSDAY, JULY 12, 1990

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns on Tuesday, July 10, 1990, and on Wednesday, July 11, 1990, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, July 11, 1990, and on Thursday, July 12, 1990.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, July 10, 1990, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, June 28, 1990.)

□ 1630

WYOMING CENTENNIAL DAY

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 271) to designate July 10, 1990, as "Wyoming Centennial Day" and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], who not only is the chief sponsor of this resolution, but who has worked tirelessly during the past very days to get the requisite signatures in order to bring it up before

we went on recess. I applaud him, not only for his resolution, but his untiring effort in order to accomplish that very difficult task.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to speak on this occasion to urge passage of a resolution giving official recognition to the 100th anniversary of the statehood of Wyoming.

The great State of Wyoming will be 100 years old on July 10, 1990. And to mark the day, when Wyoming became the 44th State in this Union, I believe it is appropriate to give congressional and national attention to this great event.

This resolution authorizes and requests President Bush to issue a proclamation acknowledging the economic, social, and historic contributions of the people of Wyoming to the United States.

Wyoming contains many firsts: Yellowstone, our Nation's first national park; Devils Tower, the Nation's first national monument; Shoshone National Forest, the first in America; the first woman Governor, Mrs. Nellie Tayloe Ross; the first State to give women the right to vote. And the list goes on.

The essence of this designation is the opportunity to celebrate the past, present, and future of Wyoming. Wyoming's lasting legacy to this Nation is a spirit of the true West and the promise of a great future. God bless the great State of Wyoming.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 271

Whereas on July 10, 1890, President Benjamin Harrison signed a proclamation admitting Wyoming as the forty-fourth State in the Union.

Whereas Wyoming is known as the Equality forty-fourth State;

Whereas Wyoming was the first State to recognize the rights of women and allow them voting privileges;

Whereas Wyoming appointed the first woman Justice of the Peace, Esther Hobart Morris, whose statue now graces the United States Capitol;

Whereas Wyoming is the home of the first national forest, the Shoshone;

Whereas Wyoming elected the first woman governor, Mrs. Nellie Tayloe Ross;

Whereas Wyoming, which represents the ideal in outdoor recreation, became the home of our Nation's first national park, Yellowstone National Park, the founding gem and is the site of the magnificent Grand Tetons;

Whereas Wyoming is also the home of America's first national monument, Devils Tower;

Whereas Wyoming is the site of the mother store of J.C. Penney's Department store in Kemmerer, founding a familiar fixture on mainstreets across America;

Whereas renowned inventor Thomas Alva Edison received the inspiration for the invention of the incandescent bulb while fishing and camping in Encampment, Wyoming;

Whereas Wyoming is home to the Nation's largest rodeo, Cheyenne Frontier Days, "the Daddy of them all";

Whereas Wyoming's beautiful mountains, trees, ranches, and natural resources are appreciated nationwide; and

Whereas on July 10, 1990, the State of Wyoming will see the dawn of a new century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That July 10, 1990, is designated "Wyoming Centennial Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation acknowledging the economic, social and historic contributions of the people of Wyoming to the United States of America over the past century.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DUCKS AND WETLANDS DAY

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 599) to designate July 1, 1990, as "National Ducks and Wetlands Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND], who is the chief sponsor of the joint resolution and who also performed a yeoman's service in getting the necessary signatures.

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

Mr. RIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored that the House is considering commemorative legislation, House Joint Resolution 599, which designates July 1, 1990, as "National Ducks and Wetlands Day."

On Sunday, July 1, 1990, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior will issue a Federal duck stamp that will go on sale at post offices nationwide.

The duck stamp of 1990 was designed by Jim Hautman of Plymouth, MN. On Sunday, the U.S. Postal Service will host a ceremony at the new Minnesota Valley Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center to honor Mr. Hautman, Minnesota's 14th designer of the duck stamp.

Through the Federal Duck Stamp Program, the U.S. Department of the Interior has been able to acquire almost 4 million acres of wetlands for the National Refuge System.

Every year, more than 1.5 million duck stamps are purchased at a cost of \$12.50 by Americans to support the conservation benefits of saving these prime habitats. Wetlands sustain nearly one-third of the Nation's endangered and threatened species, while providing breeding and wintering grounds for waterfowl and shore birds. During the past 56 years, the Federal duck stamp program has raised over \$400 million for wetland preservation.

This resolution has the strong support of Ducks Unlimited, Friends of the Minnesota Valley, Minnesota Conservation Federation, Minnesota Waterfowl Association, the University of Minnesota Band Alumni, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Postal Service, Wild Wings, the staff of the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge and local Minnesota businesses.

Undeniably, the Federal duck stamp has been one of our Government's most successful conservation programs.

I want to thank Mr. SAWYER, the chairman of the Census and Population Subcommittee, Mr. RIDGE, the ranking minority member, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee's chairman, Mr. FORD and all my House colleagues without whose support House Joint Resolution 599 would not have come to the House floor.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 599

Whereas the United States converts almost 500,000 acres of wetlands to other uses each year;

Whereas the Department of the Interior annually issues a Federal duck stamp and uses all funds raised by the sale of the stamp to acquire wildlife habitat in the form of wetlands that support both waterfowl and other wildlife;

Whereas the United States Postal Service sells more than 1,500,000 duck stamps annually;

Whereas citizens of the United States have purchased duck stamps for over half a century to support the conservation benefits of saving wetlands;

Whereas the sale of duck stamps has raised more than \$400,000,000 since the inception of the program, and these proceeds have been used to acquire almost 4,000,000 acres of prime habitat for the National Refuge System;

Whereas on Sunday, July 1, 1990, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior will issue a Federal duck stamp

that will go on sale at post offices nationwide;

Whereas according to popular tradition, the artist who designed the new stamp will be honored at a First Day of Sale Ceremony to be held near the hometown of the artist;

Whereas the United States Postal Service will host a ceremony at the new Minnesota Valley Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center to honor the fourteenth duck stamp to be designed by a Minnesota artist; and

Whereas the citizens of Minnesota have dedicated an afternoon program of ceremony, information, and family activities to support the conservation of wetlands and waterfowl: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That July 1, 1990, is designated as "National Ducks and Wetlands Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities and to support conservation efforts by purchasing duck stamps.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolutions just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF ENTERPRISE ZONE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Enterprise Zone Tax Incentives Act of 1990, legislation to address those areas of the country which have been bypassed by the economic recovery occurring generally in our country over the last decade. Many areas of the country have experienced increased incomes and close to full employment. On the other hand, the areas my bill addresses have not prospered. They have remained poor. Many of their residents fall within our country's 5.3-percent unemployment rate. As I said last fall when the Committee on Ways and Means held hearings on enterprise zone proposals, the lack of job opportunities, poor educational facilities, and job skills keyed to a changing economy form a vicious cycle of poverty in many of these areas.

My bill is a comprehensive effort to improve the economic and personal quality of life in these areas of the country. It would provide direct Federal incentives for employment, child care, housing, health insurance, and capital investment. It also recognizes that direct Federal tax incentives alone will not turn these areas around. Businesses want to oper-

ate in safe communities, with access to markets and quality schools and housing to attract good workers. In addition, startup businesses and other small businesses may not have the profits necessary to use Federal tax incentives. My bill would award extra Federal tax incentives to those communities demonstrating a financial commitment to their enterprise zones in the form of crime prevention, infrastructure, property and sales tax abatements, and loan or grants to small businesses.

It is essential that we find a way to inject new capital investment into these impoverished areas. We need to help new businesses develop and existing businesses thrive and remain in enterprise zones. This legislation would allow the deferral of capital gain on the sale of any asset wherever located if it were reinvested in an enterprise zone. It would share part of the risk of investing in an unproven enterprise zone business by making losses on stock or debt of those businesses fully deductible against ordinary income. It would provide accelerated depreciation for nonresidential real property. It would focus the use of small issue tax-exempt bonds in enterprise zones to encourage the development of manufacturing jobs and to help end the cycle of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, much would be gained by encouraging people to live in the same general area in which they work. Right now, the schoolteacher lives in the suburbs but teaches in the ghetto. The fireman lives on the far north or south side of the city, but works in the inner city. The policeman does the same thing. I'd like to see the teacher, the fireman, and the policeman, all work in the communities where their children are being educated, because if there's anything enterprising about the American system, it's the fact that we govern ourselves. So, if the kids are drag racing out in front of the poor person's home, but the policeman lives over on the northwest side, he says, "Oh, they do that down here." If they did it in his community, and his kids were playing out on the street, even if he was off duty, he would do something about the drag racing. The teacher wouldn't be looking at an IBM card and, saying, "Oh, this poor kid is failing." If the teacher's kid was going to school in the same school that he or she was teaching in, you can bet that that teacher would make an extra effort. Talk about an enterprise zone, that's the way to create activity in an inner city.

So, my bill doesn't just focus on bringing capital investment to an enterprise zone. It would give small business tax credits for employing people living in that same zone. It would give businesses credits for providing these same residents with health insurance. It would bring money for housing into the enterprise zones. It would bring in money for child care, both in the parents' apartment building or in their places of work. It would pay for rehabilitation of existing buildings, so that it wouldn't be necessary to tear them down and disrupt the fabric of a neighborhood. The more resources a State or local government was willing to dedicate to an area, the more likely that that area would be designated an enterprise zone and the more Federal tax incentives that zone will receive.

I do not believe that the administration's enterprise zone proposals would be effective in providing the broad range of incentives that would be necessary to revitalize our most impoverished areas. However, while I believe that we must look to innovative solutions to our Nation's most troubling problems, I am a realist about our ability and willingness to finance solutions. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my strongly held views on fiscal responsibility, my bill would place an annual cap on the amount of tax incentives an enterprise zone could use. That cap would be roughly equivalent to what the administration has said that its enterprise zone package would cost. If this enterprise zone proposal moves forward in the legislative process, it is my intention that the plan be fully financed in the course of the normal budget reconciliation process. My bill would provide for the designation of 25 zones over a 4-year period. It would require the effectiveness of the incentives to be studied, so that the Congress could determine whether to extend or expand the program after 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I request that a more detailed summary of my bill be included in the RECORD following this statement.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 5190, THE ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX INCENTIVES ACT OF 1990

GOALS

1. To revitalize distressed areas both economically and physically, with emphasis on new business starts, retention of existing businesses, and expansion of existing businesses.
2. To promote meaningful employment of EZ residents.
3. To encourage employees to live in the EZs in which they work.

CRITERIA

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is to designate 25 demonstration EZs by applying certain criteria discussed below to rank those applications submitted by State and local governments. Ten zones are to be designated for 1992, and five zones are to be designated for each year thereafter through 1995, in each case from applications submitted within a reasonable time before the year for which the designation is sought. The following criteria must be satisfied for a nominated area to be eligible for designation. They are similar to those contained in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 42 U.S.C. Sections 11501 et seq., although the proposal amends the Internal Revenue Code, but not the 1987 Housing Act.

1. Population.—The area must have a population of at least 4,000.
2. Distress.—The area must be one of pervasive poverty, unemployment, and general distress.
3. Size.—An EZ may not exceed 12 square miles. The borders of the EZ need not be entirely coterminous with the borders of census tracts; provided, however, that no EZ may consist of more than 3 noncontiguous areas. Each EZ with one continuous border and each zone comprised of noncontiguous areas, if any, must be located entirely within traditional neighborhood or community boundaries and, where appropriate, be bounded by major natural or man-made physical boundaries, such as bodies of water, railroad lines, or limited-access highways.

4. Unemployment rate.—The unemployment rate must not be less than 1.5 times the national unemployment rate, as determined by the appropriate available data.

5. Poverty rate.—The poverty rate for at least 90 percent of the populous census tracts within the EZ must be at least 20 percent, as determined by the most recent census data available.

6. State and local course of action.—The State and local governments in which the EZ is located must agree in writing that, during the period of EZ designation, they will follow a specified course of action to reduce the various burdens borne by employers or employees in the EZ. The course of action must include at least 3 of the following provisions (2 of which must be provisions h and i):

a. A reduction of tax rates or fees applying within the EZ.

b. An increase in the level of public services, or in the efficiency of the delivery of public services, within the EZ.

c. Actions to reduce, remove, simplify, or streamline paperwork requirements within the EZ.

d. Involvement in the program by public authorities or private entities, organizations, neighborhood associations, and community groups, particularly those within the nominated area, including a written commitment to provide jobs and job training for, and technical, financial, or other assistance to, employers, employees, and residents of the nominated area.

e. The giving of special preference to contractors owned and operated by members of any minority.

f. The gift (or sale at below fair market value) of surplus land in the EZ to neighborhood organizations agreeing to operate a business on the land.

g. The establishment of a program under which employers within the EZ may purchase health insurance for their employees on a pooled basis.

h. Establishment of a program to encourage local financial institutions to satisfy their obligations under the Community Reinvestment Act by making loans to EZ businesses, with emphasis on small (as defined in the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 632(a)) and/or start-up businesses.

i. The giving of special preference to (1) qualified low-income housing projects located in EZs in the allocation of the State housing credit ceiling (in the event that the low-income housing credit is extended past its current December 31, 1990 expiration date) and (2) facilities located in EZs in the allocation of the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

Once the Secretary of HUD has determined which nominated areas are eligible for designation as EZs, he must make designations on the basis of the following equally weighted factors:

1. The strength and quality of the contributions which have been promised as part of the courses of action, relative to the fiscal ability of the nominating State and local governments.

2. The effectiveness and enforceability of the guarantees that the courses of action will actually be carried out.

3. The level of commitments by private entities of additional resources and contributions to the economies of the nominated areas, including the creation of new or expanded business activities.

4. The average ranking of the nominated areas with respect to the poverty and unemployment criteria discussed above.

5. The potential for the revitalization of the nominated areas as a result of zone designation, taking into account particularly the number of jobs to be created and retained.

BUSINESS INCENTIVES

1. Wage credit.—A credit will be permitted to be claimed by small (no more than 100 employees) EZ employers equal to 10 percent of (a) wages paid by such employers to EZ resident employees and (b) the cost of health insurance provided to such employees. No credit may be claimed with respect to employees with wages in excess of \$30,000. The amount of the credit will reduce deductible wages.

2. Targeting of qualified small issue tax-exempt bond provisions.—Issuance of qualified small issue bonds will be permitted only for the benefit of EZ businesses.

3. Expansion of rehabilitation credit.—The rehabilitation tax credit will be permitted to be used in EZs even with respect to buildings placed in service after 1935, as long as the buildings are at least 30 years old.

4. Encouragement of investment.

a. Faster depreciation of non-residential real property.—The useful life of newly constructed non-residential real property located in EZs will be reduced to 28.5 years, so that straight-line depreciation over that period will approximate the 150 percent declining balance method over the current 31.5 years.

b. Capital gain deferral.—Deferral of tax on capital gain for 10 years from the sale or exchange of any asset whether located within or without the EZ will be permitted if the gain is invested in new EZ property; provided that deferral will terminate, and interest at the underpayment rate will be due from the date of gain realization, if the property purchased with the gain is sold within 5 years.

c. Ordinary loss treatment.—Losses on worthless stock or debt instruments of an EZ business will be treated as ordinary, rather than capital, in nature. The underlying investment must have been new capital in the EZ when made.

d. Loans to small and/or start-up businesses.—State and local governments must establish a program to encourage financial institutions to satisfy their obligations under the Community Reinvestment Act by making loans to small and/or start-up EZ businesses, as described under Criteria. State and local governments may receive increased EZ volume cap (with a maximum of a 10 percent increase) to the extent they make loans or grants to small and/or start-up EZ businesses, as described under State and Local Government Incentives.

5. Foreign trade zone status for EZs.—EZs are to receive priority in the designation of foreign trade zones. Foreign trade zone status will permit storage, exhibition, sale, and general dealing (e.g., repacking, assembling, distributing, sorting) with respect to foreign commerce without subjecting it to United States Customs laws.

LABOR INCENTIVES

1. Encouragement of EZ employment.—An employer wage and health insurance credit for compensation paid, and health insurance provided, to EZ resident employees will encourage employment of EZ residents.

2. Construction of low- and moderate-income housing.—In the event that the low-income housing credit is extended generally past its current December 31, 1990 expiration date, the existing 130 percent basis rule will apply only in EZs.

3. Child care facilities.

a. The proposal presumes that the earned income tax credit will be increased in child care legislation now before the Congress for all low-income people, not just those living in EZs.

b. Parts of EZ low-income rental buildings used for child care centers for children of EZ residents, with priority given to children of building residents, will be included in qualified basis for purposes of the low-income housing credit (in the event that the low-income housing credit is extended past its current December 31, 1990 expiration date).

c. The cost of employer-provided child care facilities located in EZ businesses will be eligible for 60-month amortization.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT INCENTIVES

1. Expansion of EZ cap.—The EZ cap will be expanded (with a 10 percent limit) if, and to the extent, matched by State and local tax abatements in EZs, State and local loans or grants to small and/or start-up businesses in EZs, or State and local expenditures in EZs for infrastructure or crime prevention.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Demonstration program.—The proposal is for a demonstration program of 25 zones designated over a 4-year period, beginning in 1992. Ten zones will be designated for 1992, 5 for 1993, 5 for 1994, and 5 for 1995. Each zone will be in effect for 24 years. Studies of the effectiveness of the proposal's incentives based on the first 3 years' experience with the program, is required to be delivered by Treasury and GAO by July, 1995.

2. Minimum tax.—All benefits will be coordinated with the minimum tax on individuals and corporations to prevent complete avoidance of taxation.

3. Volume cap.—A volume cap analogous to that for tax-exempt bonds and the low-income housing credit will control the revenue cost of this proposal to approximately the same amount as the Administration says that its bill would produce over the period from 1992 through 1995. The Federal/State and local government matching portion of the bill will, if fully utilized, raise the cost by 10 percent in each of those years.

REVENUE, THE ENVIRONMENT, AND ENERGY CONSERVATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, over 6,000 people attended the Annual Conference of the Air and Waste Management Association in Pittsburgh. One of Pittsburgh's distinguished citizens, Paul H. O'Neill, addressed the conference and set forth his proposal for addressing simultaneously the three problems of environmental quality, energy conservation, and the Federal budget deficit.

I commend Mr. O'Neill's remarks to my colleagues because of his unique experience as chairman and CEO of ALCOA, his tenure as Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget in the Ford administration, and his concern as a private citizen.

PRESENTATION TO THE AIR AND WASTE
MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, JUNE 25, 1990
(By Paul H. O'Neill)

I am happy to have this opportunity to speak today. As I look at the program, I find myself between a government official and an environmentalist. I assume my assigned label is "industrialist." After all, I am the Chairman of a large industrial company and, therefore, I must, by association, be "an industrialist" and can be counted on the deliver the "industrial viewpoint."

It is true I have been an industrialist for the past thirteen years but before that I was a government official for fifteen years—serving for ten of those years in the Executive Office of the President at the Office of Management and Budget.

But I am not here to speak as an industrialist, or as a former government official—or as an environmentalist. I'm here to speak for myself, as a citizen.

To begin—it seems particularly fitting that this conference is being held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania because this city exemplifies, environmentally, man's capacity for constructive change.

You can't be here very long without an "old-timer" telling you about life in Pittsburgh in 1950—when it was standard practice to take an extra shirt to work for a change at noon because the morning shirt was dirty by then from the pollution in the air—or about how they used to burn street lamps all day because the sun couldn't penetrate the stuff in the air. And even earlier in Pittsburgh's history when a British writer labeled the place "Hell with the lid off"—and no one objected.

The key point of remembering all of this is to celebrate the demonstrated capacity for constructive environmental change.

It is interesting to note that the roots of this change predate the Environmental Protection Agency and Rachel Carson's galvanizing book.

Before there was a broad-based environmental movement, the people of Pittsburgh set aside their historical practices and acted to clean up their environment. It took time to accomplish the change, and in the process, there were significant disruption for individuals and businesses. But few would dispute: Pittsburgh is better for the change.

This is the theme of what I want to say to you today. In order to accommodate to the imperative living with our environment, we must change. We need to plan the change. We need to accept the fact that change will create disruption in our established ways of doing things. We need to be flexible in our policy—prepared to change if our interventions don't produce the desired consequences, but above all, we need to get on with change.

Now, as I think about the environment, nothing seems clearer to me than the seemingly unseverable connection between the condition of the environment and energy utilization. In fact, if we were limited to only one policy intervention to improve the environmental condition and future prospect of the United States, I would choose a policy aimed at energy productivity and conservation. And because I think our economic system does a great job of translating general incentives into specific actions, my choice of a policy instrument would be a Federal tax on energy.

The pros and cons of such policy have been debated endlessly over the last twenty years. It seems to me, we should stop debating and act. The literature is full of specific ideas as to how we should impose an energy

tax—everything from a tax on oil or gasoline to a BTU tax—to the current talk about a carbon tax.

I don't have a personal favorite; each one has its own complications. But however we intervene, our policy should be aimed at energy productivity and conservation. Our policy intervention should be large enough to be meaningful but not so quickly implemented that it shuts down our economy. In an economy that is running at a rate of over \$5 trillion, we do have some latitude, especially if we think about a phased-in tax that gives individuals and businesses fair warning of an impending change.

In order of magnitude, I believe we should be thinking about a tax of about \$40 to \$50 billion per year—when fully phased in.

That would imply a BTU tax of about 12 percent on current value, or a \$10 per barrel tax on all oil consumption or a 40 cent per gallon increase in motor fuel taxes.

There is much dispute about the distributional effects of these different taxes and a clamor about the competitive implications for our industries but it helps me to put these into perspective when I remember that the average national price of gasoline was \$1.39 per gallon in 1981—compared to \$1.15 in 1989.

Incidentally, in inflation adjusted dollars, that is a 40 percent drop.

From the point of view of an individual driving 10,000 miles per year in a car with 20 mile per gallon fuel efficiency, a 10 cent per gallon gasoline tax would mean \$50 per year or 13 cents per day.

In any event, the consequences of a meaningful energy tax are manageable and I believe the benefit to our environmental position are clear.

In addition, if the proceeds of an energy tax were dedicated to reducing the Federal debt, we would create a larger pool of societal savings and investment which would enhance our world economic competitive position.

To a former Federal budget official, this seems like an intervention made in social policy heaven—an action that benefits the environment while reducing energy consumption and the Federal debt.

The great curiosity is why we haven't done something along these lines long ago. Instead, we've limped along with analysis paralysis.

A favorite notion of policy analysts these days is "robustness." Essentially, a robust policy is one that can be changed to accommodate new information or different conditions. An energy tax could certainly meet the test of being a robust policy instrument.

So my call to you today is for you to become advocates for an energy tax. The Administration and the Congress are discussing budget and tax policy right now. They have certainly heard from you on all nuances of regulatory schemes as they have worked on the Clean Air Act. I venture to say they have heard very little from you on your willingness to lead the fight for an energy tax.

As you go about your deliberations over the next several days, I hope you will resolve to direct your activism toward the enactment of an energy tax.

PARENTS AS TEACHERS LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, in our national debate about education, we often overlook the most valuable teachers our children could ever hope to find—their parents. Through its Parents as Teachers program, Missouri has shown the value of early childhood education programs in preparing our youngest citizens of the future.

Today using Missouri's pioneering effort as a model, I am introducing legislation to bring the success of the Missouri program to families around the Nation. This legislation is designed to build on the success of the Missouri example, which began with pilot programs in Independence and three other locations and now serves 50,000 families statewide.

This bill is based on the principle that parents who take an early and active role in their child's education increase these youngsters changes for academic success and give them a lifelong interest in learning. In the process, they develop a greater sense of involvement in the well-being of their children. Through coordination with local school districts, this valuable program engages parents in a long-term partnership with their children's schools.

The Federal Parents as Teachers legislation would provide \$100 million in Federal grant money in the next five years for States wishing to create or expand their own early childhood education programs. As in Missouri, the national Parents as Teachers plan would provide for home visits by trained parent educators who would help design an individual program for each family. Parent would receive a wide range of useful and understandable information about the development of their children.

Far too many children in our society never see a doctor before they enter school and medical problems that can interfere with learning go undiagnosed. The National Parents as Teachers bill would address this problem by providing periodic health screenings for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers.

Parents from all walks of life face similar issues as they attempt to raise their children. This legislation—which would provide services to all families with children three and under—gives participating parents an opportunity to meet in groups and share their childrearing experiences.

It is my expectation that states will pick up an increasing share of the costs as the benefits of the program become apparent. In Missouri, for example participating children scored significantly higher on standardized tests than nonparticipants—a good indicator of future academic success. Many parents continue to take a active role in their child's education well beyond the end of the program.

Parents are the first and most important teachers a child will ever have. As a nation, we must give parents every possible means of assistance to help their children start with healthy and curious minds and sound bodies.

THE SAVINGS AND LOAN CRISIS DID NOT HAVE TO HAPPEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, every day newspapers, magazines, and radio and television are filled with stories about the savings and loan crisis and about the ultimate cost of the crisis to the taxpayers. It is estimated that the final cost to the taxpayers could reach as high as \$1 trillion when the cost of the interest on the 40-year bonds to pay for the debacle is included.

Our Government and the taxpayers of this country cannot afford the cost of the savings and loan crisis. At a time when the national debt is over \$3 trillion, there simply is not room in the Federal budget to pay for this tragedy.

President Bush has now proposed a tax increase, and many Government officials say that the tax increase is necessary in part to pay for the savings and loan crisis. I cannot support such a tax increase. A tax increase will be asking the American people to pay for the actions of a group of crooks who stole billions of dollars through the operation of savings and loan institutions.

Many States have adopted victim restitution programs under which victims of crimes receive payments from both the State, and in many cases the person, who committed the crime. The administration's tax increase proposal is victim restitution in reverse. The tax increase will be asking the victims of the crimes, the taxpayers, to pay to clean up the mess made by the crooks. And that is not right.

But perhaps the saddest part of the savings and loan crisis was that it did not have to happen. We must go back to 1980 to find the origins of the problem, and to study the reasons that the crisis need not have occurred.

In 1980, Congress passed the Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act. In short, this legislation began the deregulation process of financial institutions in general, and savings and loans, in particular. Among the items in that bill was an increase in the insurance provided by the Federal Government to bank depositors from \$40,000 an account to \$100,000 per account. Virtually every story written about the savings and loan crisis blames the increase in deposit insurance for a major portion of the problem. I agree with that analysis. It is easy to see now how the \$100,000 insurance increase was to blame for the problem.

But in 1980, a decade ago, I saw the problem, and spoke out about it at that time. In 1980 I was a member of the conference committee that ultimately wrote the ill-fated Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act. I warned during those conference committees that if we wrote a bill along the lines that were ultimately adopted, that it would lead to tragedy.

I predicted in 1980 that the financial institutions of our country, particularly the savings and loan industry, would be severely damaged by deregulation. I predicted virtually on a line-by-line basis what was going to happen to the savings and loan industry.

Unfortunately, not many people listened. I was the only member of that conference committee from either the House or the Senate who refused to sign the conference report as

a sign of protest against a bad bill. Members of that conference committee pleaded with me to go along, or at least to sign the conference report, but I resisted because I knew it was a document dedicated to tragedy.

When the conference report reached the House floor, I was one of only 13 Members of this body who voted against the conference report. Had that conference report been defeated, the savings and loan crisis would never have happened, and the American people would not face a tax increase in order to pay for the crimes of the savings and loan crooks.

One of the biggest mistakes made with the 1980 law was not only the increase in the deposit coverage from \$40,000 to \$100,000, but of just as great importance was the fact that the premiums paid by the financial institutions for this coverage were not raised. When have you ever heard of an insurance company increasing your coverage by more than 100 percent and not increasing your premium? Any insurance company that would operate in that manner would soon go bankrupt, and that is exactly what happened with the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and that is the path being taken by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The failure of the 1980 Deregulation Act was guaranteed shortly after its passage when the Reagan administration came into office. The Reagan administration came into office with the promise to take Government off the backs of business. We now see that is exactly what the Reagan administration did. It took Government off the backs of business and put it right on the backs of taxpayers, who now must pay the cost of the savings and loan crisis.

During the decade of the eighties, I constantly pleaded with the administration to beef up the examiner force at the various Federal bank regulatory agencies. I pointed out that deregulation would make it too easy for financial operators to violate the public trust, and they must be watched closely. But instead of hiring more bank and savings and loan examiners, the Reagan administration actually decreased the number. One bank regulator went to the Reagan administration and asked for 450 new examiners. He was told he could only have 35.

During this same period, the savings and loan industry, which prior to 1980 had financed 80 percent of all of the new homes in America, began moving away from home financing into highly speculative-type business lending. Since there were very few examiners to check on these high flyer deals, the industry continued to move in that direction, and eventually the industry saw its home financing portfolio reduced to only 40 percent of all the new homes in America.

It must be pointed out that there were many savings and loans that operated in a sound and profitable manner. But it should also be pointed out that in virtually every one of these good institutions the majority of their loans were in single-family residence and in the area served by that institution. In short, the institutions that stuck to home lending did not get into trouble. And they are not costing the taxpayers any money today.

But when the switch away from home lending started, I pleaded with the regulators to keep the savings and loan industry in home lending and not to allow investments such as windmill farms, race horse sperm banks, and gambling casinos. But once again, my pleas were ignored.

When the Nation finally realized last year what I realized in 1980, I fought hard to make certain that those responsible for the crisis would pay. I authored legislation that would force officials of S&L's that didn't follow the regulations to pay a fine of \$1 million a day. I authored an amendment that would provide \$75 million to the Justice Department on an annual basis to go after the S&L crooks. And I also made sure that the industry would no longer continue its high flying ways. My amendment requiring the industry to have 70 percent of its investments in home mortgage lending was adopted overwhelmingly.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue to try to pick up the pieces of the savings and loan crisis, we must remember that this was not an act of nature. It was a man-made disaster. It is a crisis of perhaps the greatest financial magnitude in the history of this Nation. The sad story is, however, that it is a crisis that did not have to happen.

A REVIEW OF THE THRIFT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaFALCE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this special order to review: First, the history of the problems in the thrift industry; second, difficulties with the FIRREA legislation; and third, some of the issues that I believe we must confront in the future.

I. THE HISTORY OF THE THRIFT CRISIS

The history of the problems in the thrift industry bears recounting. One of my major concerns is that we will learn the wrong lessons from this thrift crisis. Too many glibly say that deregulation caused the thrift crisis. In fact, a number of complicated factors brought us where we are today. Unless we understand the sources of the problems, we will be unable to correct the situation.

I believe the thrift crisis has evolved through three distinct phases: First, the interest rate mismatch phase; second, the bad asset, coupled with poor supervision, phase; and, now, third, the FIRREA phase.

A. PHASE I—THE INTEREST RATE MISMATCH

In many ways, the original problem—the interest rate mismatch problem—was quite fundamental: the market changed. Significant changes occurred in financial delivery systems and monetary policy, and thrift institutions were not in a position to respond. In the 1960's, deposit interest rate controls had been extended to the thrift business as a way to keep mortgage rates low. But, by the early 1970's, highly regulated depository institutions began to face unbelievable new competition from new entrants into the industry who were playing by a different set of rules. The Merrill Lynch and Prudential Baches created money market mutual funds and threatened to

make a dinosaur of the traditional financial services sector. The result was that the new competition in the industry virtually inhaled your deposits. We had never seen such massive disintermediation in the industry, and it looked as if thrifts would become extinct.

The economics of the situation necessitated some response. The 1980 Monetary Control Act was passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion. This legislation was the culmination of the effort to deal with the disintermediation issue by deregulating liabilities—that is, lifting the ceiling on the interest rates depositors would receive—and a phased, 6-year deregulation of bank and thrift deposit rates was initiated.

But in trying to solve one problem, another was created—a serious interest rate mismatch between the asset and liability side of the balance sheet. Thrifts, needing to offer higher returns to customers to prevent deposits from going to money market funds, were nevertheless locked into fixed rates of return on long-term mortgages. And it took a long time for variable rate mortgages to become a norm of the industry in some areas.

In response, efforts were made to assist the asset side of the balance sheet so that thrifts could diversify their portfolios and hopefully improve their earnings. New powers were granted to thrift institutions by State legislatures followed by the Garn-St Germain Act at the Federal level. In retrospect, criticism has been leveled at those decisions made in 1980 and 1982. But it is important to recall again that these were not hotly contested or partisan issues—both bills were embraced by the administration and passed by overwhelming bipartisan margins. They reflected a significant consensus that it was impossible for the industry to remain as it was and survive. The structural problems inherent in the thrift industry had been recognized as early as 1961, when the Commission on Money and Credit recommended that thrifts be given substantially greater flexibility regarding their investments. The bills passed in the early 1980's were not some sort of radical anomaly, but responsible efforts to bring the industry back to health. They reflected the thinking of numerous expert commissions, several administrations, and a number of congressional studies over a period of years that expansion of the asset powers of thrift institutions was essential to their viability and survival. Those expert judgments should not now be forgotten in a frenzied effort to place blame.

What is true, though, is that many States went much, much further in granting new investment authority to thrifts, making and implementing investment decisions that the Federal insurance fund had to ultimately stand behind. It has become axiomatic to emphasize the benefits of our dual banking system, and there are benefits. But those benefits appear far less clear when Federal taxpayers end up paying the bill for the actions of what were largely State-chartered institutions operating under lax or nonexistent State regulation and supervision. That is an abuse of the system, and must not be permitted to happen again.

In addition to the expansion of asset powers, in order to prevent the industry from being overwhelmed by the problems it faced, the Reagan administration and the Congress

moved together to bolster the industry's situation through a variety of devices, including net worth certificates, deferred losses on asset sales, and favorable accounting treatment in other areas, including the acquisition of failing institutions. These devices did not contribute to real earnings or net worth. But they did delay insolvency and bought time, allowing institutions to stay alive until they could, hopefully, work their way out of their problems. Many institutions that used that time to work their way out of their interest rate mismatch problems did so; many if not most institutions that used that time to grow their way out of the problem did not do so.

B. PHASE II—THE BAD ASSET/POOR SUPERVISION PHASE

Here, we enter the second state of the thrift crisis. As interest rate problems abated, asset quality problems arose. It is crucial to distinguish between the interest rate mismatch problems of the early 1980's and the bad asset problems of the mid and late 1980's. They are fundamentally different.

A variety of factors had an influence in this second phase. Some institutions simply did not have the professional expertise to move into the higher risk activities in a prudent manner. Real estate markets subsequently deteriorated most in precisely those areas where loans could be most readily booked. You had a convergence of regional economic collapse precisely where State laws were most lenient and State supervision, most weak. Geographic constraints prevented the spreading of risk. And plain old-fashioned crooks became a significant element in the business. It was, indeed, a perfect setup—every high-rolling operator knew that all profits were his, and all losses belonged to the taxpayer. It was not a scenario that would induce prudence. It was a scenario that cried out for close scrutiny and supervision. Instead, we had a major breakdown in examination, supervision, and regulation. That was the major problem.

State regulators were asleep at the switch, and Federal regulators did nothing to awaken them, despite the insurance funds they should have been protecting.

At a time when it was critical that the Bank Board protect the insurance fund by close monitoring of institutions, the closing down of insolvent institutions, and the placing of appropriate constraints on growth and lending, the pressure coming from the administration was for a hands-off policy. I fault the philosophy that government should not govern, that the private sector can be trusted to play—unsupervised—with taxpayer dollars, with insured funds.

Beginning in the early 1980's, the Bank Board, with substantial congressional support, did repeatedly seek from the administration more examiners and a higher pay scale for its examination and supervision staff, so the industry, now operating under new lending laws, could be closely monitored. But those efforts were stymied by an administration bent on not governing. OMB blocked necessary increases in the size and pay scale of the examination force. That is part of the historical record. In fact, the administration actually cut back on manpower within the regulatory agencies. The theory was that the private sector

should not be burdened by a regulatory presence. We can see the result.

Only after many years was the Bank Board able to circumvent the administration's resistance by transferring its examination staff into the Home Loan Bank System. This was a move with which I strongly concurred. But by then, much of the damage had been done and it was too late.

By that time, it was clear that a problem was developing. But no one was really sure of its scope. The problem festered, while Congress continued to operate in an information vacuum.

Congress relied on the Bank Board and Treasury for their estimates of the problem over the years, and they either didn't have or wouldn't share information regarding the full scope of the problem. I believe that you would now admit that your league itself was, at that time, also a significant part of the problem. The industry kept insisting we had, at most, a \$2 to \$3 billion, perhaps \$5 billion, problem, and strongly resisted any meaningful congressional attempt to move on this issue.

In 1986, Congress debated a \$15 billion recapitalization of FSLIC, but the bill bogged down in conference on an unrelated issue, the nonbank bank loophole. Almost everyone in Congress was concerned about this. I was never concerned about the so-called nonbank bank loophole. I didn't think it was a problem, or even a loophole. I thought it increased competition in the industry and was pro-consumer. And I wanted to deal with real problems, such as bad assets and poor supervision.

In early 1987, the Banking Committee had hearings on the thrift issue. I always and consistently favored at least a \$15 billion recapitalization of the FSLIC and the administration consistently stated that a \$15 billion recap was adequate. Unfortunately, the House only voted for a \$5 billion recap, responsive largely to intense pressure from the thrift industry, which continued to minimize the scope of the problem. This, despite floor speeches by Speaker JIM WRIGHT and Banking Committee Chairman ST GERMAIN strongly urging a full \$15 billion recapitalization, a fact often overlooked by most commentators.

The conference finally came to agreement on a \$7.5 billion recap, half of what the administration sought, with, however, an annual limitation of approximately \$3 billion on the FICO bonds that could be issued, ostensibly because the industry argued that the market could not sustain bonds beyond that level but, in fact, to minimize cost to the industry. I argued that the industry was minimizing the problem so it could avoid paying for it, since the FICO bond program relied on industry funding, and could then turn to the taxpayer in the next administration. Whether that was or was not your intent, that is precisely what happened.

In subsequent hearings in 1988, the administration was again given the opportunity to define the nature and scope of the problem, but no new information was forthcoming. Indeed, as late as September of 1988, Treasury testified before the Banking Committee that \$15 billion would be adequate.

Toward the end of 1988, I again attempted to go beyond the \$7.5 billion authorized and introduced legislation that would have increased the level of recapitalization to the full \$15 billion sought by the administration and eliminated the annual cap on bond issuance. The bill was reported out of the Banking Committee. But I was stymied in the Rules Committee. Industry opposition was one of the principal reasons.

As the problem continued to fester, we heard from Vice President Bush's and Governor Dukakis' campaigns. What we heard was silence. For if they discussed the problem, it would be incumbent upon them to discuss solutions. And since the problem and the solution were bad news, they didn't choose to discuss them. Instead they discussed Willy Horton and the flag.

After the election, Secretary Brady finally began a serious effort to diagnose the problem. To do so, he brought in individuals who helped study the 1987 stock market crash to work with Dick Breeden, now SEC Chairman, in the study of the issue. I gave them credit for coming in with a sincere effort to diagnose and offer prescriptions for the problem. Unfortunately, I believed that the Bush administration's diagnosis was seriously flawed and the prescriptions, while perhaps appropriate for the illnesses perceived by the administration, were destined to make the real problems far worse and to turn a regional problem into a national crisis.

C. PHASE III—FIRREA AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

That brings us to the third phase of the crisis. From its inception, I voiced major objections to the FIRREA legislation. I believed that legislation and its implementation have helped turn a primarily regional problem into what is now a national crisis.

What are the objections I had then and have now to FIRREA, the third and most serious phase of the thrift crisis?

The assumptions: First of all, FIRREA was based on a series of wild eyed, unbelievably rosy assumptions regarding interest rates, deposit growth in the industry, recovery level on assets, and unrealistic estimates of the ultimate industry contribution. As a result of all of these false assumptions, the administration could and did grossly underestimate the ultimate cost of the bailout to the taxpayers.

Funding mechanism: My second, and perhaps my strongest, objection was the funding mechanism. We were borrowing money to deal with the problem, over a long-term period, first 30 years, now 40 years. Indeed, we might go on borrowing forever.

When do you use long-term money? For capital expenditures. You don't lend long-term for present consumption, for operations and maintenance. If you did, you'd be fired. And you would never lend long-term money for past consumption, money already spent. If you did, you would not only be fired, you'd be institutionalized. But the President and Congress did it, and foisted the problem on to future generations. But we couldn't get the media to focus on this issue—just on being tough, or whether the money should be on- or off-budget. In my view, the on- versus off-budget issue was never the critical issue. The key issue was whether the costs should be on- or off-Gramm-Rudman. If the costs had

been counted toward the Gramm-Rudman targets, this generation would be paying for its problems, as is appropriate, rather than foisting those problems on future generations.

Regional inequity: The third problem I had was the regional inequity. Most of the problems were concentrated in the Southwest because of State-chartered institutions operating under State law and State supervision. The States have obligations as well as rights under the dual banking system and I believe that they should have made a contribution to the cost of the bailout. They were not required to do so, and the result could be a massive redistribution of wealth to the Southwest. Fourth, the problem has now spread throughout the rest of the country, creating a national crisis. How did this happen? Because of the way that we treated the problem—not of failed, but frail—institutions.

Treatment of problem institutions: The administration's approach erred, in my view, in adding unnecessary new shocks to a system already reeling from previous ones. FIRREA was the largest shock to the system. New capital requirements were essential, but the precipitous application of new requirements in some cases can create more problems than it will solve. In fact, the administration's own original proposal granted regulators far more discretion in the application of new capital standards than did the final product. Ultimately, the impulse of the administration and some Members of Congress to play tough to the media inhibited a discriminating analysis of the issue.

I thought that meaningful distinctions needed to be drawn between basket case institutions that have no hope of recovery and are only incurring new losses that will increase taxpayer liability, and other weakened institutions, who have problems, but are in a position to gradually, but substantially and consistently, increase their tangible capital position. To treat these institutions alike was to unnecessarily increase taxpayer liability.

A particular problem that raised, in my view, fundamental questions of equity was also not effectively addressed. A number of institutions, in cooperation with the Bank Board, had entered into supervisory agreements as the result of acquisitions of failing institutions. In imposing new requirements across the board on the industry, the Government in effect broke these contracts, putting many of these institutions into impossible situations and creating total, absolute uncertainty about any future government deals whatsoever among potential acquirors. Where institutions were making tangible progress under existing supervisory agreements, I believe some greater accommodation should have been made.

Some exemption authority was given, and I hope it will be used effectively. But I had concerns at the time, and these concerns continue, that the provision does not give the regulator adequate discretion. Such discretion is critical if we are not to unnecessarily place weak but viable institutions into the group that the taxpayer must eventually bailout.

Further, I believe that the administration's implementation of FIRREA has resulted in our rushing institutions into conservatorship to no real end. The RTC is now inundated with a caseload far in excess of its ability to resolve

in a timely fashion. Meanwhile, conservatorship status in and of itself has a significantly negative effect on the institution's franchise value, making the acquisition process all the more difficult. Nor has the RTC been substantially successful in eliminating high-cost deposits in Government-run institutions.

The ever-mounting caseload has also induced the RTC to develop targets regarding the number of institutions it will attempt to resolve within a certain time frame, so the appearance of steady progress can be maintained. But the progress is not real progress. Deadlines for "resolution" give potential buyers undue leverage and allow acquirors to make a killing. Moreover, little is actually resolved. In most cases, whole thrifts are not being sold. Most typically, deposits are purchased for a great premium and the bad assets go to the RTC, pushing the real problems to the future, and at a much, much higher cost to the taxpayer.

Impact on strong institutions: We have increased the vulnerability of those who have long run a sound and profitable business by specializing in home mortgage lending. The thrift charter is less valuable today than it once was, to put it mildly. Relatively higher premiums have placed thrift institutions at a competitive disadvantage. Pressures on the Home Loan Bank System have decreased dividends flowing to member institutions. Many institutions argue that the QTL test unduly hampers their ability to effectively diversify. And because of both the real problems and the media presentation of them, the very name "savings and loan" has become a competitive disadvantage.

Nature and function of the RTC: But I think one of our fundamental problems in FIRREA as constructed may have been the belief that Government could somehow solve the problem by bringing it into the public sector, rather than working it out with the private sector. During the course of congressional deliberations on FIRREA, far too little attention was paid to the nature of the RTC or the oversight board and their respective functions.

In fact, the administration's compromise on the structure of the RTC was dropped in the Congress' lap during the waning hours of the conference, after weeks of internal debate within the executive branch over the balance of power between the Treasury and the RTC. The result was a convoluted structure which reflected no conclusive determination regarding the locus of decisionmaking authority and promoted ongoing tensions that have delayed the process of resolution.

Perceptions as to the fundamental nature and function of the RTC were unclear. Many anticipated that the RTC would be of a relatively skeletal nature, certainly not a massive new bureaucracy. Indeed, I recall administration officials saying they estimated the RTC might have no more than 100 employees. But the RTC has become this country's largest financial institution, with asset disposition responsibilities unmatched in our history. Such a misperception was possible because the administration also misperceived the course of case resolution. At the time, it was anticipated that the whole institutions transaction more typical of previous FDIC case resolutions

would be the likely approach. But with the Federal Government now a proven contract breaker, it has become clear that the private investor community has little appetite for whole thrifts.

Reforming deposit insurance: Finally, one of the most fundamental problems with FIRREA was what was not addressed at all—the need to reform our deposit insurance system. In addition to the expanded powers of State-chartered institutions, the lack of supervision at the State level, and a depressed economy in the Southwest, deposit insurance can be added to the mix of factors responsible for bringing about the thrift crisis. By increasing the level of deposit insurance from \$40,000 to \$100,000 in the Monetary Control Act of 1980, the intent was to draw more funds into the thrift industry after the outflow that had occurred when interest rates skyrocketed in the late 1970's.

But, as many tried to point out at the time and in the immediately following years, deregulation of interest rates had to be accompanied by increased supervision of thrifts and by fundamental reform of the deposit insurance system to insure that funds flowed to the stronger, more creditworthy thrifts, rather than to the high flyers that were willing to pay the highest rates.

Unfortunately, those warnings were not heeded. The most stunning abuse of the deposit insurance system may have been brokered deposits. Investors looking for risk free investments used Wall Street brokers to allocate their funds to those thrifts offering the highest CD rates. Any hope of market discipline was destroyed when investors were free to shop for the highest rate, with no thought given to the creditworthiness of the individual thrift issuing the CD, effectively shielded by deposit insurance from any risky investments that thrift made. In fact, the more troubled an institution, the higher its rates. This resulted in the thrifts that were least deserving of reward being rewarded with an inflow of deposits from around the country. These thrifts were then free to use these deposits to make high risk investments. Indeed, only such high risk investments could earn a high enough return to pay the high interest rates these thrifts were paying on their CD's. All the while, the thrift manager could be assured that the Government would pay for any risky investment that did not succeed.

It was indeed a downward spiral that resulted from the combination of deregulated interest rates, lack of supervision, and the use of brokered deposits. Although the FDIC and FSLIC attempted to restrain the use of brokered deposits, the Treasury Department under Don Regan opposed any effort to do so. The Regan Treasury was very effective in rallying Wall Street to oppose any restrictions on what the FDIC and FSLIC considered an abuse of the system. As a result, brokered deposits continued to fuel the thrift debacle, allowing the worst thrifts to thrive and their owners and management to enrich themselves without any personal risk. This, in turn, forced what had been healthy, well-run institutions to increase their own rates, and distort their own business practices in order to survive in this poisoned environment.

Some significant changes were made in FIRREA—for example, giving the FDIC greater authority to withdraw or withhold insurance from State-chartered institutions. But, I believe that the entire concept of deposit insurance must be re-examined. We have lost sight of the original intent of deposit insurance, which was to protect small unsophisticated depositors. The incredible abuse of the deposit insurance system by the use of brokered deposits should be sufficient to convince us of the need to drastically reform the existing system. Although it can be argued that deposit insurance has been beneficial in preventing bank runs and affording stability to the financial system, we are now being forced to recognize the cost attached to a deposit insurance system that is not properly managed. And those costs are monumental. We must act to reduce the exposure of the American taxpayer.

We need to face a fundamental element of our market economy—the need for market discipline. We can choose to ignore that reality, but we do so at taxpayer expense. We might even remember that President Roosevelt had serious qualms about the viability of a deposit insurance scheme, believing that it would allow high risk institutions to be subsidized by more conservative, well-managed institutions. Some people have foresight.

II. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

So where do we go from here? We cannot undo what has been done. The problem has been magnified unbelievably, especially in this third phase, from the beginning of 1989 to the present. But if we recognize where we have gone wrong, we can change course and deal more effectively with the continuing problems we face.

What direction should we take on some key issues?

Funding: With respect to the funding, it is now clear that significantly higher levels of funding will be necessary. Secretary Brady has emphasized that it is illegitimate to factor in interest costs when discussing the cost of the bailout. I disagree fundamentally. Those interest expenses are real, as is the burden they impose on our taxpayers. Interest payments on Government debt account for an ever growing portion of expenditures—moneys that could otherwise be turned toward productive investment. It is irresponsible for us to blithely add to that burden and then treat that additional burden as somehow irrelevant to the discussion. Stanford University recently made an estimate that, because of paying interest on interest on interest, we are dealing ultimately with a \$1 trillion problem.

Whatever we do in the future, let us put it on budget and on Gramm-Rudman and deal with it in this generation. I hope we will come to recognize that we are engaging in massive child abuse of our children and grandchildren, and stop it.

I believe we should pay for the thrift bailout through a special surtax. I called for such a surtax in 1989. Two weeks ago, Felix Rohatyn called for one. To ensure that the burden is shared as equitably as possible, that surtax should be imposed on a more progressive system than the one we have now—which, in my view, requires decreasing payroll taxes and making the overall income tax structure

more progressive by raising the rate on upper income individuals.

What's the administration position? The administration has suggested that Congress might provide the RTC with a blank check through the back door using the budget resolution to get the RTC a permanent appropriation like that on interest payments on Federal debt. Again, I fundamentally disagree and will forcefully oppose that approach. I believe the Congress will too. It is painful, to be sure, but Congress must know on an ongoing basis how much money is necessary, why, and how it is to be spent. There can be no blank check.

Treatment of problem institutions: How should we deal with problem institutions? Driving institutions relentlessly into conservatorship status may make for good press and reduce agency vulnerability to congressional criticism. In fact congressional criticism has been responsible for some of the regulators' overly ambitious action and the increasing stringency in reviewing portfolios. But the relentless effort to push institutions into conservatorship status is increasing taxpayer cost. Institutions with no hope of recovery should not be permitted to incur further losses that will increase the taxpayer's burden. But institutions that show a good prospect of recovery should not be driven relentlessly into conservatorship by a too rigid and precipitous application of inflexible standards. The regulators require some reasonable flexibility, and they should not be afraid to apply it intelligently. And we should not make them afraid to apply it intelligently. That will require much less demagoguery from the Administration and the Congress.

For example, the FDIC has noted that it has insufficient flexibility to grant waivers regarding the powers available to state-chartered savings associations even where such waivers would be beneficial to the thrift and, in the judgment of the FDIC, pose no risk to the insurance fund. Issues such as these must be reexamined.

Reducing taxpayer costs: We must also place a premium on reducing taxpayer costs. If there is value to be realized in failed or failing institutions, that value should act to defray Government, and therefore, taxpayer obligations. For example, we may have to consider increasing the FDIC's authority to ensure that taxpayer obligations are not unduly increased, S&L management does not unduly benefit, and that holding companies cannot hide from their legitimate obligations. FIRREA gives the FDIC, in its role as conservator or receiver, the power to repudiate any contracts that are burdensome. This new power will be particularly helpful in the repudiation of golden parachutes. However, the FDIC would appear to need additional authority to prohibit or limit excess or abusive golden parachutes. They should be given this authority.

And we must fully support legislation which I hope will be enacted soon to keep S&L crooks from hiding their assets behind personal bankruptcy. This issue, too, should be addressed as soon as possible.

FIRREA also establishes the cross guarantee liability of insured affiliated banks and savings associations to prevent multi-institution

holding companies from abandoning failing insured affiliates. But, there appear to be loopholes in the provision that are creating an incentive for holding companies to sell or otherwise separate the healthy insured institutions prior to a failure to avoid this obligation. We should examine this carefully.

It also appears that State law is having the effect of increasing taxpayer obligations in purchase and assumption transactions. In a number of cases, State law provides that the RTC must share any proceeds from an institution's assets with unsecured creditors including uninsured depositors, so the RTC recoups only a portion of available funds. This necessarily increases the taxpayer obligation, and this too should be examined.

Asset disposition: What of asset disposition? We are now making too many decisions for the wrong reasons. Decisions as to whether assets should be held or rapidly sold should be a function of what will do the least damage to the market and maximize value. The decision should not be driven by what best serves RTC's increasing need for funds or how we might best evade the fundamental budget issue. I think those concerns are the primary motivation right now. We should explore all alternative approaches for securing greater involvement by the private sector in asset management and disposition.

Organizational changes: With respect to organizational changes, I do not want to delve into such changes right now. The RTC and the Treasury have made some progress in working out tensions in the organizational structure, and things are beginning to function more smoothly. I do not want to disrupt that at this juncture. But I do believe that the regulatory structure in financial services requires significant reorganization and any further changes in the structure of thrift industry regulation should be a part of that comprehensive process.

Rethinking the structure of financial services: Let me turn to that comprehensive process or rethinking the structure of our financial services industry. We must be willing to rethink whether the solution devised last year deals effectively with the problems as we now see it, and how that solution relates to other reforms we must undertake in the financial services industry.

We know a great deal now that was not generally known when we began deliberating on the thrift crisis: the problem is much bigger than most thought; the appetite for sick thrifts in the investor community much smaller; the asset disposition problem much more substantial; the real estate market much softer. Given this new information, we must consider whether everyone's interest is best served by nationalizing S&L's as quickly as possible, as is being done, and then having the government try to manage and sell an ever mounting stockpile of assets.

In truth, our archaic and segmented financial services industry is badly in need of complete restructuring. As chairman of the House Banking Committee Task Force on the International Competitiveness of U.S. Financial Institutions, it has become clear to me that a highly compartmentalized and fractionalized financial services industry cannot survive in this newly competitive internationally driven finan-

cial world—the inherent inefficiencies are just too debilitating and costly to society. We must overcome artificial barriers, such as State branching restrictions that are inhibiting acquisitions, that preclude necessary and appropriate mergers, consolidations, and acquisitions from occurring so that we can build capital strength in those institutions that remain viable.

Finally, it is not for the Government, but the market, to decide the fate of the thrift industry. I believe there is a place in our financial services system for institutions, whatever they're called, which specialize in mortgage finance. Whether those institutions are commercial banks, or mortgage banks or thrifts should depend on who is the best and most efficient provider of particular services.

The Government should neither tax the industry out of existence nor insure its continued place as a separate industry. In that regard, those factors that arguably deny the thrift industry a level playing field should be reassessed—the premium structure, the appropriation of district bank earnings, the nature of the QTL, restrictions on transferring from SAIF to BIF.

III. CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, we have a monumental problem on our hands. The thrift industry problem has been transformed into a national crisis unlike any in our national history. We won't deal with it in 1990, unless there is a lame duck session, and even then comprehensive action is unlikely. But whether in a lame duck session or in 1991, we must address three issues: revisit the FIRREA legislation, reexamine the deposit insurance system, and address the whole question of restructuring the totality of our financial services industry. These issues are inextricably interrelated.

□ 1640

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, on July 17 the U.S. House will have an opportunity for the first time since 1982 to vote on a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Over the course of the last two decades, the American people when polled on an annual basis have between 70 and 80 percent agreed that the Congress of the United States should balance the Federal budget on an annual basis and not continue to mount the large Federal debt that we have today.

As most of us know, many of our States operate under a balanced budget amendment to their constitution. They must in fact on an annual basis bring about a State budget that has receipts and expenditures in balance, and a failure to do that is a violation of their constitution. So their legislatures automatically and in a fiscally responsible way simply comply.

Of course, if the public feels necessary to shift priorities of programs or to raise additional revenues for new programs or expansion of programs, then they do the wise and judicious thing. They vote for tax increases and they go home to their constituents to convince them or to otherwise be convinced that they have done the right or the wrong thing.

That is why I and others since 1984 have worked in a bipartisan manner to build a majority consensus in this House that someday we could ultimately vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and I over a year ago introduced House Joint Resolution 268. This resolution is the balanced budget amendment to our Constitution that now has 248 cosponsors. A week ago last Tuesday, 218 Members of this House signed a discharge petition that discharged the rule that will now allow this issue to come to the floor. The leadership of the House this week agreed that we would use the rule that we have discharged and allow full debate and a vote on this issue on July 17.

Let me now read for the body this very simple amendment, one that I believe will set new standards and demand an entire reforming of the budget process of the House, and in fact that budget process of this Congress and the Government itself:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after its submission to the States for ratification:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Prior to each fiscal year, the Congress and the President shall agree on an estimate of total receipts for that fiscal year by enactment into law of a joint resolution devoted solely to that subject. Total outlays for that year shall not exceed the level of estimated receipts set forth in such joint resolution, unless three-fifths of the total membership of each House of Congress shall provide, by a rollcall vote, for a specific excess of outlays over estimated receipts.

"SECTION 2. The public debt of the United States shall not be increased unless three-fifths of the total membership of each House shall provide by law for such an increase by a rollcall vote.

"SECTION 3. Prior to each fiscal year, the President shall transmit to the Congress a proposed budget for the United States Government for that fiscal year in which total outlays do not exceed total receipts.

"SECTION 4. No bill to increase revenue shall become law unless approved by a majority of the total membership of each House by a rollcall vote.

"SECTION 5. The provisions of this article are waived for any fiscal year in which a declaration of war is in effect.

"SECTION 6. Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States (except those derived from borrowing.) Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States except for those for repayment of debt principal.

"SECTION 7. This article shall take effect beginning with fiscal year 1993 or with the second fiscal year beginning after its ratification, whichever is later."

So today I have read into the RECORD what is our proposed constitutional amendment. It is simple and straightforward, clear and easy to understand, setting forth a procedure and a process that for the first time asks the President of the United States to submit a balanced budget. For the first time it asks both the Congress and the President to agree on a revenue estimate and that to change that revenue estimate would require a three-fifths vote, to agree that if a debt ceiling increase is necessary that that, too, would require a three-fifths vote of the whole House; in other words, very tough votes, and if revenue increases were deemed necessary, to require a majority of the total membership, a constitutional majority, in a rollcall vote. A simple process, a tool that has been necessary for over 200 years, that this Congress because the Constitution is silent to the issue has been without.

Thomas Jefferson said years following the ratification of the Constitution that if he had to make but one change in the Constitution, it would be to disallow the Federal Government the ability to borrow; in other words, to insist that expenditures only be that derived equal to the receipts on an annual basis; in other words, to provide for a balanced budget to our Constitution.

Today this Congress, for all intents and purposes, has lost the political will to be fiscally responsible. We have not had a balanced budget in our Government since 1969. Since World War II ended, we have had only six balanced budgets, of which only one has occurred since 1960.

When I say we have lost the political will to be fiscally responsible, I think I speak the obvious truth. Although many of our colleagues oppose the idea of a constitutional amendment, I have suggested to them on more than one occasion that it is the clear and necessary tool that provides them, if they deem it necessary, with the political safeguards and the protection to go home on an annual basis, to tell their citizens that they could only vote for those issues of public policy that required expenditures that were within the confines of the total receipts so designated by the Congress itself.

Today our voters know that if we truly wish to, we can spend beyond

our ability to gain receipts. In other words, we can borrow at will as this Congress has for the last several decades to mount today the phenomenal debt that is nearing \$3 trillion, that commands on an annual basis now well over \$100 billion a year just to pay the interest on the national debt.

Our President and the leaders of this House and the leaders of the other body today would not be meeting in summit if this balanced budget amendment were in place. There would simply be no need to. That would all have been determined by an act of the budget and an act of this Congress itself agreeing with the Executive on the total outlay and the total receipts and then to move forth in the discussion and the debate of public policy and public priority as to where those dollars ought to be spent.

Whether we like it or not, whether this country or those who represent this country in the Congress of the United States will admit, we are truly at a crossroads. We are in a major budget crisis today. This is the second time in a decade that the executive and the legislative branches have met in summit announcing a major budget crisis and the need to arrive at new policies and changes and new directions if we are to stave off fiscal insolvency, or at least if we are to be responsive to the Budget Act as we know it.

Several years ago we passed the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Budget Limitation Act. That was to set forth and to bring in balance this year the Federal budget; but of course, we all know that as we pass laws on the floor of this House and as they are signed by the President, they can be changed just the way they have been passed.

□ 1650

Although the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act has provided some fiscal discipline, it has failed to balance the budget as was its intent and was its requirement when it was originally passed.

Why has it been possible to avoid the law or to change the law? Simply because it is so easy to do. We do not have the people's law, the Constitution that this Congress cannot change, but only the people can, as our guideline, as our direction, as the body of law that insists that we comply on an annual basis with a balanced budget.

That is why I and others have been so insistent over the years that the only way to bring about fiscal solvency, that the only way to avoid the ultimate crisis at hand was to insist that we move toward a balanced budget, that we propose an amendment and send it forth to the States for ratification. Today in a press conference in the triangle here in front of the Capitol, I said that the Congress of the United States would not really debate

this issue. We would, in a limited way, discuss it, and hopefully pass it, and our counterparts in the other body would do the same, and we would send it forth to the States of the Union for the ultimate debate, and then in all legislatures across this great country over the next 2-year period, we would hear and become part of probably one of the most fascinating debates since the ratification of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights over 200 years ago. That would be how to bring about fiscal solvency in this country and manage the fiscal affairs of this Nation, and whether the people want it and would accept and, therefore, ratify an amendment to our Constitution that would insist that on an annual basis this Congress balance the budget for the Federal Government and live within the confines of that balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I must commend the gentleman for holding this special order, but, more importantly, to commend the gentleman for his tireless attempt to pass a balanced-budget amendment. I know the gentleman has been working on this for years, and finally he is seeing the fruits of his labors by a vote that we hopefully will have on the balanced-budget amendment in the month of July.

The gentleman understands that this Congress is responsible for the deficits that we have been running up over these years, that this Congress is responsible for ignoring calls for cuts in spending, and this Congress is also responsible for pushing the President and laying on the table tax revenue increases in the budget summit in order to even come to the summit, because this Congress and the majority in this Congress want to raise taxes so they can continue to spend on their favorite programs that they have instituted over the years, and new programs which they want to institute in the future.

If the gentleman will just indulge me for just a moment, behind the calls for new taxes are assumptions that the Federal budget already has been cut to the bare bones. If one reads the press, the press will tell the American people that we have got to raise taxes. Yes, well, we have to raise taxes if we want to continue the spending practices of the past, but if we truly want to reform this Government, cut it down to size to provide programs that are beneficial, to eliminate programs that are not providing any benefits to the American people, then we can do it, and we do not have to raise taxes. The only way that we can do it, the

only thing that will bring us the discipline to do it, is the gentleman's balanced-budget amendment.

The press and the Members of this Congress try to put a sham on the American people that the budget has been cut to the bare bones, that every program is running as efficiently as possible, and that every program serves some vital national goal that cannot be accomplished by State and local governments or by the private sector.

Analysts have identified billions of dollars; I know there is a group called the Citizens Against Government Waste that has identified well over \$185 billion over a 5-year period of savings if we just made our Government more efficient and cut out a number of wastes.

The Heritage Foundation has identified \$130 billion in spending cuts and budget savings that could be made without harming programs or compromising the so-called social safety net. However, Congress has repeatedly ignored reputable studies calling for hundreds of billions of dollars in spending cuts.

In 1984, for instance, the President's private sector survey on cost control known as the Grace Commission, after the Commission Chairman, J. Peter Grace, recommended spending reductions and efficiency measures totaling \$424 billion over 3 years, but the year following the Commission's report, Congress increased Federal spending by \$94.5 billion, an inflation-adjusted increase of 7.2 percent. Congress repeatedly has ignored revelations of wasteful spending by its own respected research arms. Last November, for example, the General Accounting Office released its fourth annual report on the implementation of the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982. This act was intended to control waste in Federal financial management systems. The GAO found over \$180 billion in program waste, fraud, and financial mismanagement.

Said Comptroller General Charles Bowsher before the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, "The problems that exist are not limited to a few agencies or a few programs, rather, all the major agencies have serious problems."

Each year the Congressional Budget Office is required by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to produce a survey of recommended budgetary options for the Senate and House Budget Committees. This year's report released in February recommended program reforms that yield roughly \$60 billion in savings in the first year of implementation, and CBO is known for erring on the side of caution, yet Congress so far has ignored these recommendations.

Americans are paying a higher percentage of their income to the Federal

Government than ever before, and the Federal Government is collecting record amounts of revenue. Therefore, rather than turning to more taxes to deal with the budget deficit, Congress must turn seriously to the task of cutting spending. Legislators in this Congress face a very difficult task when spending reductions are necessary. Most Government spending benefits some group of individuals or interests. If there are no limits to revenues, Congress could find many worthy projects to fund, but Government spending is at the expense of the taxpayer.

Helping one interest always harms another. Congress, therefore, must decide which expenditures truly serve the national interest and which should be left to State and local governments or to the private sector. Unless we have a balanced-budget amendment, the Federal Government will continue to operate with a budget deficit. Congress and the administration must justify to the American taxpayer why each dollar of revenue is needed, why the last dollar did not accomplish what lawmakers promised, and why existing programs should continue.

If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to just point out a couple of examples. I would like to list a few things while not necessarily expressing support for any one of these, but just pointing out the kinds of things that this Congress will not do. These are the kinds of decisions that this Congress chooses not to take, in lieu of raising taxes, because they are tough decisions.

Congress makes it illegal to use privatization to reduce costs. Congress constantly blocks attempts to inject market incentives into Government. After years of academic analysis and successes at the local level, there is no longer any question that the private sector can provide many Government services at greatly reduced costs.

Let me give a couple of examples. The General Services Administration is prohibited from contracting out guard, elevator operations, messengers, and custodial services.

□ 1700

The Legal Services Corporation may not use vouchers or hire private legal clinics as an alternative to staff lawyers employed by a limited number of legal service agencies. Thus it cannot employ the services of private for-profit legal clinics such as the Hyatt Legal Services or private arbitration or mediation companies such as In Dispute, Inc. or New York City's Dispute Center.

Another example, due to congressionally mandated employment levels, the Food and Drug Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and the Coast Guard Maintenance Yard, are effectively prohibited from reducing

costs through privatization or eliminating duplicative staffing.

The Congress refuses to close down programs that have completed their purpose. Examples are the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931, which establishes inflated prevailing wages for Federal construction contracts over \$2,000. It was enacted to protect unionized construction workers, the majority of whom were white, from competition from lower cost nonunion labor, the majority of whom were black. For 60 years that law had denied opportunities to black tradesmen and raised Federal construction costs by \$1.5 billion per year. Yet Congress refuses to abolish it.

I mentioned earlier today in a 1-minute speech the Export-Import Bank, which was created in 1934 to finance exports to Russia. Sixty-five years later the Bank loses about \$400 million a year financing exports for some of America's largest international corporations.

The Rural Electrification Administration was created in 1935 to bring electricity and later telephone service to rural areas of the country. Today 99 percent of rural Americans have electricity, and 96 percent have telephones, yet, REA still exists at a cost to the taxpayers of \$2 billion per year.

I could go on and on. I have a list this long, if the gentleman will permit me, but I will yield back to the gentleman for his comments. Then if he will give me some more time, I would like to give more examples.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] for his tremendous effort over the last good number of years to point out waste that has gone on in our Government, waste that certainly has been picked out and pointed out by different agencies and by different outside organizations and study groups, this Congressman's tireless efforts with the activities on the outside, his forming of special caucuses to draw attention by Members of Congress to this issue.

Now, why has it not happened? It has not happened because this Congress has not had to establish priorities, plain and simple. It had a checkbook and it had unlimited borrowing power, and it had the American taxpayer to pick up the tab. It was not forced to do what we are suggesting it be forced to do in the coming years, and that is live within some reasonable constraints of a balanced budget or the reasonable constraints of an economy in which it spends only a limited amount of it.

We debated a bill today in which there was an increase in spending of 17 percent. I do not think any of us would pick any one part of the bill and say it was not worthwhile or it was not necessary. Because to the individual or to the recipients on the outside it

would have been tremendously necessary. But here we struggle along in this Congress, with our economy growing at the rate of about 2 or 2½ percent annually. But on the whole we will see requests for a Federal budget that will grow at the rate of about 12 percent this year, even with the strong possibility that we will reduce defense spending by upward of some tens of billions of dollars. So the area that has received the most attention over the last decade as the great culprit of deficit creators will now be a shrinking portion of an ever rapidly growing Federal budget.

For once and for all, those who study what we do here will not have the excuse of a massive defense expenditure as the excuse for Federal deficit spending. They will no longer have the opportunity to say well, it is somebody else's fault. It was the Russians' fault that we had to spend all of this money.

The fault must rest here in this Congress. The fault must rest with the individual Members. The fault must rest with the process. That is why I believe, as many do, that it is fundamentally important that in that process of the budget, that we make fundamental changes, and that those changes recognize the importance of saying there is only so much money to spend on an annual basis, and that in an honest and fair way to the American taxpayer, that if in fact we want to spend more money, that with a super majority we would so vote and record that vote, and then go home and say well, you know, we did not have enough money, we had other programs of high priority and I voted to raise taxes for that purpose.

Now, that is fair and that is honest. Of course, it is important that some of our folks be forced into that situation, because they always hide behind the excuse that some other Member of Congress did it.

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

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Moody].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to your comments. In fact, that is what brought me to the floor. The gentleman is aware, of course, and I hope he did not mean to imply to anyone who might be listening, to the contrary, that the fastest growing part of the Federal budget is, of course, the interest bill, which is not discretionary, not based on some unlimited checkbook that Congress decided to write, to use your words, but based on an absolute obligation of this country because of the borrowing binge this country has been on, the two straight Republican Presidents have asked us for, and which in fact we have given them less than they asked us for.

It is not just Congress that spends money, my friend, it is the executive branch that spends it. We appropriate.

In the last 200 years the Congress has never deviated more than 2 percent from what the President himself has asked. So let us share the blame in this, and there is plenty of blame to go around. Let us not pretend this body has gone out on a spending binge.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Moody] that I agree, and I in no way have insinuated that it has been that this is Congress' sole responsibility. In fact, the gentleman will notice that for the first time in the 200-year history of this Government, that we are proposing that the Constitution require that the President of the United States submit a balanced budget annually.

Mr. MOODY. I give the gentleman credit.

Mr. CRAIG. But I have been here 10 years, and I do not really put much credit in any argument that comes to the floor and points fingers in 10 different directions, unless you are willing to point the finger at yourself.

Mr. MOODY. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAIG. For the simple reason that this body, and I have been here and have watched the budget battles, and Democrats like to blame Republicans and Republicans like to blame Democrats, and let me tell you, Democratic Congresses delight in blaming Republican Presidents. But you and I both know there is a world of blame to go around, because there is no political will to be fiscally responsible. There is no will to cut, and I have to say there is a growing will to raise taxes.

Of course, that is alarming to me, because I see a good many programs, many like mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DeLay], which simply do not justify being on the books any more. But no one here has the wherewithal or, more importantly, political will to say no.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Moody].

Mr. MOODY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I really do appreciate the gentleman letting me participate. I was going to say that yes, there is blame to go around. I do not think that Congress in the 1980's should have given President Reagan nearly as much spending as he asked for. I blame the Congress for going along with the President. We gave him most of what he wanted, but we did not give him everything he wanted. If we gave him all the military spending he asked for, the deficit today would not be \$200 billion, it would be almost \$300 billion. With compound interest rates, it makes a big difference.

But the only thing that has grown in the last several years, and I think should redound to the credit of both the President and the Congress, have

been those parts of the budget which are almost locked in, unless we are willing to touch the entitlements. Half the budget is entitlements, and that is based not on our appetites, but based on demographics.

We are an aging society. We have more and more people growing old. That is not something we decide in Congress, that is happening by the population. That is driving Medicare and Social Security and the other entitlement costs up very fast.

That, plus interest, is almost two-thirds of the budget. Two thirds of the budget has been growing rapidly, most rapidly interest payments because of the borrowing, because we did not want to cover it with taxes.

The other one-third of the budget, discretionary spending, has in fact not been growing.

Mr. CRAIG. Reclaiming my time, let me ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Moody] one question. On July 17 we will debate a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The gentleman and I agree on many of the budgetary problems that this Congress has faced. Will you vote in support of sending to the people of the United States a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution? That is a simple question.

Mr. MOODY. I am going to answer it. I have begun to study the latest proposal. There have been so many proposals in the past, I have not supported them.

Mr. CRAIG. This has been the lead proposal for the last 4 years here in Congress.

Mr. MOODY. It is not the only proposal in Congress.

Mr. CRAIG. That is correct.

1710

Mr. MOODY. In the past I have always opposed them because they tend to put us in a straitjacket in terms of managing the economy. That is a straight balanced budget economy would require us to raise taxes in a recession because our revenues would drop, and it would require us to raise taxes even higher in a depression, which then forces us into a deeper depression. So we augment the cycle, the business cycle.

Mr. CRAIG. The gentleman will find that this one has flexibility to disallow that.

Mr. MOODY. What I like about the latest proposal is the flexibility, and I am giving it serious consideration and may well support it.

I think the borrowing we are now on, my friend, the 8-year borrowing binge or the 9-year borrowing binge is so serious that it is beginning to swamp the other reservations that one might have about this.

Mr. CRAIG. Out of fairness to my cosponsor and my colleague, the gen-

tleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], and the bipartisan effort that has gone on this issue, let me now yield to the gentleman from Texas, coauthor of House Joint Resolution 268.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank my friend for yielding, and I will not take a large amount of time so that I can yield to my colleague from Texas and others who would like to talk. I also appreciate very much the input of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY], and the spirit in which he in fact is looking at this particular proposal, because as we all have labored since 1982 to try to put together a proper constitutional restraint on the propensity of both Congress and Presidents to spend more than we have, or that we are willing to in fact tax the American people to spend, we have listened to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY] who has been very constructive in his help on this side of the aisle in attempting to rationalize and to put together the proper language, because this is one Member that understands the significance and the severity of amending the Constitution of the United States. I too am concerned about straitjackets.

We have tried this through Gramm-Rudman in a legislative straitjacket and it did not work. If in fact we make it so tight that we cannot escape, we in fact will escape. It is just as simple as that.

What we have tried to do in this amendment and in this proposal that we will be voting on on the floor on July 17 is to present it in such a way that it is perceived, and not just perceived but actually would be some help for the Congress. When we propose that the first major economic item of business for every year shall be for the House and the Senate, in a concurrent resolution, to agree on how much money we are going to have to spend, and the President signs it, to me that is a significant improvement over the manner in which we deal with our Nation's fiscal business today. I happen to believe very strongly had this amendment been in place in 1980 we would not have borrowed \$2 trillion over the last 9 years. I do not believe we would have had up and down votes on this House floor to borrow beforehand, but to borrow up to \$200 billion a year to spend if we had had to make that an overt act on the part of the House.

So we propose in this that we vote then, and we decide how much we are going to spend, and then keep it simple so not only the American people can understand it, but also we Members of Congress can understand it. We keep it simple by saying that then if, in the wisdom of the House or the Congress that we need to spend more, we can. But we make it difficult to spend more than we have. If we are going to borrow that money it will

take a 60-percent vote on the floor of this House to borrow money. That does not mean should the economy be in a recession, if in the wisdom of 60 percent of the Representatives we need to borrow money in order to stimulate the economy, it cannot be done because it can under this, but it makes it more difficult.

And that dreaded "T" word, there are those who believe that we should make it impossible to raise the "T" word. They are going to have a chance to vote on that. My colleague in the well will be offering that amendment, and we will have a chance to work our will on that.

So this is not a straitjacket; if in the wisdom of the people's representatives we decide that we need more, then we can provide money on a pay-as-you-go basis or borrow it, but it is going to be tougher. But that is the spirit in which we have worked so hard with my colleague, who in the spirit of taking this world and the Congress as it is, and really truly amending the Constitution, not talking about the Bill of Rights here, but we are talking about taking away the freedom of the U.S. Congress to spend more money than we have for the people's programs. I believe that fundamentally is a major change.

Mr. MOODY. If the gentleman will yield, it is also taking away the ability of the President to propose a budget that is incredibly out of balance, which we have seen over the last several years.

Mr. STENHOLM. Absolutely. The gentleman is correct. That is one of the requirements, one of the articles in this amendment. It says that the President must submit a balanced budget in the same spirit and under the same constitutional restraints that the Congress does, and I would be the first one to point out that I have been in Congress 11½ years, and no President that I have served with, and there is three, has submitted a balanced budget.

I totally agree with the remarks and comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin earlier in talking about spending. I am a little tired as a Member of Congress of getting blamed for this \$2 trillion of debt when we actually have spent within \$20 billion what the President has asked us to spend during the Reagan administration. How can it be our fault?

But again, this is not the point of the discussion now. This is all hindsight.

What we have to look forward to now is first off a realistic summit agreement in which we do something about the deficit we are running today. This constitutional amendment proposal will not touch that, never has been intended to touch that. What we have to do are the tough things in this

body later this year, in July, I hope, when we begin to address those.

Let me sum up by saying first off, this amendment is designed to be in place when we, in fact, have shown our backbone in this body following leadership and backbone at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue to deal with our Nation's fiscal problems. Once we have done that, over the next 5 years, I hope, then we will have a constitutional restraint in place that will make it much more difficult, if not impossible, for future Congresses and future Presidents to do as the last President and the last four Congresses that I have served in have done, and this is not meant as a slap to anybody, and the finger is pointing to CHARLIE STENHOLM. We believe that we have a proposal worthy of the consideration of the Members, hopefully of two-thirds of the body.

I am glad to yield back to my colleague so that others may participate.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague from Texas for his comments and for this effort over the last good number of years in working together in the refinement of and the ultimate proposing of House Joint Resolution 268. I think both Congressman STENHOLM and I would agree, this document is not, by our definition, perfect, but it is as close as we can come based on the input of a good many people as to what would serve as the proper guideline for directing the Congress of the United States and the President in proposing and bringing about Federal budgets.

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

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield back to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of misstatements that have been made that I need to correct, because it is these kinds of misstatements that undermine the reason for having a balanced budget amendment. I am not defending any one President, because I feel that the President is not using, this President or the President preceding, did not use the veto. It is true that neither Ronald Reagan nor George Bush has submitted a balanced budget to Congress; yet, if we had enacted all of the budgets proposed by Ronald Reagan without adding all of the little add-ons that we add, we would be at a balanced budget today.

What happens, and the gentleman knows this, and I am on the Appropriations Committee and have to agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY], about some of the problem. He is totally correct about borrowing and paying interest on what we borrow. That is totally correct.

But the problem is we borrow money to spend, and that is where the real problem lies, is in the spending.

The gentleman is also correct that entitlements are half the budget, and that is the biggest problem.

A lot of times the Appropriation Committee is blamed by the public for the entitlements, and the entitlements are in the committee of the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. MOODY], the Ways and Means Committee, and the entitlements need to be reformed. I have plenty of examples where we need to reform entitlements, and I agree with that.

□ 1720

The problem is—and I will submit this for the record—that Congress has not spent less than the President. I am as guilty as anybody. But when the Committee on Appropriations brings a bill to the floor and tells you that it is below the President's requests, that is true. Most appropriation bills are below the President's requests as they come to the floor. What they do not tell you is that you have got to add the supplementals and everything else on top of that, which are way above the President's requests.

The total, in the 8 years that we have been spending, from 1982 to what is projected to be spent in 1990, Congress has approved bills—and I will say that the Presidents have signed them and they need to veto more—\$285 billion over what the Presidents of those years have requested.

Now, what happens is the President has his favorite programs, Congress has their favorite programs, and what we have seen over the years is the President gets most of his, Congress gets most of theirs and we send the President one big package. Then the President has a choice of either voting against his own by vetoing the package or going along with it. There is a deal struck between the President and Congress, and we end up spending.

Mr. CRAIG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I will accept these figures that the gentleman is putting into the record as being accurate. I totally agree with his assessment that these are money that have been signed and spent by the President. I think this proves both of our points, though, because \$285 billion is far short of the \$2 trillion that we have borrowed. That is the significant point that we have to make.

The President requested within \$285 billion of what we spent. Now, I said 20, maybe I missed it. So I will concede the number of the gentleman at \$285 billion.

I will still state that these are the kinds of games that we, with this amendment, want to stop being played by both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, I think my friend from Texas [Mr. DeLAY] concurs on that.

Mr. DeLAY. I totally concur and appreciate the gentleman in his efforts to pass this amendment.

Mr. CRAIG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. I do not know if the figures are accurate, but I will take the word of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DeLAY. Again, if I may, they are from the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. MOODY. Assuming they are accurate, I think they should be labeled "the Congress spent and the President signed." The Congress proposed that the President authorize and the Presidents signed it in big bold letters "Ronald Reagan" or "George Bush," and it was both parties, the top representatives of both parties that conspired to put these numbers together.

I think what the gentleman from Texas said a moment ago, if it is accurate, Congress and the President had a different set of priorities over the last 9 years, particularly the previous administration, the Reagan administration. The President wanted more military spending than generally the Congress was willing to grant. They granted most of it in the early years. Congress was unwilling to cut the domestic as much as the President wanted, particularly entitlements. Nobody wanted to touch those. So Congress tried to protect the discretionary spending. Nobody touched the entitlements at all, or hardly very much. The President wanted to protect or even augment the military spending. As the gentleman knows, rather than force themselves into trade-offs, which I gather this amendment would require trade-offs, they said, "Well, let's have both."

So the Congress protected the women and the children and orphans and old folks and the poor folks and the handicapped, by the way, the environment and law enforcement. That was both sides of the aisle. You remember Ronald Reagan's budget got only some 30 votes in this House. It was not the Democrats rejecting Ronald Reagan's budget, the slim budget on the domestic side. It was Republicans and Democrats.

In the Senate—in 1 year, Jack Kemp, our former colleague, was the only vote for the Reagan budget. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. DeLAY. I was not here.

Mr. MOODY. The only Republican in the whole body to vote for the Reagan budget was Jack Kemp, former Congressman from Buffalo. Every Republican in this body rejected the President's priorities, which would have slashed discretionary spending on environment, education, health, and so forth.

So as my colleague from Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, says, there is plenty of burden to go around here as to who we got in this mess.

Mr. CRAIG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DeLAY. The gentleman makes a decent point. A pox on all houses.

But the point here is now that we are in this budget summit, this Congress is unwilling to make the kinds of spending cuts to avoid raising taxes. That is where we are. We are at a crisis situation, and there is plenty, plenty of spending cuts that can be made that do not eliminate the social safety net. But we refuse to make those tough choices.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for the RECORD:

HOW CONGRESS FORCES UNCLE SAM TO WASTE MONEY

(By Scott Hodge, Grover M. Hermann Fellow)

Lawmakers are always quick to argue that cuts in federal programs are impossible to achieve without significant reductions in the quality or quantity of essential services. They give the impression that all spending is necessary and relevant to the goals of government, and that they have taken all possible steps to permit the Executive Branch to use the most efficient means available to deliver services.

The reality is very different. In a number of ways, Congress consciously prevents the federal government from saving money without reducing necessary services. Thus billions of dollars must, by law, be wasted, rather than being used to reduce the deficit.

(1) Congress makes it illegal to use privatization to reduce costs

Congress constantly blocks attempts to inject market incentives into government. After years of academic analysis and successes at the local level, there is no longer any question that the private sector can provide many government services at greatly reduced costs. Yet during the Reagan Administration, Congress in many cases passed legislation explicitly blocking White House attempts to expand federal contracting and the sale of certain federal assets. In some cases laws were passed to prevent agencies even from studying ways to save money through privatization. Currently there are 37 laws blocking privatization, including measures that exempt 70 percent of federal commercial services from competition. In addition, Congress often micromanages programs, bypassing the normal chain of command, to require programs to serve certain constituencies. The total cost to taxpayers of these prohibitions: \$5 billion per year.

Example: The General Services Administration is prohibited from contracting out guard, elevator operation, messenger, and custodial services.

Example: The Legal Services Corporation may not use vouchers or hire private legal clinics as an alternative to staff lawyers employed by a limited number of legal service agencies. Thus, it cannot employ the services of private for-profit legal clinics, such as Hyatt Legal Services, or private arbitration or mediation organizations, such as EN-Dispute Inc. and New York City's Dispute Center.

Example: Due to congressionally mandated employment levels, the Food and Drug

Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and the Coast Guard Maintenance yard are effectively prohibited from reducing costs through privatization or eliminating duplicative staffing.

Example: The Commission created in 1987 to explore the privatization of Amtrak was denied funding and future studies of privatizing Amtrak were prohibited.

(2) Congress refuses to close down programs that have completed their purpose

Once Congress creates a program it rarely lets it die. If the program succeeds, some new constituency is found that "needs" help from the program. Washington's bureaucrats are remarkably entrepreneurial, creating new missions for their programs and creating new political constituencies.

Some 35 states and many local governments avoid this problem by enacting "sunset" laws. These laws mandate that an agency or program must expire after a specified period of time, unless the legislature takes specific action to extend its life. But the federal government has yet to accept such a comprehensive system of automatic agency and program review. Failure to close down agencies and programs that have fulfilled their mission may cost taxpayers as much as \$20 billion per year.

Example: The Davis-Bacon Act of 1931, which establishes inflated "prevailing wages" for federal construction contracts over \$2,000, was enacted to protect unionized construction workers, the majority of whom were white, from competition from lower cost non-union labor, the majority of whom were black. For 60 years this law denied opportunities to black tradesmen and raised federal construction costs by \$1.5 billion per year. Yet Congress refuses to abolish it.

Example: The military commissary system was created to provide foodstuffs to the cavalry on the Western plains in the 1800s. The program continues today, although over 80 percent of military commissaries are within 10 miles of two or more commercial supermarkets.

Example: The Export-Import Bank was created in 1934 to finance exports to Russia. Sixty-five years later the Bank loses about \$400 million a year financing exports for some of America's largest international corporations.

Example: The Rural Electrification Administration was created in 1935 to bring electricity, and later telephone service, to rural areas of the country. Today, 99 percent of rural Americans have electricity and 96 percent have telephones. Yet REA still exists at a cost to taxpayers of \$2 billion per year.

(3) Congress is addicted to creating programs

Congress rarely designs just one program to solve a problem; rather, Congress tends to "spread-out" a program over many agencies so that as many constituencies as possible become reliant on the program. If a program proves to be a failure, Congress never reforms or abolishes it. Rather, a new program is created to "solve" the problem or a new layer of bureaucracy is added onto the old one.

Example: There are roughly sixty anti-poverty programs administered by the federal government. Nearly every federal agency has its own anti-poverty program. This includes the military if certain veterans programs are counted.

Example: The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987, intended

to help the homeless, created seventeen different programs administered through seven federal agencies. Yet, there were already over sixty separate federal programs providing assistance to the homeless.

(4) Congress does not trust people to help themselves

With few exceptions, Congress designs programs to empower bureaucrats and private sector professionals, not those individuals that a program was intended to help. For instance, federal money for the poor reaches recipients only after it has trickled through a half million poverty-industry bureaucrats and untold numbers of private sector specialists, such as doctors, real estate developers, and social workers.

Example: Since the mid-sixties the federal government has spent about a quarter of a trillion dollars to build or subsidize the construction of over four million low-income housing units. The use of housing vouchers, like food stamps, would have allowed the government to help twice as many poor individuals, using market demand to stimulate construction of more low- and moderate-income housing. More important, vouchers give the poor a greater sense of efficacy because vouchers allow the poor to live where they choose, near the good schools and good jobs, for example.

Congress is addicted to "porkbarrel" spending

The election process provides powerful incentives for each member of Congress to bring more federal money back to the home district than the voters in the district paid in federal taxes. This is the political equivalent of the "tragedy of the commons" problem found with limited natural resources. Because the resource does not have an identifiable owner, it is to everyone's advantage to obtain as much of the resource as possible before it runs out. The result of this situation is obvious; the resource is quickly destroyed by everyone's rush to "get theirs." In budgetary terms, the result is "porkbarrel" spending and consistent budget deficits. The cost to the American taxpayers is difficult to calculate.

Some representative examples of porkbarrel spending are:

A \$107,000 grant from the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Mental Health for the study of "sexual looking, classical conditioning of sexual arousal, and improvement of copulatory performance with practice" of the Japanese quail. The conclusion: male quails prefer female quails over male quails and female ducks for mating purposes. Congress has renewed this study with a \$100,000 grant.

\$2,500 to study the causes of rudeness, lying and cheating on tennis courts.

\$84,000 to study why people fall in love.

\$500,000 to build a ten-story replica of the Great Pyramid of Cheops in Bedford, Indiana, and an additional \$200,000 to the same city to build a 800-foot replica of the Great Wall of China.

\$46,000 to study how long it takes to cook breakfast eggs.

\$221,000 to send twenty-one members of Congress and their "officials" to the Paris Air Show.

\$68,000 to send officials of the Urban Mass Transit Administration to Disney

World to study the secrets of the Disney transportation system.

\$150,000 for Broom Snakeweed research in New Mexico.

The burden is on Congress to change the way it does business. Taxpayers should no longer have to pinch pennies so that Congress can spend them with abandon.

Slashing the Deficit: FY 1991

Last year, in the monograph *Slashing the Deficit: FY 1990*, Heritage Foundation experts recommended \$128 billion in budgetary spending cuts. The following recommendations are based in part on that monograph, though greatly summarized. But, reflecting recent concern over the budget deficit some new recommendations have been added and other recommendations which were to phase-out programs over many years have been modified. Therefore, Heritage analysts suggest over \$130 billion in cuts this year:

Although the three fastest growing programs in the budget, Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare are not addressed here. These programs are in such serious need of reform that they are beyond the scope of this paper. Congress should, however, freeze spending for these programs for one-year at 1990 levels. This one-year period should be used to develop long-term reform policies to bring the spiraling costs of these programs under control. All suggested spending cuts are reductions from Fiscal Year 1990 outlays and are, therefore, real dollar cuts, not reductions in projected baseline increases.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Legislative Branch Expenses—Deficit Reduction: \$220 million

Repeal the congressional payroll and reduce funding for Congress and Legislative Branch agencies and activities by 10 percent. Congress should not receive a pay raise until a balanced budget has been achieved without a tax increase.

Congressional Mail Privilege—Deficit Reduction: \$50 million

Reduce expenditures by 50 percent on congressional mailings, known as the "franking privilege." Members of Congress use this free mailing privilege to enhance their chances for reelection. In 1987, lawmakers sent out 12,000 pieces of mail for every piece received on Capitol Hill.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

Contracting Out Federal Services—Deficit Reduction: \$5 billion

Issue an executive order requiring federal agencies to contract out to private firms or groups of federal employees all functions that are not inherently governmental.

Merge the Department of Energy with the Departments of Interior, Commerce and Defense—Deficit Reduction: \$2 billion

Close the Department of Energy and transfer all defense related activities to the Department of Defense; place regulatory functions with the Department of Commerce; and, merge resource management functions with the Department of the Interior, creating a Department of Natural Resources.

Merge HUD and HHS—Deficit Reduction: \$2 billion

Move all low income housing programs into the Department of Health and Human Services; replace all low income housing assistance with vouchers; transfer HUD's economic development functions to the states and the Department of Commerce.

¹ See: "Pork Barrel Items in the FY 1990 Appropriations Bills," Citizens Against Government Waste, March 27, 1990 and Walter Williams, "Your Tax Dollars at Work," The Washington Times, April 13, 1990.

**Streamline the Department of Agriculture—
Deficit Reduction: \$1 billion**

Streamline the Department of Agriculture: Move the Food Stamp and nutrition programs into the Department of Health and Human Services; move the Forest Service into the Department of Interior and the agricultural trade programs into the Department of Commerce; close the Farmers Home Administration and place all low-income housing programs in HHS.

Expand Federal Loan Sales and Include Revenues in Deficit Reduction Calculations—Deficit Reduction: \$4 billion

Initiate a comprehensive credit reform program requiring federal lending agencies to sell the existing \$250 billion federal loan portfolio, plus all new loans to the private sector through competitive auctions.

Require Reinsurance on Federal Loan Guarantees—Deficit Reduction: \$3 billion

Require all federal lending agencies to purchase reinsurance from the private sector for all federally-guaranteed loans; establish a new federal loan guarantee policy prohibiting lending agencies from granting a guarantee of more than 90 percent of the face value of a loan.

Cut the Capital Gains Tax—Deficit Reduction: \$4 billion

Cut the capital gains tax from 33 percent to 15 percent.

Improve Federal Debt Collection—Deficit Reduction: \$2.5 billion

Adopt the standard debt collection procedures found in the private sector.

Modernize Federal Cash Management—Deficit Reduction: \$40 million

Charge states and cities interest on federal grant and loan money that is paid before the funds are actually spent. A Treasury Department revolving fund should be established to insure that the federal government is fully compensated for early payments to the states and cities, as recommended by the Grace Commission. This revolving fund similarly should reimburse cities and states for late federal payments.

Repeal the Davis-Bacon Act—Deficit Reduction: \$1.5 billion

Repeal the 1931 Davis-Bacon Act, which establishes inflated "prevailing wages" for federal contracts over \$2,000. This law was designed to protect white labor from competition from lower cost Black labor and has continued to have a disparate impact on minority labor.

Repeal the Service Contract Act—Deficit Reduction: \$500 million

Repeal the Service Contract Act of 1965, which establishes inflated "prevailing wages" for federal service contracts of more than \$2,500. This law has been especially harmful to small, minority-owned businesses.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—DEFICIT REDUCTION: \$11.2 BILLION

Bush's proposed 1991 Pentagon budget already trims 2.1 percent from last year's defense outlays, for a saving (in 1991 dollars) of \$6.2 billion. Bush accomplished the savings by terminating thirteen programs including the M-1 tank (saving \$1.1 billion in 1991), Maverick missile (saving \$367 million in 1991), and Sea Lance anti-submarine warfare missile (saving \$156 million in 1991). He also proposed cutting two divisions from the army for savings of \$1.2 billion in 1991 and closed 35 military installations.

New Bush proposals will trim the budget by an additional \$2.5 billion in 1991: a cut-

back in spending for the B-2 bomber, C-17 transport and Advanced Tactical Fighter aircraft programs, and termination of the Follow-on-to-Lance missile, a 280 mile-range nuclear missile designed primarily for use in Europe. These cuts were recommended in a Heritage Foundation Back-grounder, Four Imperatives for Cutting the Defense Budget, in March.

On top of these savings, Bush can trim another percent or so from the budget by such measures as: Postponing production of the C-17 aircraft; putting the equivalent of another army light division in the reserves; and slowing down procurement plans for the Army Light Helicopter and other programs geared mainly to meet advanced Soviet forces.

As important an issue as how the Pentagon budget is cut is which the question of which programs are protected from the budget ax. Key areas of the budget which should be protected are: (1) strategic nuclear forces, particularly land- and sea-based intercontinental missile modernization programs; (2) the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI); (3) Marines and Special Forces most likely to be engaged in combat, (4) research and development, and; (5) programs critical to armed forces morale and professionalism, such as training time and benefits for military personnel.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Reduce U.S. Contributions to the World Bank—Deficit Reduction: \$110.6 million

U.S. taxpayers now are committed to \$30 billion in loan guarantees to the World Bank, in addition to America's annual contribution. Yet the Bank repeatedly gives out loans contrary to U.S. interests. Funds go to governments in less developed countries which mismanage their economies and waste countless billions of dollars. Moreover, the World Bank continues to increase its loans to less developed countries that have little hope of repaying the loans.

P.L. 480 "Food for Peace" Program—Deficit Reduction: \$146.3 million

Eliminate Food for Peace funding except for temporary food shipments in emergencies like earthquakes, droughts, and famines. This program has actually harmed the economies of the Third World countries by depressing the market prices that local farmers can obtain for their crops.

Agency for International Development (AID)—Foreign Aid—Deficit Reduction: \$3.1 billion

Cut the overall AID budget by 50 percent and phase out the remainder of the program over three years. American economic development assistance has effectively rewarded wasteful and irresponsible economic policies in less developed nations. Any U.S. economic development aid should be given contingent on reforms toward free enterprise, free markets, and local entrepreneurship.

U.S. Contributions to the United Nations—Deficit Reduction: \$190 million

Cut U.S. contributions to those programs that clearly do not serve American interests, completely eliminating funding for those which are fundamentally hostile or ineffective. Specifically: U.N. Food and Organization (FAO); U.N. Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO); World Health Organization (WHO); World Heritage Fund; U.N. Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA); U.N. Education and Training Program for South Africa and the U.N.

Trust Fund for South Africa; and, the U.N. Development Program (UNDP).

International Monetary Fund (IMF)—Deficit Reduction: \$5 million

End all U.S. direct funding of the IMF and prohibit any new U.S. commitments in contingent liabilities. It is now requesting a \$60 billion capitol increase which will bring its total operating assets to some \$175 billion. The IMF does not need expanded lending authority. Moreover, IMF lending policies have actually led to less economic development in recipient countries because IMF loans tend to cover up for bad economic policies and corrupt governments.

Export Import Bank (Eximbank)—Deficit Reduction: \$364 million

Close the Export Import Bank. The Bank's existing loan guarantee commitments should be honored, but the Bank should be forbidden from insuring any new loans. The Bank was established in 1934 to finance U.S. exports to the Soviet Union. In recent years, the Bank loses an average of around \$400 million a year financing exports for some of America's largest multinational companies.

SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

NASA—Space Station—Deficit Reduction: \$1.7 billion

Delay federal funding of the planned Space Station Freedom (highlight) for two years. This period should be used for further study of less expensive options such as encouraging privatization of commercial space activity, or sponsorship of a joint public-private venture.

NASA-Mars Project—Deficit Reduction: \$150 million

Delay federal funding of the proposed manned mission to Mars. The entire Mars program is estimated to cost as much as \$400 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). While a manned landing on Mars is a noble goal further thought should be given toward developing less expensive alternatives.

Superconducting Super Collider (SSC)—Deficit Reduction: \$218 million

Cease funding of the (SSC). The SSC would be the world's largest, and most powerful, high energy particle accelerator, with a projected total cost of \$8 billion to construct and \$270 million annually to operate. The SSC will drain funds from less exotic, and less costly, research projects with greater commercial potential.

ENERGY

Naval Petroleum Reserves (NPR)—Deficit Reduction: \$1.6 billion

Sell the NPRs through a well-publicized public stock offering. For over 70 years the federal government has owned and operated commercial oil fields at Elk Hills, California and Teapot Dome in Wyoming in case of a national emergency. Since these reserves account for about 1 percent of U.S. domestic output, the government has no reason to continue operating these sites.

Federal Dams: The Five Regional Power Marketing Administrations (PMA)—Deficit Reduction: \$5 billion

Sell the Power Marketing Administrations through public stock offerings. With few exceptions, the government has not reviewed or revised its policy for pricing the electrical output of these dams since the 1930s, when many of them were built. Consumers of PMA electricity receive over \$1.5 billion worth of subsidies yearly. The federal

Treasury could be receiving more than \$4 billion per year if the government let buyers bid for the electricity. Underpriced federal power even lights gambling casinos in Las Vegas.

**The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)—
Deficit Reduction \$5 billion**

Sell the TVA through a public stock offering after dividing it into three or four independent power generating companies. The TVA, which is a government-owned corporation created in 1933 to bring electricity to the Tennessee River Valley, is effectively bankrupt. Of TVAs \$22 billion in assets, some \$15 billion are inoperative. The only way to ensure service to this region is to sell it to the private sector.

**Uranium Enrichment Enterprise—Deficit
Reduction: \$1.8 billion**

Sell the U.S. uranium enrichment facilities to the private sector. The logical buyers for this enterprise are current employees, in addition to the 108 commercial nuclear power plants located in the U.S. that purchase the uranium.

**Fossil Energy Research and Development—
Deficit Reduction: \$383.7 million**

Eliminate the Fossil Energy Research and Development programs which support research and development for new technologies intended for commercial markets. Alternatively, the government should require private sector cost sharing for all federal energy research and development expenditures with commercial applications. The government should impose a 50 percent upfront cost-sharing charge before launching new research projects and recoup 100 percent of the federal investment if the technology is eventually commercialized.

**Rural Electrification Administration
(REA)—Deficit Reduction: \$2 billion**

Eliminate the REA by phasing out REA loans by 1993 and selling existing loans to private investors and commercial banks. The REA was created in 1935 to bring electricity, and later telephone service, to rural areas of the country. Today, 99 percent of rural residents have electricity and 96 percent have phone service. Yet REA still distributes \$2 billion in below-market cost loans each year.

**Clean Coal Technology Program (CCTP)—
Deficit Reduction: \$151.5 million**

Eliminate funding for the CCTP which was created to assist private industry in developing environmentally safer coal technologies. The federal government is currently funding 60 percent of the program's costs while private industry funds the remainder. Since private industry is the beneficiary of this program, it should bear the full costs. Alternatively, regulations should be changed to allow power companies to use cleaner fuels.

**Energy Conservation Programs—Deficit
Reduction: \$340.6 million**

Eliminate funding for energy conservation programs which support research and development of technologies intended for future use by the private sector. Since private industry potentially may receive lucrative benefits from this technology it should bear the full costs.

**Energy Supply, Research and Development
Activities—Deficit Reduction: \$2 billion**

Eliminate funding for Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities which support research and development on technologies ranging from solar power to magnetic fusion. Continue funding on "pure sci-

entific research" projects. Over the last fifteen years, the government has spent billions on research projects that have brought little or no return to the government or the private sector. For instance, over \$10 billion was spent on nuclear energy research even though ten years has passed since the last commercial reactor was built in this country.

**NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)—
Deficit Reduction: \$3 billion**

Sell the most marketable portions of the 340 million acres of Western land owned by the Bureau of Land Management and transfer ownership of the remaining land to the respective states. This should include the same 600,000 acres of land classified as "in urbanized areas or with residential, commercial, or industrial value," in addition to the 350,000 acres of federal property classified as "no longer needed for federal purposes". Private buyers could include: Environmental groups; Recreational associations; Ranchers; Mining interests; or, individual citizens. Federal ownership of Western land is an historical anomaly with no environmental or economic purpose. These are lands that were not transferred to the private sector under the Homestead Act, state land grants, and similar means in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

**Bureau of Reclamation—Water and Con-
struction Projects—Deficit Reduction:
\$665 million**

Close down the Bureau of Reclamation, which was formed in 1902 to promote economic development in the arid West. Begin by withholding all appropriations for new water projects which the Bureau itself recommends. Also, transfer all water distribution and pricing responsibilities to the private sector, thus bringing market efficiencies to the very inefficient and inequitable Western water market.

**Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing—Deficit
Reduction: \$800 million**

End current moratoriums on exploration and drilling of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). Technology can prevent the oil spills that drilling restrictions are intended to prevent. Experience of the past two decades demonstrates that offshore drilling need not damage the environment. Most spills occur as a result of shipping oil over long distances, not from offshore drilling.

**Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR)
Leasing—Deficit Reduction: \$1 billion**

Lease the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) tracks immediately through competitive bidding under standard Department of Interior leasing guidelines. According to a 1987 Department of Interior study, ANWR oil could bring \$38 billion in new revenue to the federal Treasury.

**Powder River Basin Coal—Deficit
Reduction: \$2 billion**

Sell the federally-owned coal that lies under the privately-owned surface land in the Powder River Basin in Wyoming. The sale should be accomplished through competitive auctions, or possibly through the public sale of stock in a newly created coal management corporation.

**U.S. Forest Service—Road Building—Deficit
Reduction: \$224 million**

Discontinue subsidized road building for private timber companies. The U.S. Forest Service is the world's largest road builder. Under its direction over 342,000 miles of roads have been built, eight times the mile-

age of the U.S. Interstate Highway System. This program is extremely harmful to the environment, yet it continues only because the Forest Service claims that timber sales yield considerable revenues to the U.S. Treasury. According to the Wilderness Society, these claims are false, the Forest Service actually has averaged \$406 million in annual losses since 1982.

**Land Acquisition—U.S. Forest Service and
National Park Service—Deficit Reduction:
\$210 million**

Cancel all new land purchases by the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service. The federal government already owns 727 million acres of property. Only the Soviet Union and China own more public land. The government should begin to facilitate the purchase and stewardship of existing Federal holdings by private conservation organizations.

**Recreational Lands—User Fees—Deficit
Reduction: \$1 billion**

Raise entrance fees for federal recreational lands to reflect the costs of maintenance and operations. Congress prevents federal land management agencies, such as the National Park Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the National Forest Service, from charging fees for use of most public lands and facilities. Minimal fees collected by the Park Service, about \$55 million, do not come close to covering the agency's annual outlays of \$729 million. Meanwhile, the fragile environment of these parks suffers near irreparable stress because there is no market mechanism to regulate visitorship.

**Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)—
Enforcement Activities—Deficit Reduc-
tion: \$200 million**

Allow independent, private environmental auditors to take over the (EPA) monitoring of industry compliance with EPA standards. EPA currently spends nearly \$800 million on the Abatement, Control, and Compliance program. Yet, much of this monitoring could be accomplished through the private markets, as is done with financial auditing.

**EPA—Wastewater Treatment Construction
Grants—Deficit Reduction: \$2 billion**

Eliminate the wastewater treatment construction grants program; which provide initial capital to states' Revolving Funds for loans to local governments to construct treatment facilities. The \$50 billion spent in this program since 1972 has encouraged local governments to build "gold-plated" treatment facilities rather than look for lower-cost and more environmentally safe alternatives.

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin-
istration (NOAA)—Deficit Reduction: \$40
million**

Impose a \$100 annual licensing fee on fisherman for the right to fish in federal waters. Other fishing user fees should also be reviewed. The National Marine Fisheries Service spends over \$100 million a year promoting fishing and conserving fishing resources in federal waters. Fishermen should pay for some of the benefit they receive.

**Bureau of Mines—Deficit Reduction: \$180
million**

Close the Bureau of Mines. The Bureau's important data gathering activities should be merged with other research agencies within the Department of Interior. The research and development facilities of the Bureau should be closed or sold to the pri-

vate sector which has a direct financial interest in conducting some of this research.

Federal Helium Reserves—Deficit Reduction: \$60 million

Sell the federal helium reserves and the Exell helium refining plant near Amarillo, Texas. Between 1929 and 1961 the federal government was virtually the sole supplier of helium. The private market flow now is flourishing and should not have to compete with subsidized government helium.

The National Weather Service—Deficit Reduction: \$60 million

Institute user fees that reflect the true cost of service. Additionally, close or contract out any activities that compete with the private sector. There are approximately 100 private companies in the U.S. preparing and disseminating weather forecasts to businesses and the public on a commercial basis.

AGRICULTURE

Farm Subsidies—Deficit Reduction: \$10 billion

Discontinue direct subsidies to farmers and the federal crop price support programs managed by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and the Commodity Credit Corporation. Farm subsidies are anti-consumer, and are especially burdensome for low-income families. Farm subsidies add as much as \$10 billion more in higher food prices for American households. Moreover, according to Cato Institute scholar, James Bovard, "With the \$260 billion that government and consumers have spent on farm subsidies since 1980, Uncle Sam could have bought every farm, barn, and tractor in thirty-three states."²

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC)—Deficit Reduction: \$500 million

Phase out (FCIC), which insures farmers against crop losses resulting from natural disasters such as droughts, floods, hurricanes, fire, and insect infestation. The government should use measures to promote a more mature private crop insurance industry. While participation in FCIC currently is voluntary, farmers receiving any level of agricultural subsidies or loans should be required to purchase crop insurance from private insurers. The role of the FCIC should be relegated to that of a reinsurer of private insurance firms.

Agriculture Extension Service—Deficit Reduction: \$190 million

Reduce the Agriculture Extension Service budget by half and phase out the remainder of the program over three years. The County Cooperative Extension Program was established in 1914, at a time when 35 percent of Americans lived on farms. Though only 2.2 percent now reside on farms the program continues. The training, education, and marketing assistance activities of the Extension are duplicated by dozens of other state and local programs in addition to private groups such as the American Farm Bureau Association.

COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

Federal National Mortgage Association ("Fannie Mae") and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation ("Freddie Mac")—Deficit Reduction: \$500 million

Begin the process to phase-out over ten years all special government benefits enjoyed by FNMA and FHLMC. Place a temporary annual fee of 0.25 percent on all

single-family and multifamily mortgages sold to or guaranteed by FNMA or FHLMC. This fee should be paid by borrowers, collected by lenders, and passed through to the Treasury. Reduce the cap on the maximum mortgage amount that can be held or traded by FNMA or FHLMC to 150 percent of local conventional home loan values. Remove the exemption from Securities and Exchange Commission reporting requirements that each enjoy.

Federal Housing Administration (FHA)—Deficit Reduction: \$1 billion

The FHA may soon become the next Savings and Loan Crisis. The FHA must be held to the same capital requirements as private mortgage insurers, 4 percent. Also, require a minimum downpayment of 5 percent of the mortgage amount from homebuyers obtaining FHA insurance. Default rates are exceedingly high for loans with less than 5 percent downpayments. Impose on lenders a 5 percent coinsurance requirement on all FHA-insured loans, and discontinue FHA mortgage insurance on second homes or investor properties.

Small Business Administration (SBA)—Deficit Reduction: \$340 million

Close the SBA and sell all outstanding loans to the private sector. The SBA has been a dismal failure, with around 12 percent lost each year on the \$3 billion of loan guarantees it issues. As many as 20 percent of SBA direct loans default. Only two-tenths of 1 percent of all small businesses in the nation receive SBA loans. To be eligible for SBA direct and guaranteed loans small businesses must have been rejected by two previous banks. As a result, SBA loans divert venture capital away from enterprises that seem likely to succeed to those with are more likely to fail.

Federal Communications Commission Auctioning of the Electromagnetic Spectrum—Deficit Reduction: \$2.3 billion

Auction licenses for unassigned frequencies of the electromagnetic spectrum to the highest bidder, with the revenues from the auction going to the U.S. Treasury. Auctioning is a more efficient and equitable method of assigning frequencies.

TRANSPORTATION

Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC)—Deficit Reduction: \$43 million

Complete the deregulation of the trucking industry, and abolish the ICC. Remaining ICC functions should be distributed to other agencies. The ICC's rail regulatory functions, for instance, should be moved to the Department of Transportation, while its consumer protection functions could be handled by the Federal Trade Commission.

Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA)—Deficit Reduction: \$2 billion

Eliminate all federal transit operating subsidies immediately, since they subsidize inefficiency in transit operations. Cost-sharing by local governments should be raised to 50 percent from 25 percent on all new projects. Despite a \$40 billion investment in urban transit projects over the past quarter century, 10 percent fewer transit trips were taken in 1986 than in 1963, the year before the program began. Much of the \$40 billion in federal aid has been spent on gold-plated transit projects which attract few riders.

Amtrak—Deficit Reduction: \$500 million

Sell Amtrak to the private sector in the same manner as the sale of Conrail. While Amtrak is becoming more self-sufficient than the past, federal subsidies to Amtrak average about \$25 per passenger trip.

Federal Highway Administration—Deficit Reduction: \$4 billion

Declare the interstate highway system complete. Over 98 percent has been completed, any further construction should be done by the states or by private companies using toll road arrangements. Eliminate funding for all highway "demonstration" projects. Allow states to impose tolls to cover the cost of maintaining and extending roads that have received no more than 75 percent federal funding. This would lift the current ban on direct user fees for primary and urban roads, but continue the ban on tolls on portions of the interstate highway system.

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)—Deficit Reduction: \$2 billion

Eliminate payments for aviation from the general treasury, except for the estimated 15 percent of FAA costs due to military use. The success of airline "in-air" deregulation should be extended to "on-the-ground" operations. The Department of Transportation should be more aggressive in selling airports to private firms or contracting out a greater portion of airport management.

Maritime Administration—Deficit Reduction: \$400

Repeal the "cargo preference" requirement for exports shipped and financed by the U.S. government. Although the Maritime Administration's activities originally were designed to promote U.S. national security interests, today many of its programs—particularly the "cargo preference" law—are little more than protectionist measures intended to shield the U.S. shipping industry from foreign competition. Protectionism for U.S. shipping interests adds to the costs of U.S. exporters and thus harms America's competitiveness.

United States Coast Guard—Deficit Reduction: \$500 million

Charge fees for Coast Guard services, such as aids to navigation, boat towing, and ice breaking, which benefit easily identifiable users. Conduct a comprehensive inventory of Coast Guard property holdings and begin to sell unnecessary land and facilities.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG's)—Deficit Reduction: \$2.5 billion

End the Community Development Block Grant program, and apply \$500 million of the program's funding toward tax abatement in federal enterprise zones in blighted areas.

Farmers Home Administration (FmHA)—Deficit Reduction: \$3 billion

Close the FmHA and shift all low income housing programs to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Repeal the 1987 congressional prohibition on further sales of FmHA loans to the private sector. Sell off the mounting inventories of defaulted properties as FmHA accumulates them. FmHA has been a disaster. The General Accounting Office estimated that 1987 losses totaled \$13 billion, pushing FmHA's accumulated deficit to a staggering \$42 billion. The situation is getting worse each year.

Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC)—Deficit Reduction: \$108 million

Abolish the Appalachian Regional Commission. Since this program was enacted in 1965, the federal government has spent nearly \$6 billion in this economically distressed region, two-thirds of that invest-

² James Bovard, *The Farm Fiasco*, (Institute for Contemporary Studies Press, San Francisco, 1989), p. 1.

ment on roads. The ARC duplicates fourteen federal rural aid programs provided by the Departments of Transportation, Labor, and Agriculture.

EDUCATION

Impact Aid—Deficit Reduction: \$764 million

Eliminate the Impact Aid program which is intended to compensate local governments for the ostensible cost of educating school children of federal employees. This program was established during World War II based on the erroneous premise that military bases and other federal facilities are a "cost" for local communities.

Bilingual Education Programs—Deficit Reduction: \$100 million

Cut federal funding for bilingual education by 50 percent and remove all restrictions on the instructional methods adopted by local schools. The remaining funds should be given to local school districts to develop the programs they deem most appropriate and effective.

Stafford Student Loan Program—Deficit Reduction: \$1 billion

Reform the Stafford Student Loan program by eliminating all federal interest rate subsidies to students after they leave school. Serious study should be given to imposing a 10 percent to 15 percent co-insurance requirement on lenders. Default rates on student loans are nearing 15 percent, and nearly 3 million Americans now hold delinquent loans, worth \$5.5 billion to the federal Treasury.

Howard University—Deficit Reduction: \$100 million

Reduce total federal support for Howard University by 50 percent. Although Howard University, in Washington, D.C., is a private institution, it receives nearly \$200 million annually in federal support. Howard should be required to develop a plan for self-sufficiency over ten years using a graduated matching grant system.

College Work Study Program (CWS)—Deficit Reduction: \$606 million

End the federal role in the College Work Study program which makes grants to participating institutions that provide part-time jobs for disadvantaged graduate and undergraduate students. Nearly all of the students who take advantage of this program already collect student aid in other forms. The federal government should not have to pay for both a student's education and his or her part-time job.

Corporation for Public Broadcasting—Deficit Reduction: \$150 million

Reduce funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to \$80 million and phase-out support over the next three years. With today's boom in cable television and the rental movie market, taxpayer supported television and radio, if it was ever justified, is now unnecessary and should be ended.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities—Deficit Reduction: \$210 million

Reduce by two-thirds federal funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities which gives grants to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities; then expand the Challenge Grants program currently operated by the National Endowment for Arts. Funding would be phased-out over three years. There is no shortage of private financial support devoted to the arts and humanities. The American Association of

Fund-Raising Councils calculates that in 1987 private donations to "arts, culture, and the humanities" was \$6.41 billion.

Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)—Deficit Reduction: \$3.9 billion

Terminate the Job Training Partnership Act, which is designed to provide job training for poor youth through block grants to the states, in addition to federally managed programs, such as the Job Corps. Government directed job training programs have a long history of failure. More often than not, job training programs have simply been a boondoggle for private operators and bureaucrats. There are other methods of achieving the same end that should be tried, such as: the Earned Income Tax Credit, lowering the minimum wage, repealing occupational licensing laws at the local level, or, perhaps, eliminating any tax burden on individuals below the poverty line.

Job Corps—Deficit Reduction: \$767 million

If JTPA is not eliminated, Congress should at least terminate the Job Corps program which is intended to provide training for disadvantaged, unemployed youth. Discontinue the construction of all new centers, and sell off the remaining centers under government control. Job Corps has a twenty-five year record of failure. According to the Office of Management and Budget, the Job Corps is the most expensive job training program administered by the Department of Labor. Training costs per youth average between \$15,000 (privately managed facilities) and \$21,000 (federally managed centers) for an eight-month session.

Trade Adjustment Assistance—Deficit Reduction: \$196 million

Eliminate all funding for Trade Adjustment Assistance, which is intended to aid workers whose jobs have been lost due to import competition. Workers who lose their jobs as a result of foreign competition should not receive government benefits that exceed the assistance available to those laid off due to domestic competition.

Community Services Block Grants (CSBGs)—Deficit Reduction: \$300 million

End the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) program, which was created in 1981 by consolidating several federally funded community action programs that had been part of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society efforts. The \$90 million remaining in this program's \$390 million budget should be directed toward federal tax abatement in enterprise zones in blighted areas. A recent General Accounting Office (GAO) study found that more than 30 percent of CSBG funds are used to defray the administrative costs incurred by local social service agencies as a result of local and federal regulations. The Davis-Bacon wage setting law can add 25 percent to administrative costs and local building and zoning codes can add 15 percent to 25 percent to the cost of building low income housing.

HEALTH CARE

National Institutes of Health (NIH)—Deficit Reduction: \$1.14 billion

Reduce by 30 percent funding for the NIH, which fund biomedical research in a variety of health care areas. During the 1980s, as much as 30 percent of NIH extramural grant funds went to recipients' indirect overhead costs rather than basic research. Institute a graduated matching-grant program which would require recipients to find additional sources of support for their work. This would also act as a

check on the validity of the research conducted.

Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)—Deficit Reduction: \$370 million

Reduce by 20 percent funding for the HRSA. Transfer control of community health centers, migrant centers, and black lung clinics to the states by transforming HRSA funds into a Primary Care Block Grant. Reducing the strings attached to this block grant would allow each state to tailor assistance to meet unique local primary care needs.

Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)—Deficit Reduction: \$35 million

Abolish the CPSC. Consumers and firms do not need the CPSC. The legal system has more than adequately protection against defective products. Moreover, product monitoring is handled very capably by private firms, such as Underwriters Laboratory, Inc., and publications, such as *Consumer Reports*.

INCOME SECURITY (600)

Civil Service Employee Retirement—Deficit Reduction: \$3 billion

Bring Civil Service Retirement benefits in line with private sector packages. Such reforms should include: Raising the federal retirement age from 55 to 65; Eliminating the lump-sum retirement option; Calculating retirement benefits based on an average of the five highest annual salaries in an employee's earnings history, rather than the current top three years earnings base; and, reduce cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs) from full CPI to the CPI less 1 percent. The government pays out over \$30 billion a year to two million civil service retirees. The unfunded liabilities of the civil service retirement system are mushrooming to potentially catastrophic levels, \$1 trillion by some accounts.

Unemployment Insurance—Deficit Reduction: \$2 billion

Reform the Federal-State Unemployment Insurance program, which will pay out \$19.5 billion to unemployed workers this year. Initial reforms should include delaying the 26 weeks of unemployment benefits for unemployed workers for two weeks, and allowing firms to opt out of the program if instead they establish and make payments to Personal Unemployment Insurance and Training Accounts for all employees. Another long-term reform is to give workers tax incentives for purchasing individual unemployment insurance.

Privatize Public Housing—Deficit Reduction: \$1.3 billion

Initiate the process of privatizing public housing. There are approximately 1.4 million public housing units nationwide, managed by 3,300 local public housing authorities. Federal expenditures now total over \$6.5 billion a year.

(1) Offer all public housing developments nationwide for sale to the highest bidder. An estimated 20 percent would be purchased in the first year, yielding immediate savings to the federal government (as well as income from sales).

(2) Require purchasers to maintain the properties sold as privately managed public housing for 5 years. Purchasers would underwrite all maintenance and operating costs and freeze rents at pre-sale levels, with annual increases for inflation. After 5 years, purchasers would own property free and

clear, with the option to convert to other uses or retain as low-income housing.

(3) Use the proceeds from the sale of public housing units to fund housing vouchers for displaced tenants, and apply the balance to deficit reduction. Twice as many poor can be assisted with vouchers than is possible with public housing.

Child Nutrition Programs—Deficit Reduction: \$1 billion

Estimate \$1 billion of the \$4.9 billion in federal grants to states which compensate for families with incomes over 130 percent of the poverty level who participate in School Lunch programs, School Breakfast programs, and Child Care Feeding programs. Families with incomes below 130 percent of the poverty level with children in schools that do not participate in the meals program should be given additional food stamps or government cash assistance equal to the amount of subsidy in the child nutrition program.

Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC), MEDICAID, and Related Welfare Benefits—Deficit Reduction: \$6.5 billion

Limit to seven years the time that a family can remain on the Aid to Families with Dependent Children assistance rolls. This will reduce the current welfare rolls by roughly one-third and reduce total state and federal spending by \$10.2 billion. There are 3.7 million families currently receiving AFDC assistance; and, these families will, on average, stay on the program 11.5 years. Two million of the current beneficiaries will receive benefits over 10 years, with an on-average stay of 16.5 years. This prolonged welfare dependence provides an unsuitable environment for raising young children.

Low Income Home Energy Assistance—Deficit Reduction: \$1.4 billion

Immediately end the Low Income Home Energy Assistance program and replace it with a scaled-back program to provide only emergency and temporary energy aid to very low-income families facing disconnection of their utilities.

VETERANS BENEFITS

Veterans Medical Benefits—Deficit Reduction: \$3 billion

Convert veterans' health benefits to a reimbursement system, paying for treatment by private doctors, hospitals, and nursing homes, with full coverage provided for treatment of service-related disabilities and tapered coinsurance charges for treatment of nonservice-related disabilities. Also, reduce VA medical staff levels over several years in areas where adequate alternative treatment facilities exist. VA health care equipment and buildings located in these areas should be sold to the private sector or closed.

JUSTICE

Legal Services Corporation—Deficit Reduction: \$306 million

Eliminate funding for the Legal Services Corporation which is intended to provide legal assistance to low income individuals. Encourage the use of private-nonprofit dispute resolution organizations and give vouchers to those who need other legal assistance. The Legal Services Corporation has betrayed its mission by involving itself in political advocacy work, not legal aid to the poor.

The Bureau of Prisons—Deficit Reduction: \$100 million

Begin gradually to contract with private corrections firms to administer and operate

prison facilities, particularly the "special need" facilities, such as juvenile institutions and illegal immigration facilities. Also, finance the construction and expansion of federal prisons through lease-purchase arrangements, rather than by issuing general obligation bonds.

Federal Blue Collar Salaries (920)—Deficit Reduction: \$900 million

Reevaluate the pay rates for non-key jobs. Reform the step classification system within each occupational grade level to bring federal pay into line with private sector pay rates.

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

Mr. MOODY. We have about half the budget in entitlements and another 16 percent in interest payments. That is some 66 percent of the budget. So if you are not suggesting that that be cut, then you are suggesting that one-third of the budget bear the \$80 billion or \$90 billion cut.

Mr. DELAY. Certainly not. Absolutely not. I suggest strong entitlement reforms. In fact, I am personally—I represent my district—I am against entitlements, period. Congress ought to look at these programs every budget cycle, see whether they are working, and how do you fix them? To automatically say just because you fit into a particular class of individuals that you are entitled to benefits is a poor way of governing and it is what has gotten us into this mess.

I think they are all on the table except for taxes.

Mr. CRAIG. I yield just one more time to both of these gentlemen because I only have a few minutes left to close out this special order. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOODY. Where I would disagree with the gentleman is if you put the promises that have been made, rightly or wrongly, to veterans, senior citizens and others about what we will do for them in their old age, if you are saying we are prepared to cancel those promises, then I think we part company. But if you are talking about any new entitlements, reform is in order.

Bear in mind if you want to find 60, 80, 90 billions of dollars and you only want to look at the discretionary spending, you are looking at a base of only about \$160 billion, \$170 billion. I do not think waste, fraud and abuse, for all the waste, fraud and abuse we have seen in the S&L and HUD, would probably find that much.

So let us be honest about what we can really pull out of spending.

Mr. CRAIG. I am going to have to pull back my time.

I would like to thank both my colleagues for their debate and their consideration.

I hope they are active in the debate that will be very valuable to us here in the Congress, and to the public, as we discuss, debate on July 17 a balanced budget amendment.

I would now yield to my colleague and cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 268, CHARLEY STENHOLM of Texas, to discuss the rule under which the balanced budget amendment will come to the floor.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I think indeed we would be remiss if we did not discuss the legislative process that brings us to this point. I would like to again publicly thank the Speaker of the House and the entire leadership on our side of the aisle for the open-mindedness that they have shown, in some cases, where they have not quite as yet agreed with the wisdom of this effort. And I say, "as yet," because I think the dynamics of the severity of the fiscal problems facing this country are going to cause all of us, even those who have had previously fixed positions regarding a constitutional restraint on spending and taxing, are going to take another look at it because we have got some tough votes coming up.

Here I want to point out that Mr. CRAIG of Idaho, myself, Mr. CARPER of Delaware, Mr. SMITH of Washington, we have spent many hours meeting with many of our colleagues as well as others out there who are interested in this particular legislation.

We have always thought of this as a very serious process. Amending the Constitution is serious.

Therefore, when we discharge this rule, we discharge what everyone now agrees is a very fair rule. We recognize that it is a modified open rule. We provide for 4 hours of general debate. We provide for amendments under the 5-minute rule so that others, perhaps more scholarly, more constitutionally correct, perhaps can offer amendments that, in fact, would find the support of 290 Members of this body.

We provide that a comparable balanced budget amendment, should it pass in the Senate prior to us taking it up here on July 17, should it pass, it too would be considered first. Then the Judiciary Committee, which is the committee of jurisdiction on this, should they have a substitute, they are made in order. Then we follow with House Joint Resolution 268. That would be the final vote.

□ 1730

We will have ample opportunity to discuss and to debate the wisdom of amending the Constitution for this purpose. I think when we say that, that I will have to close my remarks now by a letter written to John Taylor, dated November 26, 1789, by Thomas Jefferson.

I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to attend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government to the genuine principles of its Constitution. I mean, an additional article taking

from the government the power of borrowing.

What we are suggesting with this is not taking it completely away, but putting it in such form that it will not be nearly so easy for future Congresses and future Presidents to do what we have been doing in playing so many games over these last several weeks and months and years.

I thank my colleague for that, and I hope we will do this again prior to July 17, and that we will get additional input. I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOONEY] coming, and I hope others as they listen to this debate will participate both on the floor that day and beforehand, so that, in fact, we will do the kind of job that the gentleman from Idaho and myself want to see Members do on this very serious process of amending our Constitution.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] for his remarks.

Mr. President, Mr. Minority Leader of the House, Mr. Majority Leader of the House, Mr. Minority Leader and Mr. Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate, or should I say the other body, please listen here. Please listen to Members here as we suggest to others in the budget summit that if we are to ask the American people to pay even a larger percentage of their hard-earned dollars to support the activities of this Government, that we allow them to put in place a process that will ensure to them and their children that this Congress and this executive branch of their Government will not continue to spend nor continue to borrow out of control, and with the lack of fiscal responsibility that has mounted a near \$3 trillion debt, and a \$200 billion deficit. It is our responsibility to be fiscally responsible, and I would trust if we can put in place within the Constitution the effective guidelines of that fiscal responsibility, that the political will, will follow to adhere to the guidelines of that Constitution.

For 200 years we have laughed at that. In that time we have mounted a debt and a deficit that even our grandchildren will probably not see paid. We can offer them one thing for the future, and that is that it would not grow, and that at some point in the near future, it might begin to shrink, and would continue as a Government to serve those who are truly in need and to adhere to the responsibilities that our Constitution and that the laws of this land entrust to Members. I would hope in the coming days that my colleagues would join with these Members not only in the debate but in the sincere consideration of this proposal, and that it can include an active part of the budget summit, and that it, in fact, could be sent forth to the States for them to consider, for them

to debate, and for them to ratify, to become a part of the Constitution of this country.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 347. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses for the July 4th recess.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4493

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4493.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 560

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] be stricken as a cosponsor of H.R. 560.

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

There was no objection.

HEALTH CARE CHOICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, what I have come before my colleagues and this body is to bring out an issue that I think is very, very important to those people in our country, and that is health care. Our older Americans agonize over the economics, and sadly, not the psychological impact on long-term illnesses. Hospitals struggling to stay open, as they confront the cost of caring for the uninsured patients. More and more physicians are practicing defensive medicine in strong part because of the fear of malpractice suits. Small businesses debate on a regular basis whether they can afford to take over the health benefits for additional workers that they need. For the majority of citizens with health insurance, we accept the reality of "cost sharing" needs to offset the costs of providing health care for those unable to cover for themselves.

Paying for health care is something that we all must confront. It is not strictly limited to the elderly or to the uninsured. I know this as chairman of

the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation. Last year, the Department of Defense spent \$6,164,000,000 on medical care for active duty members, and members and their families and retirees. This year, DOD estimates that health care costs will be \$6,283,000,000. Of that, \$2,448,000,000 will be dedicated to CHAMPUS, the health insurance plan used by military retirees and dependents for private care. Like the family or the small business owners faced with an increase in their health insurance premiums, my subcommittee is trying to address the problems of cost inflation and the inability to precisely predict medical expenses for those in the armed services.

This year, we are looking at a \$740 million unanticipated shortfall in our health care budget. Health care has become increasingly expensive for everyone. I think we need to talk about it. We really need to try to understand what is causing it, to see if we cannot reach some agreement on how to deal with this escalation in cost.

Some people seem anxious to declare our health care system a failure. Clearly, we are faced with some serious problems with health care delivery. However, I think that we need to recognize that our system can provide the best health care in the world. Before we throw out the system, we better really look at it and look at what we want out of the health care system. We need to evaluate exactly how much we are willing to pay for that system.

I think it is imperative that our system reflect the diversity of our country. A bigger system is not necessarily better. In fact, I think a bigger system sometimes could sacrifice the choices that we have today. Since the beginning of June, I have held three consumer forums in western Maryland on health care and the cost. They were informal public meetings which I think gave me a pretty good gage of what my constituents think about their health care. I would like to share some of the common themes I heard at these meetings. I learned very early in my tenure in this body that my constituents are the smartest by far on issues. When they came before me with their papers and pages and their health care costs, I learned about one couple not yet eligible for Medicare. They said they have to pay \$4,800 a year for health care insurance coverage. The husband had been a meatcutter before leaving his job, and subsequently losing his health insurance. They could not be without it. The best policy that they could find cost them \$1,200 a quarter. A younger individual related his experience in not being able to find health insurance coverage because of a preexisting condition. No one would insure them. At least not at

a rate he could reasonably afford. I had another constituent that came before me and said that he was to be admitted to the local hospital for a surgical procedure. As he went into the admission office he asked what would the cost of his room be for the day. They looked at him and said, "I beg you pardon?" And he said, "What will the cost of my room be?" They said, "Well, what difference does it make, you have insurance." He said, "It makes a great deal of difference to me." So, 3½ hours later and five people later, they finally got the answer on what the cost of his room would be for 1 day.

The subsequent comments surrounding the Medicare Program concerns reimbursement rate structure, and it was generally criticized for being arbitrary.

□ 1740

One woman said it was embarrassing going to her doctor knowing that the rate at which she was being reimbursed by Medicare was not covering his services.

Mr. Speaker, I have a constituent that is in Florida in the winter. She tries to get most of her work done down there because it is covered at a higher rate than locally. I had an attorney call me that is trying to settle an estate, but because Medicare will not finally resolve a discrepancy, the court is after him to close the estate. He cannot close it until the discrepancy is completed.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen defensive medicine identified as a major contributor to the rising health care costs. The physician was not blamed for this. Instead, my constituents advocated possibly capping the malpractice awards or tort reform as a solution.

How many times have we seen a physician, someone we have all known and loved as a part of our community, who may for one reason or another hit those golden years of the mid-fifties, which really is not golden years in this day and age, but because of the cost of malpractice insurance decides that he does not care to practice 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and, therefore, it is easier for him to hang up his shingle, go to tend his garden, play a little golf and leave health care to someone else? I think we have a tremendous number of individuals in this country that could be served by these physicians, not full time, but talented physicians that would still like to practice.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a deterioration in the physician-patient relationship, and that was discussed, the desire to let my doctor and me decide what is the best for me which has been sacrificed in a lot of cases as a primary focus on cutting health care costs. Common sense and caring sometimes has been lost to Government regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Member that does better when I cite cases in point. I had an 88-year-old gentleman that was admitted to the hospital for a gall bladder surgery. The prospective payment system says that he should be hospitalized for just 2 days. It is time for him to be discharged and to be sent home for continued care. But the only person at home to give that continued care is his 83-year-old wife who is legally blind herself. Regardless of the practicality of the situation, this gentleman is discharged. Against the advice of his physician this gentleman has been discharged. That is what the manual says, and that is what the hospital must do. So, in this case 5 days later the 83-year-old legally blind wife returned her 88-year-old husband to the hospital. He had to be readmitted.

The frustration that we see over the shortfalls in our own health care system and the outrage over the cost of medicine has made many of us look at the Canadian and the Swedish health care plans and think maybe they look attractive. There are benefits to some of these systems, but they are not perfect either.

Are we willing to pay higher taxes for health care? Are we prepared to reduce the supply of medical resources required to make these plans economically feasible? I am not sure that we, as a nation, are ready for that.

Do we want to be told where to go for surgery? Do we want to go 200 miles away to a hospital?

Mr. Speaker, following these three consumer forums that I held, I followed up with a roundtable discussion on health care costs with health care providers from western Maryland. We had a lot of talent in that room. Not a lot of people, but a lot of talent. We had hospital administrators, we had physicians, we had nurses, nursing home administrators, health benefit counsellors, health planning agency directors, individuals actively involved in our health care system. We had a small business man that has a health care plan for his company. We had a large business that has a health care plan for their company.

Mr. Speaker, it came as somewhat of a surprise to me that the concerns that I heard from my three forums were the same concerns that closely reflected those voices at the roundtable. Included in these issues was paper work, paper work choking the system. Twenty-two percent of our health care expenses go toward administrative costs.

One hospital administrator told me that their computer screens are split three ways to account for the multiple requirements needed by insurance companies and excessive Government regulations. We all know what has happened with the nine-digit system that we have on DRG coding. I was told that rather than simplifying the

system, it is just getting more complicated. On an average there is a new regulation issued every day.

Mr. Speaker, I had one individual tell me that on their form they need to know on a 92-year-old woman what her mother's maiden name was and what her father's address is. This all costs.

A primary physician that practiced for 26 years said that with all the regulation hassle and the fear of malpractice he has lost his love of medicine. He once enjoyed medicine. I think that is important for all of us because the good physician is the doctor who truly loves to practice medicine and who feels a part of his or her community, and today this is becoming nearly impossible.

How often have we as Members of Congress heard people say that Congress really is the problem? That all Congress people are bad? That all Congress men and women are crooks? We have also heard that same person say, "That is except for mine."

We are now hearing that all physicians are bad. That is except mine.

But beyond the dollar issue, there was a general agreement that attitudes will have to be changed. We go to the doctor so we can feel better, and, if we do not feel better, is there something wrong with the doctor? Perhaps our demands for health care will need to be reevaluated.

The meetings that I had showed me that people are extremely concerned about the high cost of health care. It is clear that changes are needed. Unfortunately, we are short on specifics. Personal experiences from our constituents can give us a rough outline of all of the problems, the self-employed painter that has a wife and three children, but because he is self-employed cannot afford any health care. These personal experiences can set up the flags needed to avoid repeating the costly mistakes that we have already made. Hopefully this special order will make some of us stop and think on how we can add to that debate.

We have looked in Eastern Europe, at the emerging nations of Eastern Europe. We have seen the chaos that their health care system is in. We have seen many times people talking about our own health delivery system not meeting our needs, yet our health care system is one of the finest in the world. How often do we see foreign physicians coming here for training, return to their homeland to practice, and yet then shortly after return to this country to practice?

I would like to close by leaving a few thoughts to my colleagues and some recommendations offered during the roundtable discussions, and it is this:

It is dangerous to advocate major changes to our system until we have defined what we expect to get from

that system. What are we willing to pay for it? Are there limits to the definition of what is adequate health care? We cannot reasonably expect to improve our health care delivery without having a clear national health policy, and, until we do this, I think our health care dollars will continue to chase what is available with no end to the rising costs.

We, each and every one of us, the American public, have an obligation to take some responsibility for our health. We have to take a responsibility for our body and to make sure that it functions and it is there when we need it. So, it is up to us in Congress to do our work and to formulate a policy for all Americans for preventive medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come that we as a Congress make those tough decisions to say how the health care costs, and the rising escalation and the delivery system for the American population is put into a proper priority.

□ 1750

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COMBEST (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today after 2:30 p.m., on account of personal reasons.

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. Goss) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DOUGLAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HANCOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COX, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHEAT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes each day, on July 10, 12, 16, 19, and 20.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Goss) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KOLBE in two instances.

Mr. DANNEMEYER.

Mr. PORTER in three instances.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. CRAIG in two instances.

Mr. RINALDO.

Ms. SCHNEIDER.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. SCHIFF.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in four instances.

Mr. TAUKE in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. HASTERT in three instances.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. GOSS.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FASCELL, in three instances.

Mr. ATKINS, in two instances.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE.

Mr. MAVROULES, in three instances.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. CARR.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. DYAMALLY.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. WALGREN.

Mr. MRAZEK.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

Mr. NELSON of Florida.

Ms. OAKAR.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 770. An act to entitle employees to family leave in certain cases involving a birth, an adoption, or a serious health condition and to temporary medical leave in certain cases involving a serious health condition, with adequate protection of the employees' employment and benefit rights, and to establish a commission to study ways of

providing salary replacement for employees who take any such leave; and

H.R. 5075. An act to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act to authorize appropriations for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2124. An act to authorize appropriations for the National Space Council, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution designating July 19, 1990, as "Flight Attendant Safety Professionals Day."

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 347 of the 101st Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 noon, Tuesday, July 10, 1990.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 347, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 10, 1990, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3476. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a combined annual report on U.S. efforts to promote the standardization of equipment with NATO members and cooperative R&D projects with allied countries, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a, 2457; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3477. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, Installations and Environment), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to delete the line-of-duty requirement for surviving dependents of members of the uniformed services occupying family housing or receiving basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3478. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Analysis of Appropriated Out-of-Town Travel Funds Shown in Current Budget," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3479. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Michael Martin Skol, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Venezuela, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3480. A letter from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector

general for the period October 1, 1989, through March 31, 1990, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3481. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting proposed forms for the submission of debt settlement plans by political committees, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d); to the Committee on House Administration.

3482. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting notification of a proposed OPM demonstration project, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 4703(b)(6); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

3483. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 1988 annual report on fatal and injury accident rates on public roads in the United States, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 401 nt.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3484. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 12, 1990, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, TX (H. Doc. No. 101-208); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

3485. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 11th annual report on administration of the offshore oil pollution compensation fund, pursuant to section 314 of title III of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4825. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. 101-566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4952. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to reauthorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission and to improve the Commission's regulatory process and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 3664. A bill entitled the "Omnibus Agricultural Commodity Promotion and Research Act of 1989"; with amendments; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period ending not later than July 13, 1990, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee

pursuant to clause 1(v), rule X (Rept. 101-568, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5188. A bill to prohibit the spraying of toxic pesticides over densely populated areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. MACHTEY, and Mr. BLILEY):

H.R. 5189. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a tax deduction for expenses exceeding 5 percent of adjusted gross income incurred in care of certain elderly individuals, to allow physicians and registered professional nurses a tax deduction for the cost of certain goods and services donated by them to elderly individuals, and to permit tax-free withdrawals from individual retirement accounts to pay certain long-term care expenses or purchase insurance to cover such expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 5190. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the establishment of tax enterprise zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MADIGAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 5191. A bill relating to the procedures to be followed and protections to be afforded to Federal employees in the event of a major reduction in force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado:

H.R. 5192. A bill to establish the Curenti National Recreation Area in the State of Colorado as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5193. A bill to authorize and direct an exchange of lands in Colorado; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. STALLINGS):

H.R. 5194. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 5195. A bill to amend the act of May 15, 1965, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CROCKETT (for himself, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FUSTER, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 5196. A bill to promote economic development in the Caribbean through a debt for development program; jointly, to the

Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ECKART:

H.R. 5197. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for recycling and to increase the environmental income tax to generate additional revenue to promote recycling; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ESPY:

H.R. 5198. A bill to aid minority farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEJDENSON:

H.R. 5199. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide contractors whose contracts for naval reactors are being terminated with assistance in using patents, designs, processes, and manufacturing data developed under the contractor in civilian production; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. BROOMFIELD):

H.R. 5200. A bill to promote and strengthen aviation security, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEREN of Texas (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. CHAPMAN):

H.R. 5201. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to reform U.S. bilateral economic assistance programs, to promote the purchase of U.S. goods and services, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DICKS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SABO, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. McGRATH):

H.R. 5202. A bill to authorize funding for environmental activities of the Department of Defense, to require the creation of a major force program category for environmental activities in the Department of Defense, to require a report on the Department of Defense's management of personnel carrying out such environmental activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 5203. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make nondischargable debts for liabilities under the terms of a property settlement agreement entered into in connection with a separation agreement or divorce decree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 5204. A bill to establish a tribal cattle herd pilot project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 5205. A bill to redesignate the National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Laboratory located in Ashland, OR, as the "Clark R. Bavin National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Laboratory; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 5206. A bill to provide for the bonding of non-vessel-operating common carriers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By LEVIN of Michigan (for himself and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 5207. A bill to amend section 842 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the use of same year tax return data in calculating minimum effectively connected net investment income and to provide for a carryover account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN (for himself, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mrs. COLLINS):

H.R. 5208. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to make that act applicable to tobacco products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. PURSELL):

H.R. 5209. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to make nonmailable any unsolicited sample of a drug or other hazardous household substance which does not meet child-resistant packaging requirements; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAVROULES:

H.R. 5210. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the acquisition process by establishing a presumption that certain contracts will be awarded by the Department of Defense based on initial proposals without discussion with the offerors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAVROULES (for himself, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. TANNER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. IRELAND):

H.R. 5211. A bill to improve the quality and professionalism of the defense acquisition work force in the Department of Defense; to the Committees on Armed Services, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 5212. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to strengthen penalties for offenses involving crystal-line methamphetamine, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOODY (for himself, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PICKLE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 5213. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Medicare Program for the services of home dialysis aides who provide medical assistance during hemodialysis treatment at the homes of end stage renal disease patients, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah (for himself, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 5214. A bill to establish the Koka-pelli National Outdoor Theater in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 5215. A bill to make a technical correction in a land description contained in the San Juan Basin Wilderness Protection Act of 1984; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 5216. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more fairly apportion

tion between foreign and domestic sources interest attributable to environmental control assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York (for herself and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota):

H.R. 5217. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude from amounts treated as wages in applying the earnings test remuneration for certain part-time service for a public elementary or secondary school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Vermont (for himself, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HILER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. SCHAEFER):

H.R. 5218. A bill to establish a national demonstration program for educational performance agreements for school restructuring; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 5219. A bill to increase the penalties for violations of law involving depository institutions; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 5220. A bill to clarify the existing authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army to use environmental improvement projects when enforcing applicable water pollution laws; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 5221. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the Social Security offset applicable to certain annuities for surviving spouses paid under the survivor benefit plan for retired members of the Armed Forces to the extent that such offset is due to Social Security benefits based on the surviving spouse's own earning or self-employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAUKE:

H.R. 5222. A bill to improve and expand restitution remedies available to victims of crimes, to provide incentive grants for State-based restitution centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 5223. A bill to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the San Carlos Apache Tribe in Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALGREN (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. RITTER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. BLILEY):

H.R. 5224. A bill to clarify the application of the functional relationship test to gas utility holding companies registered under the Public Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALGREN (for himself, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. LEVINE of California):

H.R. 5225. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to clarify and

strengthen provisions pertaining to national security takeovers; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Energy and Commerce; and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHEAT (for himself, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. GEPHARDT):

H.R. 5226. A bill to encourage States to establish Parents as Teachers Programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ERDREICH (for himself, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BATES, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PAXON, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. OLIN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. PATTERSON):

H.J. Res. 613. Joint resolution designating April 7 through 13, 1991, as "National County Government Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 614. Joint resolution to designate the decade beginning January 1, 1990, as the "Decade of the Child"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Con. Res. 347. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses for the July 4th recess; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H. Con. Res. 348. Concurrent resolution supporting peace between India and Pakistan and a peaceful resolution of the crisis in Kashmir; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself and Mr. BROOMFIELD):

H. Con. Res. 349. Concurrent resolution with respect to United States policy toward the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself and Mr. ANNUNZIO):

H. Con. Res. 350. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that American workers, farmers, and businesses should not finance the savings and loan bailout through tax increases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

456. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to chronic fatigue syndrome research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

457. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to democracy in Nicaragua; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

458. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the land and water conservation fund grant program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

459. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the maximum speed limit on public road; to the

Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

460. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the issue of wetlands; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Agriculture, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER:

H.R. 5227. A bill to authorize issuance of a certificate of documentation for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel *Sea Wind*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Florida:

H.R. 5228. A bill for the relief of Hossein Alipour and Zehra Alipour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. OWENS of Utah.
 H.R. 118: Mr. CARPER and Mr. BATEMAN.
 H.R. 222: Mr. FASCELL.
 H.R. 303: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.
 H.R. 529: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 530: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 579: Mr. GOSS.
 H.R. 711: Mr. MAVROULES.
 H.R. 857: Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. SABO.
 H.R. 1083: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. CLINGER.
 H.R. 1130: Mr. MINETA.
 H.R. 1174: Mr. MINETA.
 H.R. 1292: Mr. DYSON and Mr. QUILLEN.
 H.R. 1317: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 1493: Mr. YATES.
 H.R. 1500: Mr. WEISS, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 1767: Mr. LEVINE of California.
 H.R. 1899: Mrs. BOXER and Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2098: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. GEREN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. WILSON, Mr. KYL, and Mr. MANTON.
 H.R. 2319: Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 2437: Mr. LOWEY of New York.
 H.R. 2460: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
 H.R. 2664: Mr. WASHINGTON.
 H.R. 2776: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
 H.R. 2911: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. LEVINE of California.
 H.R. 3272: Mr. HOAGLAND.
 H.R. 3409: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. OWENS of New York.
 H.R. 3547: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.
 H.R. 3604: Mr. OXLEY.
 H.R. 3659: Mr. BLILEY.
 H.R. 3690: Mr. MINETA.
 H.R. 3719: Mr. GOSS and Mr. WEISS.
 H.R. 3733: Mr. SWIFT and Mr. GRAY.
 H.R. 3880: Mr. MARLENEE.
 H.R. 3970: Mr. SIKORSKI.
 H.R. 4003: Mr. BENNETT and Mr. DORNAN of California.
 H.R. 4025: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 4040: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 4063: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 4121: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 4125: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. McCurdy, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 4224: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4287: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 4300: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 4310: Mr. FALCOMAVALGA.

H.R. 4349: Mr. VENTO and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 4369: Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 4412: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 4421: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 4431: Mr. JACOBS and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4464: Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 4487: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CLARKE, and Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 4494: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GEREN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. ROE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BATES, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 4548: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4589: Mr. FALCOMAVALGA, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 4590: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 4593: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 4618: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BATES, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UBALL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. YATES, and Mr. WOLFE.

H.R. 4669: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 4680: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FALCOMAVALGA, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 4683: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. RINALDO, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 4690: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GUNDERSON, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT.

H.R. 4691: Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 4714: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4729: Mr. BRUCE.

H.R. 4761: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 4772: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. McCREERY.

H.R. 4793: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 4808: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 4814: Mr. COX and Mr. FIELDS.

H.R. 4816: Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HUCKABY, and Mr. MADIGAN.

H.R. 4864: Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. JAMES, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. FROST, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 4865: Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. JAMES, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HORTON,

Mr. FRANK, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. FROST, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 4866: Mr. KYL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. COX, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 4868: Mr. FAZIO and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 4915: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. STARK, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. BEILSON.

H.R. 4916: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 4923: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 4953: Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. McMILLAN of Maryland, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 4955: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 4959: Mr. TAUKE and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 4992: Mr. SAIKI, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 4993: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 4995: Mr. ANNUNZIO and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 5007: Mr. MOORHEAD and Mr. HOLLOWAY.

H.R. 5013: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 5023: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 5050: Mr. STANGELAND, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TORRES, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. TAUKE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. SUNDRQUIST, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 5053: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FALCOMAVALGA, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LENT, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. McEWEN.

H.R. 5054: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PEASE, Mr. BOSCO, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 5055: Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 5067: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 5088: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 5095: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 5098: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. RITTER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. YATRON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 5101: Mr. EVANS and Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 5162: Mr. McCLOSKEY.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 268: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.J. Res. 285: Mr. WOLF, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GEREN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.J. Res. 459: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. FROST, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.J. Res. 507: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.J. Res. 510: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WISE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. OLIN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. KYL, Mr. FASCELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PAXON, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JAMES, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. FISH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. ASPIN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GALLO, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. COX, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. WELDON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. BATES, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ROE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr.

MICHEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. TALLON, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.J. Res. 519: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. WEBER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.J. Res. 521: Mr. TORRES.

H.J. Res. 525: Mr. HYDE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.J. Res. 528: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. WILSON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. YATRON.

H.J. Res. 532: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. WEBER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FROST, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. HAWKINS.

H.J. Res. 538: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FROST, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DERRICK, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.J. Res. 543: Mr. MADIGAN.

H.J. Res. 552: Mr. PICKETT, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. JONTZ, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.J. Res. 554: Mr. GALLO, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. ECKART, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. GEREN of Texas, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.J. Res. 562: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.J. Res. 570: Mr. HORTON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GRANT, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FUSTER, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HATCHER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KASICH, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.J. Res. 571: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.J. Res. 581: Mr. CARPER, Mr. COX, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.J. Res. 586: Mr. KYL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. COX, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.J. Res. 590: Mr. EVANS.

H.J. Res. 592: Mr. BEILINSON.

H.J. Res. 593: Mr. BEILINSON.

H.J. Res. 594: Mr. BEILINSON.

H.J. Res. 598: Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.J. Res. 599: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. NOWAK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. TORRES, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. HASTERT.

H. Con. Res. 264: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 270: Mr. HUGHES.

H. Res. 374: Mr. ARMEY.

H. Res. 390: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. SLATTERY.

H. Res. 402: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. DYMALLY.

H. Res. 407: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. ROTH, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H. Res. 414: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H. Res. 418: Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RITTER, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. DENNY SMITH.

H. Res. 419: Mr. FROST, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FISH, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. RHODES, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. HILER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. COURTER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HYDE, Mr.

TAUKE, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. McDADD, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. LENT, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. POSHARD.

H. Res. 421: Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. McDADD, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. OLIN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SKEEN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 560: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 4462: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 4493: Mr. TORRICELLI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

199. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Council of the borough of Somerset, PA, relative to opening up the cable industry to more competition; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.